

together with this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 739

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House being in possession of the official papers, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on S. 1790 shall be, and they are hereby, discharged. It shall then be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, to move that the House recede from its amendment and agree to an amendment to the Senate bill (S. 1790). The motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except for one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on the postponed question at a later time.

PALLONE-THUNE TELEPHONE ROBOCALL ABUSE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT AND DETERRENCE ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 151) to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 151

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pallone-Thune Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act” or the “Pallone-Thune TRACED Act”.

SEC. 2. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 3. FORFEITURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated this subsection shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty pursuant to section 503(b)(1). Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection. A forfeiture penalty under this subparagraph shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by this Act. The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2).

“(B) VIOLATION WITH INTENT.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated this subsection with the intent to cause such violation shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty pursuant to section 503(b)(1). Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection. A forfeiture penalty under this subparagraph shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by this Act. The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be equal to an amount determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an additional penalty not to exceed \$10,000.

“(C) RECOVERY.—Any forfeiture penalty determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be recoverable under section 504(a).

“(D) PROCEDURE.—No forfeiture liability shall be determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) against any person unless such person receives the notice required by section 503(b)(3) or section 503(b)(4).

“(E) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 503(b), no forfeiture penalty shall be determined or imposed against any person—

“(i) under subparagraph (A) if the violation charged occurred more than 1 year prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability; or

“(ii) under subparagraph (B) if the violation charged occurred more than 4 years prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability.

“(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the Commission may not determine or impose a forfeiture penalty on a person under both subparagraphs (A) and (B) based on the same conduct.”;

(2) in subsection (e)(5)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by adding at the end the following: “Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection.”; and

(B) in clause (iv)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “2-YEAR” and inserting “4-YEAR”; and

(ii) by striking “2 years” and inserting “4 years”; and

(3) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ROBOCALLS AND TRANSMISSION OF MISLEADING

OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Commission, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit to Congress a report regarding enforcement by the Commission of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) during the preceding calendar year.

“(2) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) The number of complaints received by the Commission during each of the preceding 5 calendar years, for each of the following categories:

“(i) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of subsection (b) or (c).

“(ii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of the standards prescribed under subsection (d).

“(iii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in connection with which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

“(B) The number of citations issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsection (d), and details of each such citation.

“(C) The number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), and details of each such notice including any proposed forfeiture amount.

“(D) The number of final orders imposing forfeiture penalties issued pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce such subsections, and details of each such order including the forfeiture imposed.

“(E) The amount of forfeiture penalties or criminal fines collected, during the preceding calendar year, by the Commission or the Attorney General for violations of such subsections, and details of each case in which such a forfeiture penalty or criminal fine was collected.

“(F) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(G) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service that discount high-volume, unlawful, short-duration calls to the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution in order to decrease the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(3) NO ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prepare the report required by paragraph (1) without requiring the provision of additional information from providers of telecommunications service or voice service (as defined in section 4(a) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act).”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect any action or proceeding commenced before and pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this section not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CALL AUTHENTICATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) STIR/SHAKEN AUTHENTICATION FRAMEWORK.—The term “STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework” means the secure telephone identity revisited and signature-based

handling of asserted information using tokens standards proposed by the information and communications technology industry.

(2) VOICE SERVICE.—The term “voice service”—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as “CPE”) and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

(b) AUTHENTICATION FRAMEWORKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), and in accordance with paragraph (6), not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall—

(A) require a provider of voice service to implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework in the internet protocol networks of the provider of voice service; and

(B) require a provider of voice service to take reasonable measures to implement an effective call authentication framework in the non-internet protocol networks of the provider of voice service.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Commission shall not take the action described in paragraph (1) with respect to a provider of voice service if the Commission determines, not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, that such provider of voice service—

(A) in internet protocol networks—

(i) has adopted the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework for calls on the internet protocol networks of the provider of voice service;

(ii) has agreed voluntarily to participate with other providers of voice service in the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework;

(iii) has begun to implement the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework; and

(iv) will be capable of fully implementing the STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) in non-internet protocol networks—

(i) has taken reasonable measures to implement an effective call authentication framework; and

(ii) will be capable of fully implementing an effective call authentication framework not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the determination required under paragraph (2), which shall include—

(A) an analysis of the extent to which providers of voice service have implemented the call authentication frameworks described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), including whether the availability of necessary equipment and equipment upgrades has impacted such implementation; and

(B) an assessment of the efficacy of the call authentication frameworks described in sub-

paragraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) in addressing all aspects of call authentication.

(4) REVIEW AND REVISION OR REPLACE-MENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Commission, after public notice and an opportunity for comment, shall—

(A) assess the efficacy of the technologies used for call authentication frameworks implemented under this section;

(B) based on the assessment under subparagraph (A), revise or replace the call authentication frameworks under this section if the Commission determines it is in the public interest to do so; and

(C) submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the findings of the assessment under subparagraph (A) and on any actions to revise or replace the call authentication frameworks under subparagraph (B).

(5) EXTENSION OF IMPLEMENTATION DEAD-LINE.—

(A) BURDENS AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTA-TION.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and as appropriate thereafter, the Commission—

(i) shall assess any burdens or barriers to the implementation required by paragraph (1), including—

(I) for providers of voice service to the extent the networks of such providers use time-division multiplexing;

(II) for small providers of voice service and those in rural areas; and

(III) the inability to purchase or upgrade equipment to support the call authentication frameworks under this section, or lack of availability of such equipment; and

(ii) in connection with an assessment under clause (i), may, upon a public finding of undue hardship, delay required compliance with the 18-month time period described in paragraph (1), for a reasonable period of time, for a provider or class of providers of voice service, or type of voice calls, as necessary for that provider or class of providers or type of calls to participate in the implementation in order to address the identified burdens and barriers.

(B) DELAY OF COMPLIANCE REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN NON-INTERNET PROTOCOL NETWORKS.—

Subject to subparagraphs (C) through (F), for any provider or class of providers of voice service, or type of voice calls, only to the extent that such a provider or class of providers of voice service, or type of voice calls, materially relies on a non-internet protocol network for the provision of such service or calls, the Commission shall grant a delay of required compliance under subparagraph (A)(ii) until a call authentication protocol has been developed for calls delivered over non-internet protocol networks and is reasonably available.

(C) ROBOCALL MITIGATION PROGRAM.—

(i) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—During the time of a delay of compliance granted under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Commission shall require, pursuant to the authority of the Commission, that any provider subject to such delay shall implement an appropriate robocall mitigation program to prevent unlawful robocalls from originating on the network of the provider.

(ii) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—If the consortium registered under section 13(d) identifies a provider of voice service that is subject to a delay of compliance granted under subparagraph (A)(ii) as repeatedly originating large-scale unlawful robocall campaigns, the Commission shall require such provider to take action to ensure that such provider does not continue to originate such calls.

(iii) MINIMIZATION OF BURDEN.—The Commission shall make reasonable efforts to minimize the burden of any robocall mitigation required pursuant to clause (ii), which may include prescribing certain specific robocall mitigation practices for providers of voice service that have repeatedly originated large-scale unlawful robocall campaigns.

(D) FULL PARTICIPATION.—The Commission shall take reasonable measures to address any issues in an assessment under subparagraph (A)(i) and enable as promptly as reasonable full participation of all classes of providers of voice service and types of voice calls to receive the highest level of trust. Such measures shall include, without limitation, as appropriate, limiting or terminating a delay of compliance granted to a provider under subparagraph (B) if the Commission determines in such assessment that the provider is not making reasonable efforts to develop the call authentication protocol described in such subparagraph.

(E) ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES.—The Commission shall identify, in consultation with small providers of voice service and those in rural areas, alternative effective methodologies to protect customers from unauthenticated calls during any delay of compliance granted under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(F) REVISION OF DELAY OF COMPLIANCE.—Not less frequently than annually after the first delay of compliance is granted under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Commission—

(i) shall consider revising or extending any delay of compliance granted under subparagraph (A)(ii);

(ii) may revise such delay of compliance; and

(iii) shall issue a public notice with regard to whether such delay of compliance remains necessary, including—

(I) why such delay of compliance remains necessary; and

(II) when the Commission expects to achieve the goal of full participation as described in subparagraph (D).

(6) NO ADDITIONAL COST TO CONSUMERS OR SMALL BUSINESS CUSTOMERS.—The Commission shall prohibit providers of voice service from adding any additional line item charges to consumer or small business customer subscribers for the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1).

(7) ACCURATE IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue best practices that providers of voice service may use as part of the implementation of effective call authentication frameworks under paragraph (1) to take steps to ensure the calling party is accurately identified.

(c) SAFE HARBOR AND OTHER REGU-LATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (j) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by section 10, the Commission shall, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate rules—

(A) establishing when a provider of voice service may block a voice call based, in whole or in part, on information provided by the call authentication frameworks under subsection (b), with no additional line item charge;

(B) establishing a safe harbor for a provider of voice service from liability for unintended or inadvertent blocking of calls or for the unintended or inadvertent misidentification of the level of trust for individual calls based, in whole or in part, on information provided by the call authentication frameworks under subsection (b);

(C) establishing a process to permit a calling party adversely affected by the information provided by the call authentication frameworks under subsection (b) to verify the authenticity of the calling party's calls; and

(D) ensuring that calls originating from a provider of voice service in an area where the provider is subject to a delay of compliance with the time period described in subsection (b)(1) are not unreasonably blocked because the calls are not able to be authenticated.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the safe harbor under paragraph (1), consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (j) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by section 10, the Commission shall consider limiting the liability of a provider of voice service based on the extent to which the provider of voice service—

(A) blocks or identifies calls based, in whole or in part, on the information provided by the call authentication frameworks under subsection (b);

(B) implemented procedures based, in whole or in part, on the information provided by the call authentication frameworks under subsection (b); and

(C) used reasonable care, including making all reasonable efforts to avoid blocking emergency public safety calls.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Commission from initiating a rulemaking pursuant to its existing statutory authority.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Chairman of the Commission, shall convene an interagency working group to study Government prosecution of violations of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall—

(1) determine whether, and if so how, any Federal laws, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints inhibit the prosecution of such violations;

(2) identify existing and potential Federal policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination among Federal departments and agencies and States, and between States, in the prevention and prosecution of such violations;

(3) identify existing and potential international policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination between countries in the prevention and prosecution of such violations; and

(4) consider—

(A) the benefit and potential sources of additional resources for the Federal prevention and prosecution of criminal violations of that section;

(B) whether to establish memoranda of understanding regarding the prevention and prosecution of such violations between—

(i) the States;

(ii) the States and the Federal Government; and

(iii) the Federal Government and a foreign government;

(C) whether to establish a process to allow States to request Federal subpoenas from the Commission;

(D) whether extending civil enforcement authority to the States would assist in the successful prevention and prosecution of such violations;

(E) whether increased forfeiture and imprisonment penalties are appropriate, such as extending imprisonment for such a violation to a term longer than 2 years;

(F) whether regulation of any entity that enters into a business arrangement with a

common carrier regulated under title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) for the specific purpose of carrying, routing, or transmitting a call that constitutes such a violation would assist in the successful prevention and prosecution of such violations; and

(G) the extent to which, if any, Department of Justice policies to pursue the prosecution of violations causing economic harm, physical danger, or erosion of an inhabitant's peace of mind and sense of security inhibit the prevention or prosecution of such violations.

(c) MEMBERS.—The interagency working group shall be composed of such representatives of Federal departments and agencies as the Attorney General considers appropriate, such as—

- (1) the Department of Commerce;
- (2) the Department of State;
- (3) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (4) the Commission;
- (5) the Federal Trade Commission; and
- (6) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(d) NON-FEDERAL STAKEHOLDERS.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall consult with such non-Federal stakeholders as the Attorney General determines have the relevant expertise, including the National Association of Attorneys General.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency working group shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the findings of the study under subsection (a), including—

(1) any recommendations regarding the prevention and prosecution of such violations; and

(2) a description of what progress, if any, relevant Federal departments and agencies have made in implementing the recommendations under paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. ACCESS TO NUMBER RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXAMINATION OF FCC POLICIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a proceeding to determine how Commission policies regarding access to number resources, including number resources for toll-free and non-toll-free telephone numbers, could be modified, including by establishing registration and compliance obligations, and requirements that providers of voice service given access to number resources take sufficient steps to know the identity of the customers of such providers, to help reduce access to numbers by potential perpetrators of violations of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(2) REGULATIONS.—If the Commission determines under paragraph (1) that modifying the policies described in that paragraph could help achieve the goal described in that paragraph, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement those policy modifications.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Any person who knowingly, through an employee, agent, officer, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, by or through any means or device whatsoever, is a party to obtaining number resources, including number resources for toll-free and non-toll-free telephone numbers, from a common carrier regulated under title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), in violation of a regulation prescribed under subsection (a), shall, notwithstanding section 503(b)(5) of the Communica-

tions Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b)(5)), be subject to a forfeiture penalty under section 503(b) of that Act (47 U.S.C. 503(b)). A forfeiture penalty under this subsection shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by law.

SEC. 7. PROTECTIONS FROM SPOOFED CALLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and consistent with the call authentication frameworks under section 4, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking to help protect a subscriber from receiving unwanted calls or text messages from a caller using an unauthenticated number.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In promulgating rules under subsection (a), the Commission shall consider—

(1) the Government Accountability Office report on combating the fraudulent provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information required by section 503(c) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115-141);

(2) the best means of ensuring that a subscriber or provider has the ability to block calls from a caller using an unauthenticated North American Numbering Plan number;

(3) the impact on the privacy of a subscriber from unauthenticated calls;

(4) the effectiveness in verifying the accuracy of caller identification information; and

(5) the availability and cost of providing protection from the unwanted calls or text messages described in subsection (a).

SEC. 8. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) shall ensure that any exemption under subparagraph (B) or (C) contains requirements for calls made in reliance on the exemption with respect to—

“(i) the classes of parties that may make such calls;

“(ii) the classes of parties that may be called; and

“(iii) the number of such calls that a calling party may make to a particular called party.”

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—In the case of any exemption issued under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall, not later than 1 year after such date of enactment, prescribe such regulations, or amend such existing regulations, as necessary to ensure that such exemption contains each requirement described in subparagraph (I) of such section, as added by subsection (a). To the extent such an exemption contains such a requirement before such date of enactment, nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to require the Commission to prescribe or amend regulations relating to such requirement.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON REASSIGNED NUMBER DATABASE.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available on the website of the Commission, a report on the status of the efforts of the Commission pursuant to the Second Report and Order in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17-59; FCC 18-177; adopted on December 12, 2018).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall describe the efforts of the Commission, as described in such Second Report and Order, to ensure—

(1) the establishment of a database of telephone numbers that have been disconnected, in order to provide a person making calls subject to section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) with comprehensive and timely information to enable such person to avoid making calls without the prior express consent of the called party because the number called has been reassigned;

(2) that a person who wishes to use any safe harbor provided pursuant to such Second Report and Order with respect to making calls must demonstrate that, before making the call, the person appropriately checked the most recent update of the database and the database reported that the number had not been disconnected; and

(3) that if the person makes the demonstration described in paragraph (2), the person will be shielded from liability under section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) should the database return an inaccurate result.

SEC. 10. STOP ROBOCALLS.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING REGARDING ROBOCALL AND SPOOFING VIOLATIONS.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to establish a process that streamlines the ways in which a private entity may voluntarily share with the Commission information relating to—

“(A) a call made or a text message sent in violation of subsection (b); or

“(B) a call or text message for which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was caused to be transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

“(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘text message’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).”

(b) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall take a final agency action to ensure the robocall blocking services provided on an opt-out or opt-in basis pursuant to the Declaratory Ruling of the Commission in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17-59; FCC 19-51; adopted on June 6, 2019)—

“(A) are provided with transparency and effective redress options for both—

“(i) consumers; and

“(ii) callers; and

“(B) are provided with no additional line item charge to consumers and no additional charge to callers for resolving complaints related to erroneously blocked calls; and

“(C) make all reasonable efforts to avoid blocking emergency public safety calls.

“(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘text message’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).”

(c) STUDY ON INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN VOIP SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct a study regarding whether to require a provider of covered VoIP service to—

(A) provide to the Commission contact information for such provider and keep such information current; and

(B) retain records relating to each call transmitted over the covered VoIP service of such provider that are sufficient to trace such call back to the source of such call.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) COVERED VOIP SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered VoIP service” means a service that—

(A) is an interconnected VoIP service (as defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)); or

(B) would be an interconnected VoIP service (as so defined) except that the service permits users to terminate calls to the public switched telephone network but does not permit users to receive calls that originate on the public switched telephone network.

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULE REGARDING DEFINITION OF TEXT MESSAGE.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (i) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by subsection (a) of this section, and paragraph (2) of subsection (j) of such section 227, as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to subsection (e)(8) of such section 227 by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115-141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 11. PROVISION OF EVIDENCE OF CERTAIN ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau of the Commission obtains evidence that suggests a willful, knowing, and repeated robocall violation with an intent to defraud, cause harm, or wrongfully obtain anything of value, the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau shall provide such evidence to the Attorney General.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) states the number of instances during the preceding year in which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General; and

(2) contains a general summary of the types of robocall violations to which such evidence relates.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the ability of the Commission or the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau under other law—

(1) to refer a matter to the Attorney General; or

(2) to pursue or continue pursuit of an enforcement action in a matter with respect to which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General.

(d) ROBOCALL VIOLATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “robocall violation” means a violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

SEC. 12. PROTECTION FROM ONE-RING SCAMS.

(a) INITIATION OF PROCEEDING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a proceeding to protect called parties from one-ring scams.

(b) MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.—As part of the proceeding required by subsection (a),

the Commission shall consider how the Commission can—

(1) work with Federal and State law enforcement agencies to address one-ring scams;

(2) work with the governments of foreign countries to address one-ring scams;

(3) in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, better educate consumers about how to avoid one-ring scams;

(4) incentivize voice service providers to stop calls made to perpetrate one-ring scams from being received by called parties, including consideration of adding identified one-ring scam type numbers to the Commission’s existing list of permissible categories for carrier-initiated blocking;

(5) work with entities that provide call-blocking services to address one-ring scams; and

(6) establish obligations on international gateway providers that are the first point of entry for these calls into the United States, including potential requirements that such providers verify with the foreign originator the nature or purpose of calls before initiating service.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the status of the proceeding required by subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ONE-RING SCAM.—The term “one-ring scam” means a scam in which a caller makes a call and allows the call to ring the called party for a short duration, in order to prompt the called party to return the call, thereby subjecting the called party to charges.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term “voice service” has the meaning given such term in section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)). This paragraph shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to such section by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115-141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 13. ANNUAL ROBOCALL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall make publicly available on the website of the Commission, and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on the status of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the participation of voice service providers in such efforts.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(1) A description of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the actions taken by the registered consortium to coordinate with the Commission.

(2) A list of voice service providers identified by the registered consortium that participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls through the registered consortium.

(3) A list of each voice service provider that received a request from the registered consortium to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected

unlawful robocalls and refused to participate, as identified by the registered consortium.

(4) The reason, if any, each voice service provider identified by the registered consortium provided for not participating in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(5) A description of how the Commission may use the information provided to the Commission by voice service providers or the registered consortium that have participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the enforcement efforts by the Commission.

(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking additional information from voice service providers and the registered consortium of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls necessary for the report by the Commission required under subsection (a).

(d) REGISTRATION OF CONSORTIUM OF PRIVATE-LED EFFORTS TO TRACE BACK THE ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue rules to establish a registration process for the registration of a single consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls. The consortium shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Be a neutral third party competent to manage the private-led effort to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the judgement of the Commission.

(B) Maintain a set of written best practices about the management of such efforts and regarding providers of voice services' participation in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consistent with section 222(d)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222(d)(2)), any private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls conducted by the third party focus on "fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful" traffic.

(D) File a notice with the Commission that the consortium intends to conduct private-led efforts to trace back in advance of such registration.

(2) ANNUAL NOTICE BY THE COMMISSION SEEKING REGISTRATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking the registration described in paragraph (1).

(e) LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Commission may publish a list of voice service providers and take appropriate enforcement action based on information obtained from the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and other information the Commission may collect about voice service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRIVATE-LED EFFORT TO TRACE BACK.—The term "private-led effort to trace back" means an effort made by the registered consortium of voice service providers to establish a methodology for determining the origin of a suspected unlawful robocall.

(2) REGISTERED CONSORTIUM.—The term "registered consortium" means the consortium registered under subsection (d).

(3) SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALL.—The term "suspected unlawful robocall" means a call that the Commission or a voice service provider reasonably believes was made in violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section

227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

(4) VOICE SERVICE.—The term "voice service"—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as "CPE") and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 14. HOSPITAL ROBOCALL PROTECTION GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the "Hospital Robocall Protection Group".

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Group shall be composed only of the following members:

(1) An equal number of representatives from each of the following:

(A) Voice service providers that serve hospitals.

(B) Companies that focus on mitigating unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consumer advocacy organizations.

(D) Providers of one-way voice over internet protocol services described in subsection (e)(3)(B)(ii).

(E) Hospitals.

(F) State government officials focused on combating unlawful robocalls.

(2) One representative of the Commission.

(3) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) ISSUANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Group is established under subsection (a), the Group shall issue best practices regarding the following:

(1) How voice service providers can better combat unlawful robocalls made to hospitals.

(2) How hospitals can better protect themselves from such calls, including by using lawful robocall mitigation techniques.

(3) How the Federal Government and State governments can help combat such calls.

(d) PROCEEDING BY FCC.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the best practices are issued by the Group under subsection (c), the Commission shall conclude a proceeding to assess the extent to which the voluntary adoption of such best practices can be facilitated to protect hospitals and other institutions.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GROUP.—The term "Group" means the Hospital Robocall Protection Group established under subsection (a).

(2) STATE.—The term "State" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term "voice service"—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission

under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as "CPE") and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 15. SEPARABILITY CLAUSE.

If any provision of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 151.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today the House will take strong, bipartisan action to protect consumers from illegal robocalls. Talk to anyone, Mr. Speaker, and you will hear just how annoyed people are by those calls; and no wonder—according to Robokiller, a whopping 5.6 billion robocalls were made to Americans in November alone. According to YouMail, more than 200 million calls have been made to the 732 area code in my congressional district this year. That is pretty outrageous.

Today the House is giving Americans back control of their phones.

This legislation is important because unlawful robocalls are not only a nuisance, they are also undermining our entire phone system and consumers' safety as a result. Too often Americans simply will not pick up their phones out of fear that a robocall is on the other end of the line.

These calls are not just annoying, in a lot of instances they are scams targeted at consumers. Unfortunately, these scams are becoming more sophisticated every day. At a hearing earlier this year, we learned that the Moffitt Cancer Center received 6,600 scam calls in just 1 month, specifically designed to appear as calls coming from within the hospital. That is dangerous for patient safety and confidentiality.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard similar stories of scammers disguised as the IRS looking to collect a debt or scammers disguised as local governments or police departments, and

scammers disguised as loved ones in trouble looking for help. These are just a few of the examples.

All of these scams are different, and there won't be a single silver bullet to fix them all, but the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act attacks the problem from multiple angles.

First, we are targeting fraudsters and scammers who are violating the law. This will be done by using innovative technologies to cut these calls off. Our bill requires carriers to implement a nationwide caller authentication system and to make call blocking software accessible to consumers for free. This is critical.

A nationwide caller authentication system that will help ensure consumers can trust the caller-ID on their phone again is obviously important. Call blocking is another thing that we do in the bill. Call blocking will stop the phone from ringing when scammers are dialing our phones. These are two critical steps—the authentication and blocking—that will give consumers control of their phones again.

When it comes to blocking, the TRACED Act also ensures that there is transparency and consistency so that the calls people want are getting through.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this bill will ensure that law enforcement and the Federal Communications Commission have the tools, information, and incentives to go after robocallers who break the law. We need to make sure criminal penalties are brought by the Department of Justice to deter future robocallers from getting into the business.

Third, this will help us go after the dodgy carriers who allow these unlawful calls to enter our networks in the first place.

These are some of the main provisions of this bipartisan bill, but there are others that will be discussed by my colleagues during our 20 minutes on my side today.

Finally, I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. WALDEN, Communications and Technology Subcommittee Chairman DOYLE, and subcommittee Ranking Member LATTA for their leadership and for their determination in getting this final bill to the House floor today.

I also want to thank our partners in the Senate, Senators THUNE and MARKLEY, for their commitment to this issue and for working with us on this final bipartisan, bicameral product.

The TRACED Act takes critical steps to give consumers control of their phones again. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation today, and I hope that it will be signed into law before the end of the year.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 151, the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act. As you heard, it is a great step forward this Congress will take to help curb illegal robocalls.

I want to thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairman DOYLE, and my colleague, Mr. LATTA, for their great bipartisan work on this; and, of course, our colleagues in the Senate again.

Last year RAY BAUM'S Act passed unanimously out of this Chamber with bipartisan support, and that included provisions that targeted fraudulent robocalls and spoofing from overseas. Those provisions are in law and are being used today.

Today the TRACED Act builds on that bipartisan success by better enabling consumers, carriers, law enforcement, and the Federal Communications Commission to target these scammers. While this Chamber has not made a lot of progress this year on legislating, I am pleased to see bipartisan legislation before us today that addresses a challenge that affects nearly every American, and that is illegal robocalls.

Last month alone, Mr. Speaker, in my district in the area code of 541 we got 14.1 million robocalls, just last month; and that is just in one part of Oregon. We know last year it was something in the order of over 50 billion illegal robocalls that came into America. I got one today already, and I imagine speaking here I will get five more. I will get targeted or something. It is time to put consumers back in charge of their phones, and that is exactly what this legislation does.

□ 1300

It allows carriers and consumers to use new, innovative call-blocking and call-authentication tools. We can strike the right balance between allowing important calls to get through while making sure illegal robocalls are blocked, all at no additional cost to the consumer.

This means when you receive a call from an unfamiliar number with a familiar area code, you should be confident that there is a legitimate reason for that call. That means your pharmacist can still automatically call you to say prescriptions are ready for pickup if you signed up for those notifications. That means vulnerable populations can be better protected from scams trying to steal their hard-earned savings. We have all read those stories.

When these illegal robocallers get caught, we need to ensure they are prosecuted. This legislation takes steps to improve our traceback efforts and provides the Department of Justice additional tools they need to go after bad actors.

We all get these calls. I got one about a year or so ago, Mr. Speaker, and it was out of Greece. I don't know anybody in Greece. It was a 02 something or other area code. I let it go to voicemail, and by golly, they left a message. A day later, I listened to it. It was the Vice President of the United States aboard Air Force Two trying to reach me. Sometimes you should answer those calls.

With this legislation, hopefully, we will know with certainty you can an-

swer a call like that, and it will be somebody that is trying to reach you for real.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, who worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will vote on the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act. This legislation resulted from diligent bicameral negotiations over many months, and I am glad that we have come to this agreement.

This bill addresses a problem that we all have firsthand experience with: persistent, annoying, nonstop robocalls. Americans received nearly 48 billion robocalls last year, a 60 percent increase from the year before. That number is expected to increase to 60 billion this year.

My hometown of Pittsburgh has already received 387 million robocalls this year. That is up from 189 million in 2017. On average, everyone in America received 15 robocalls in the month of November alone.

This legislation before the House is bipartisan and bicameral, and I believe it will help seriously reduce the onslaught of illegal robocalls Americans face. The bill before the House today is the result of bipartisan negotiations, which included industry and public interest stakeholders.

The original House bill was reported unanimously out of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, which I chair, as well as out of our full Committee on Energy and Commerce. It was approved by the full House with overwhelming support.

I am also pleased that the language from the STOP Robocalls Act, which Ranking Member LATTA and I introduced, was included in this bill. These provisions allow phone carriers to enable robocall blocking services by default on phone lines automatically. While these technologies have been available on an opt-in basis, too many seniors and, frankly, too many people in general just don't know about these services or how to sign up for them.

Allowing these services to be enabled by default allows all consumers to benefit from these technologies without having to go through an onerous signup process, especially seniors and those most vulnerable to scam calls. These provisions also include requirements that new opt-out robocall blocking services do not result in new consumer fees.

Finally, this bill requires all carriers to adopt call authentication technology that would enable people to be certain that the number they see on their caller ID is really the number that it is coming from. All too often, folks get calls that look like they are coming from down the street when they are really coming from scammers half a world away.

The legislation came about through the hard work of the majority staff and the minority staff of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. In particular, I thank Jerry Leverich, Phil Murphy, Dan Miller, AJ Brown, Parul Desai, and Alex Hoehn-Saric on the majority staff, and Kate O'Connor, Evan Viau, and Rachel Rathore on the minority staff for their hard work and diligence to get this bill to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. This is another example of the House passing bipartisan legislation, sending over 200 such bills this session to the Senate. Hopefully, our colleagues in the Senate will act on this bill and give the relief that our constituents deserve from these unwanted robocalls.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the top Republican on the Communications and Technology Subcommittee and a real leader in this effort.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the Republican leader of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan legislation to combat illegal robocalls. With an estimated 48 billion robocalls each year, it is time for Congress to take swift action against illegal robocalls and give Americans the security of knowing their incoming calls are legitimate.

That is why we introduced the bipartisan STOP Robocalls Act, which is included in the legislation before us today. Our bill would give phone companies and the Federal Communications Commission the tools they need to fight back against illegal robocalls. Private companies will be able to block fraudulent calls before they get to your phones, all with consumer control and no additional line-item charges.

Our provision also provides and improves information-sharing to enhance the FCC's ability to track and stop illegal robocall spoofing operations. As technology continues to evolve, so do the tactics that bad actors use to spoof numbers illegally to make fraudulent robocalls. We must allow these companies and the FCC to keep pace.

While we are all tired of annoying and illegal robocall scams, there are also legitimate users of autodialing technologies that must be preserved. The bill before us today rightly recognizes those important proconsumer messages. From school closures to bank fraud alerts, there are voice and text messages that consumers want, and those should not be blocked.

This is strong bipartisan legislation, and I am pleased to have worked with Chairman PALLONE, Republican leader WALDEN, and subcommittee Chairman DOYLE on this bill to improve consumer trust in our phone system.

I urge all of our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership in preventing the continued spread of illegal robocalls.

Mr. Speaker, these unlawful operations are deceiving and defrauding unsuspecting citizens, with little recourse. Congress must do its part to bring these perpetrators to justice, and the bill before us today does just that.

I am pleased that my bill, H.R. 3434, is included in the bill we have today. I thank Chairman PALLONE for fighting to keep the language in my bill in the underlying legislation during negotiations.

My bill recognizes industry efforts to address illegal calls by directing the FCC to publish an annual report on best practices in tracing back illegal calls to their origins. It promotes provider accountability by allowing carriers to block calls from providers who do not fully participate in private-led efforts to trace suspected illegal callers.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, consumers fall victim to scams initiated by fraudulent calls. I believe that the TRACED Act is a practical and comprehensive solution that will aid us in ending these illegal calls for good.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the top Republican on the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 151, the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act.

So far this year, Kentuckians have received 500 million robocalls. That is over 100 calls per person this year. Robocalls are the number one issue I hear about when I am home.

Scammers have found creative ways to trick people into thinking their calls are legitimate. These calls have wreaked havoc for private citizens, hospitals, small businesses, and everyone in between.

One Kentucky woman told me she gets three to four calls a day. She always answers for fear that there might be a family emergency, only to be greeted by a spam call, disrupting her work at a factory.

I was proud to cosponsor the original House bill, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, and I am proud to support the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act, which would put an end to these frustrating calls. I commend my fellow colleagues on the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and in the Senate for developing this bipartisan, bicameral solution to stop bad robocalls.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I recommend all of my colleagues support this.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the TRACED Act.

This is a long-overdue effort by Congress to crack down on out-of-control abuse of robocall marketers. These are annoying and inconvenient calls, but they also have real-life impacts.

Kathryn Ottinger is an 84-year-old Vermonter from Shelburne. She and her husband receive at least three or four robocalls a day, at all hours of the day. Kathryn's husband is hard of hearing, so he doesn't hear the phone ring, which requires her to race to answer the calls constantly, even though it is really difficult for her to get up. She always answers the calls because they could be important. It might be a son or a daughter.

Unfortunately, it is usually a marketer or a scam call. Kathryn sums it up perfectly when she says: "I am very upset about these calls. I want the calls to stop."

She speaks for all of our constituents. She is not alone.

In 2018, there were 47 billion robocalls made in the United States. Vermonters receive nearly 4 million robocalls a month. In 2016, scams involving robocalls cost 22 million Americans a total of \$9.5 billion.

I am hopeful this bill today will stop these harassing phone calls. The bill will give the FCC the authority and tools it needs. It will allow consumers to revoke consent they had previously given. It will require calls to have verified caller ID information associated with the call before the call can be put through.

These are important steps that will reduce and, hopefully, stop these robocallers, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I want to paint a picture of why I support this bill. Last Sunday night, many retired NFL football fans were watching my Houston Texans throttle the Patriots from New England.

Let's say the phone rings at halftime. A fan walks up to answer his phone. The caller ID says it is from the Social Security agency, the Social Security office, the Social Security Administration.

He picks up the phone, and there is a slight pause. A voice comes on and tells him that his benefits have been canceled. To restore them, he has to give these people he doesn't know his number. And, "Oh, by the way, we can fix this right now with your credit card."

For years, people in Texas and all across the country have dealt with criminal phone calls. I am pleased to say that today is the day we pass a bill to help these Texans and Americans fight back.

It is great to see a bipartisan piece of legislation that I worked on with Representative MCEACHIN, the Locking Up

Illegal Robocallers Act, included in this package. It empowers the Justice Department to go after criminals who prey upon senior citizens, veterans, and all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Let's ring in a new era in the Congress, dial back robocalls, hang up on criminals, and give them one call a week from jail.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who is the vice chair of our committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act and to address the intrusive reality of robocalls.

The jig is up for con artists who have time and time again deceived the American people into answering fraudulent calls that put our constituents on the hook for outrageous charges on their phone bills.

I am so proud to have my bill, H.R. 3264, the Ending One-Ring Scams Act of 2019, included in the underlying bill to ensure that the American people are protected from this harmful scam culture.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE and Senator THUNE for their work on the TRACED Act and for holding these bad actors accountable for their deceptive tactics.

□ 1315

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who brings an incredible amount of background and technology to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation that will benefit all Americans by addressing the nuisance of robocalls.

Unwanted and annoying robocalls are increasing at an alarming rate. Some estimate that U.S. consumers received nearly 4 billion robocalls per month in 2018. This needs to end.

This legislation would require service providers to adopt call authentication technologies and would establish additional protections for consumers receiving unwarranted and sometimes fraudulent robocalls. It would also require the FCC to work with other Federal agencies on improving deterrence and criminal prosecution of robocall scams.

I am also pleased that the legislation includes legislation that I sponsored with my colleague, Representative BUTTERFIELD, which requires the FCC to publish an annual report on the private-led efforts to trace the origin of unlawful robocalls, an important step in stopping these bad actors from reaching consumers.

It is time for Congress to act and prevent these illegal and unwanted robocalls, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), a member of our committee.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for bringing us together on this bipartisan bill.

I rise today to speak in support of the TRACED Act. There is nothing more frustrating than receiving robocall after robocall to our landlines and cell phones. I receive countless robocalls every week, often from a phone number that seems to be just down the road.

Even worse, many of these calls are scams designed to prey on our seniors and vulnerable populations that may be more susceptible to this kind of fraud.

This year I have held 26 town halls across Arizona's First District. Time and time again, I have heard from citizens about scam and spoof calls they have encountered, putting their private information and their hard-earned dollars at risk.

I cosponsored the TRACED Act to crack down on scammers and bad robocalls by creating real penalties for violators and requiring voice service providers to develop call authentication techniques.

This is an issue on which we can all agree. I urge my colleagues to come together to pass this commonsense legislation that will benefit so many.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), another great Texan who needs to speak on this matter.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here with the honorable Speaker pro tempore from Texas as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for S. 151, the TRACED Act. This legislation is a culmination of strong bipartisan work by the Energy and Commerce Committee in the House and our Senate counterparts.

We all hear complaints from constituents about the scourge of robocalls, and I am glad we are answering the American people with decisive action.

This bipartisan bill gives consumers tools to prevent robocalls at no additional cost. It also provides law enforcement and the FCC with authority to go after bad actors.

I am also pleased that S. 151 includes language from an amendment that I offered in committee that raises fines to \$10,000 per violation, which will further deter illegal operators from entering into this abusive behavior.

Alongside advances from last year's RAY BAUM'S Act and efforts at the FCC, we are in a better position to restore confidence in our communication services once again. This is the type of work that the House of Representatives ought to be engaged in for the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), the former Governor.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with spam robocalls.

Today, we are bringing to bear the full weight of the Federal Government

to go after those calls. We have an obligation to do what is right for the people.

The TRACED Act utilizes all known weapons in the arsenal, from cooperation, to investigation, including enforcement.

I am especially proud that the TRACED Act includes my bill, the Spam Calls Tax Force Act, which will bring together agencies, the private sector, and consumer advocates to shut down spam robocalls. All hands on deck is necessary here.

I thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for their leadership, and I also thank my partners on the Spam Calls Task Force: the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

I am filled with optimism that the work of the people goes on: Members of both parties coming together, setting differences aside to work on commonsense solutions to real problems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the TRACED Act.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of S. 151, the TRACED Act.

In 2018 alone, phone numbers with 517 and 734 area codes in my district received over 223 million robocalls. I know. I received a bunch of them.

Not only are these calls bothersome and unwelcome, but they often lead to scams that prey on the most vulnerable. One such scam is the one-ring scam, which attempts to trick consumers into paying huge fees for return phone calls.

S. 151 includes important legislation that I worked to have included which will end the harmful practice of one-ring scams.

Mr. Speaker, robocalls are not only a nuisance; they pose a threat to individuals' privacy and security. S. 151, the TRACED Act, will help put a stop to these harmful practices by empowering phone carriers to implement call authentication technologies so consumers can trust their caller ID with no additional cost.

It will also expand and streamline the FCC's enforcement authority to take strong and quick action when it tracks down robocallers and levy fines against those bad actors.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will put a stop to these predatory actors behind harmful robocalls and put consumers back in charge of their phones.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak in strong support of the TRACED Act.

The bipartisan provision I co-led with Representatives CLARKE, VAN DREW,

BILIRAKIS, FOXX, and WALBERG to address one-ring scams will make the finances of vulnerable Americans—especially seniors—more secure and the lives of all people in Orange County and across the country a little more peaceful.

We can all agree that it is time to provide Americans with a greater sense of security when it comes to our phones. We shouldn't have to worry about unsolicited robocalls, and the vast array of tactics bad actors are using to target our pocketbooks and our privacy.

This bicameral and bipartisan bill is a big step forward in combating robocalls, and I am thankful for the bipartisan group of legislators who reached across the aisle to protect Americans' bank accounts and their sanity. I urge strong support of this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the top Republican on the Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee yielding, and I stand in strong support of the TRACED Act to crack down on robocalls.

I have heard from hundreds of people in eastern Washington about this. For example, an office manager in Colfax logged more than 318 robocalls at her small business, and she told me, "That is 318 times I have picked up the phone to hear a robot talking to me. I dropped what I was doing to run to the phone for one of these obnoxious calls, or I put a real client on hold to answer an empty call. Anything Congress can do to stop this shameful practice would be a relief."

So, Mr. Speaker, I agree. People need relief, and they have asked Congress to take action. So I look forward to supporting this bill and sending it to President Trump's desk with strong bipartisan support.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM), my colleague, whose legislation has been included in this bill.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the TRACED Act, a bipartisan effort to crack down on the scourge of predatory robocalls.

Over the past year, I have heard from my neighbors in Burlington and Ocean Counties about their frustrations from constant robocalls. In fact, more than 400 neighbors from Beachwood to Bordentown and Toms River to Tabernacle contacted our office to complain.

That is exactly why I dug into the issue and teamed up with four Republicans and two Democrats to offer H.R. 3325, the Locking Up Robocallers Act of 2019, which would strengthen enforce-

ment of current laws aimed at ending the scourge of predatory robocalls.

I am glad our bill was incorporated into this legislation, because these calls aren't just annoyances; they are used by scam artists to target people in our community.

According to the FCC, they receive over 200,000 complaints a year from residents receiving predatory robocalls. An estimated 26.3 billion robocalls were made to mobile phones, and more than 47 billion were made in total to phones in the U.S. in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and taking a real step to end predatory robocalls.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), the only pharmacist in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 151, the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act. The Energy and Commerce Committee has prioritized combating the scourge of robocalls for quite some time now.

In May, the Senate passed their robocalls legislation, and in July, the House nearly unanimously passed the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Last year, Americans saw nearly 50 billion robocalls. Those robocalls come morning, night, and noon, often interrupting important life events. This year, we are on track to see a high number of robocalls again. Unfortunately, nearly everyone in the United States has been on the receiving end of dozens and dozens of robocalls.

It is time we finally take action to empower telecom providers to help put a stop to this and to hold those responsible accountable for these actions. That is why this bill, which builds upon the bipartisan work of the Energy and Commerce Committee, is so important.

I want to thank my colleagues in the Energy and Commerce Committee for working with our friends in the Senate to get this completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), another colleague whose legislation is also included in the TRACED Act.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for yielding time and for all of his work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the TRACED Act, a good anti-robocall bill that is badly needed given the robocall epidemic facing our United States of America.

Robocall scams are at an all-time high, and they are getting worse. Data shows that New Jersey residents reported the most robocall complaints of any State in the Nation last year.

Robocalls not only impede our quality of life as family dinners and impor-

tant work meetings get interrupted, but they also effectuate scams, scams that take advantage of vulnerable populations such as our senior citizens, who need to be protected.

This bipartisan legislation is a critical step toward ending the scourge of robocalls. I am pleased to see portions of my own robocall bill, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, incorporated in the TRACED Act. While there is more to be done, without a doubt, I am proud to be a part of this important effort to help protect consumers, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. Robocalls are not only a nuisance, they are a threat to honest, hardworking Montanans. Illegal robocalls seek to exploit them and steal their personal, private information and their money.

Montanans hate robocalls. It is time to put an end to the stories I hear too often from Montanans about illegal robocalls.

Today, we are taking a huge step forward, providing relief from robocalls with the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act. It gives consumers tools to block illegal robocalls at no cost. It also holds illegal robocallers accountable for their scams, including higher fines and more prison time. This bill includes language from my bipartisan bill that helps identify and prosecute illegal robocall companies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and providing the American people with needed relief from robocalls.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Oregon. I want to thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for their hard work on this important bipartisan issue.

Robocall scams leave anyone with a cell phone vulnerable to fraud. Today it is time for Congress to act. The TRACED Act expands the authority for the Federal Government to punish these folks and will help verify legitimate calls.

I want to thank everyone who worked to bring this bill to the floor

for a vote, and I urge all my colleagues to show their support.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, for too long, unwanted callers have circumvented the law in order to deliberately mislead Americans through robocalls and spoofing. In fact, this is the number one issue at every townhall that I hold in my district.

Unfortunately, the number of robocall scams are ever increasing. Robocalls should not be a part of our everyday lives, and we must take action to stop it.

This malicious practice has led to fraud and theft, exploiting vulnerable consumers, including our Nation's seniors. That is why I was a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, which passed the House in July.

The House and Senate took parts of this bill and were able to come together and agree on the TRACED Act. This bill allows the Federal Communications Commission to seek financial penalties against those making calls with misleading caller identification information. Most importantly, this legislation allows robocalls to be blocked transparently at no extra cost to Americans.

We must stop this practice once and for all by identifying and taking action against these violators. I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support and encourage its swift passage.

By some estimates, nearly 48 billion robocalls were made in the U.S. in 2018, which is a 57 percent increase over 2017.

This antirobocall bill provides the FCC new authorities to impose substantial fines on violators—up to \$20,000 per violation, and possibly higher in some cases. It requires phone companies to verify callers and help block robocalls at no extra charge.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake: This legislation is a big step forward. But given the rapidly changing technology, combined with the fact that many of these calls come from overseas, we can't let up, and more will need to be done.

Thankfully, this bill requires a number of reports to Congress over the coming months that will allow us to start to crack down on these perpetrators even harder.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work we have done, bicameral and bipartisan. I thank those involved.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to get this done. Our constituents deserve this. We deserve this.

Over 50 billion illegal robocalls—we are not talking about the kinds you sign up for to give you notices when your prescriptions are ready for something else; we are talking about illegal scammers, often state-backed enterprises overseas, coming into our wallets, coming into our bank accounts, coming into our homes, coming into our offices, and coming into our cell phones.

Now, let's be clear: While this legislation will make a difference, the scammers are going to try and do an end around whatever technology the carriers use to try and block these calls, authenticate these calls, stop these calls; so we have, in this legislation, additional requirements for reporting back to Congress on other steps that need to be taken, especially when it comes to our healthcare system and our hospitals. That will be something the committee needs to continue to look at.

But I think building a better bridge between the Department of Justice and the Federal Communications Commission so they can go after the bad actors and really nail them is a good thing in this bill, and extending out to 4 years the statute of limitations is a good thing so bad actors don't get to run the clock and get away with their crimes.

This is good legislation; it will make a difference; and we will continue to fight this fight.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I, too, want to thank our terrific staff, some of whom, by the way, have worked on this long enough they have gone on to other pursuits, including Robin Colwell and Tim Kurth, who is still with us but in a different role than when he started on this, Kristine Hackman, Kate O'Connor, Evan Viau, Rachel Rathore.

And on the majority side, Alex and Jerry and AJ and Dan and Parul and Phil, a thank-you for their great work on this, as well. We really appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues to vote for this bill. Let's get it to President Trump's desk. He will sign it, and we are going to help our consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are receiving more unwanted and illegal robocalls than ever before. The rising tide of illegal robocalls has quickly turned from a nuisance to a real threat on the way we all view and use our telephones.

Consumers need more control and transparency over who is calling them. The laws that prohibit unwanted calls and the Do Not Call Registry no longer effectively protect consumers from unwanted or illegal calls because it is

easier than ever to become a robocaller. These calls all undermine the public's trust in our phone system.

If we don't fix this problem, it will only get worse. The TRACED Act is the best way Congress can address the deluge of spam and spam robocalls.

Consumer groups and industry widely support the legislation, including Consumer Reports, AARP, the National Consumer Law Center, US Telecom, and more.

Basically, what we have in this bill are commonsense, meaningful solutions that will put consumers back in control of their phones and will help restore trust in our phone system.

Now, in closing, I just want to thank all of the Members and staff who were able to work together to produce this great legislation, and there are a lot: obviously, our ranking member, Mr. WALDEN, the subcommittee ranking member, Mr. LATTA, as well as Mr. DOYLE.

But I also want to thank our staff and other Members who contributed their legislation to the TRACED Act. So, Members such as Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIM, Mrs. BROOKS, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. KUSTOFF introduced the Locking Up Robocallers Act, which was added to this legislation in section 11.

Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WALBERG introduced the Ending One-Ring Scams Act, which was added to this legislation in section 12.

Mr. CRIST introduced his Spam Calls Task Force Act, which was added to the bill in section 5.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GIANFORTE introduced the Tracing Back and Catching Unlawful Robocallers Act, which was added to this bill in section 13.

And Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. BURGESS introduced their Protecting Patients and Doctors from Unlawful Robocalls Act, which was added to the bill in section 14.

Mr. FLORES and Mr. McNERNEY offered their amendment to increase the financial penalties for illegal robocallers, which was added to section 3.

And, of course, Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LATTA introduced their STOP Robocalls Act in section 10.

Finally, I would like to thank all the staff on both sides of the aisle who worked on this bill, in particular, Jerry Leverich over here, Alex Hoehn-Saric behind me, Dan Miller behind me, AJ Brown, and Parul Desai on the majority staff; Tim Kurth, Kate O'Connor, Evan Viau, Robin Colwell on the minority staff; as well as Phil Murphy on Subcommittee Chairman DOYLE's staff and Rachel Rathore on Subcommittee Ranking Member LATTA's staff.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 151, the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act.

Robocalls are an epidemic and anyone with a phone knows this. I hear from my constituents daily about robocalls, and I know all of

my colleagues do as well. Just last month Americans received a near record of 5.5 billion robocalls. I'm subjected to this harassment and so are my colleagues.

These calls are highly annoying, but they are also used to scam and swindle people. Last year, an estimated 43 million Americans were scammed out of \$10.5 billion.

The American people are demanding that Congress take action to combat this national nuisance and today the House will deliver a victory for them. I'm proud that this bipartisan, bicameral agreement will put a real dent in our robocall problem.

We know that no one bill can completely solve such a complex problem, and it's why the FCC and Congress must remain vigilant to ensure statutory and regulatory protections are sufficient to protect consumers.

This legislation will bring relief to millions of Americans, so let's pass it and get it signed into law pronto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 151, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 739;

Adoption of House Resolution 739, if ordered; and

Adoption of the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 151.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2534, INSIDER TRADING PROHIBITION ACT, AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 77, DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 739) providing for consider-

ation of the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, and relating to consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Syrian Arab Republic that have not been authorized by Congress, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]		
YEAS—226		
Adams	Foster	McBath
Aguilar	Frankel	McCollum
Allred	Fudge	McEachin
Axne	Gallego	McNerney
Barragán	Garamendi	Meeks
Bass	Garcia (IL)	Meng
Beatty	Garcia (TX)	Moore
Bera	Golden	Morelle
Beyer	Gomez	Moulton
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell
Blumenauer	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al (TX)	Nadler
Bonamici	Grijalva	Napolitano
Boyle, Brendan F.	Haaland	Neal
Brindisi	Harder (CA)	Neguse
Brown (MD)	Hastings	Norcross
Brownley (CA)	Hayes	O'Halleran
Bustos	Heck	Ocasio-Cortez
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Omar
Carbajal	Himes	Pallone
Cárdenas	Horn, Kendra S.	Panetta
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Pappas
Case	Houlahan	Pascrall
Casten (IL)	Hoyer	Payne
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peters
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Peterson
Cicilline	Jeffries	Phillips
Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Porter
Clay	Keating	Pressley
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Quigley
Cohen	Kildee	Raskin
Connolly	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kim	Richmond
Correa	Kind	Rose (NY)
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Rouda
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Royal-Allard
Cox (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Craig	Lamb	Ruppersberger
Crist	Langevin	Rush
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Scanlon
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Dean	Lee (NV)	Schiff
DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Schneider
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Schrader
DeLauro	Lewis	Schrier
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Delgado	lipinski	Scott, David
Demings	Loebssack	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Shalala
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Doggett	Lowey	Sherrill
Doyle, Michael F.	Luján	Sires
Engel	Luria	Slotkin
Escobar	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	Malinowski	Soto
Espauillat	Maloney,	Spanberger
Evans	Carolyn B.	Speier
Finkenauer	Maloney, Sean	Stanton
Fletcher	Matsui	Stevens
	McAdams	Suozzi
		Swalwell (CA)

Takano	Trahan	Wasserman
Thompson (CA)	Trone	Schultz
Thompson (MS)	Underwood	Waters
Titus	Van Drew	Watson Coleman
Tlaib	Vargas	Welch
Tonko	Veasey	Wexton
Torres (CA)	Vela	Wild
Torres Small (NM)	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
	Visclosky	Yarmuth

NAYS—193

Abraham	Gosar	Nunes
Aderholt	Granger	Olson
Allen	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pence
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Perry
Arrington	Griffith	Posey
Babin	Grothman	Reed
Bacon	Guest	Reschenthaler
Baird	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Balderson	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Banks	Harris	Roby
Barr	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Berman	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bost	Holding	Rouzer
Brady	Hollingsworth	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Scalise
Buchanan	Hunter	Schweikert
Buck	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Burchett	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Burgess	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Calvert	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Carter (GA)	Katko	Spano
Chabot	Keller	Stauber
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Cloud	King (IA)	Steube
Cole	King (NY)	Kinzinger
Collins (GA)	Komar	Stewart
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Conaway	LaHood	Taylor
Cook	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons
Curtis	Lesko	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Long	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Upton
DesJarlais	Lucas	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duncan	Marchant	Walden
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	Mast	Waltz
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Flores	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McKinley	
Foxx (NC)	Meadows	Westerman
Fulcher	Meuser	Williams
Gaetz	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wittman
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Womack
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gohmert	Mullin	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gooden	Norman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Carter (TX)	Gabbard	Serrano
Cartwright	McGovern	Smith (NE)
Cunningham	Newhouse	Young
Dingell	Ratcliffe	

□ 1406

Messrs. AMASH, CALVERT, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 645.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.