

other government broadband deployment funding programs.

“(D) PENALTIES FOR PRE-AUTHORIZATION DEFAULTS.—In adopting rules for any new covered funding award, the Commission shall set a penalty for pre-authorization defaults of at least \$9,000 per violation and may not limit the base forfeiture to an amount less than 30 percent of the applicant’s total support, unless the Commission demonstrates the need for lower penalties in a particular instance.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 in the RECORD on this particular bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2399, the Rural Broadband Protection Act led by my good friend, Representative HOUCHIN.

The Federal Communications Commission’s Universal Service Fund provides funding for broadband networks in our rural communities.

The Rural Broadband Protection Act requires the FCC to establish a process for upfront vetting of providers seeking USF funds. It also directs the FCC to set penalties for providers that do not meet their commitments. This will ensure that USF recipients deliver on their promise to serve our rural communities.

I thank Representative HOUCHIN for leading this particular bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2399, the Rural Broadband Protection Act. This legislation would direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a process to more thoroughly vet internet service providers participating in the Universal Service Fund’s high-cost program.

I have long advocated for reforms to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in the high-cost program. Following an investigation by Energy and Commerce Committee Democrats in 2017, we requested that the Government Accountability Office open its own inquiry into reports of abuse of high-cost support.

In a scathing report, GAO detailed a remarkable lack of oversight by the FCC, as well as the need for greater accountability to ensure precious USF dollars are spent on the mission of deploying high-speed broadband to unserved and underserved commu-

nities. Since then, we have seen modest progress to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the high-cost program, but more accountability is needed.

I commend Representatives KELLY and HOUCHIN for their work on this legislation and appreciate their commitment to protecting unserved and underserved communities in need of high-speed connectivity.

However, I must note that this legislation was not considered as part of the Energy and Commerce Committee’s typical regular order process. It was not considered during a subcommittee legislative hearing or taken up in a subcommittee markup prior to being voted on by the full committee.

I am supporting the bill today, but I am disappointed that the Committee members were not afforded the opportunity to seek testimony from experts on this specific text of the legislation or inquire about the bill’s impact on the program and consumers as is our typical practice for legislative hearings.

Still, I believe this legislation will help address critical gaps in the vetting of high-cost recipients and will curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, so I urge our colleagues to support H.R. 2399.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN), an outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for his leadership on this important issue. I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of H.R. 2399, the Rural Broadband Protection Act of 2025, a bill that I am proud to sponsor.

Across Indiana and throughout rural America, families, farmers, students, and small business owners still struggle with slow or unreliable internet access. It is not just inconvenient, it is a barrier to opportunity, to education, to healthcare, and to economic growth.

When Congress invests in rural broadband, we must ensure those dollars are getting where they are intended and that providers that are receiving those funds are capable of getting the job done.

That is exactly what the Rural Broadband Protection Act does. It puts accountability and transparency in the grant review process by requiring the Federal Communications Commission to vet applicants for broadband funding based on experience, capability, and performance.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, this is a smart, bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation, and I know my constituents back home agree.

That is why today I will be voting “yes” on the Rural Broadband Protection Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2399, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative HOUCHIN and Representative KELLY on this bipartisan bill. It is necessary that we pass this.

In closing, I encourage a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2399.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUTURE USES OF TECHNOLOGY UPHOLDING RELIABLE AND ENHANCED NETWORKS ACT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2449) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force to be known as the “6G Task Force”, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2449

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 “Future Uses of Technology Upholding Reliable and Enhanced Networks Act” or the “FUTURE Networks Act”.

SEC. 2. 6G TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish a task force to be known as the “6G Task Force”.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The members of the Task Force shall be appointed by the Chair.

(2) COMPOSITION.—To the extent practicable, the membership of the Task Force shall be composed of the following:

(A) Representatives of companies in the communications industry, except companies that are determined by the Chair to be not trusted.

(B) Representatives of public interest organizations or academic institutions, except public interest organizations or academic institutions that are determined by the Chair to be not trusted.

(C) Representatives of the Federal Government, State governments, local governments, or Tribal Governments, with at least one member representing each such type of government.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Task Force is established under subsection (a), the Task Force shall publish in the Federal Register and 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 sixth-generation wireless technology, including—

(A) the status of industry-led standards-setting bodies in setting standards for such technology;

(B) possible uses of such technology identified by industry-led standards-setting bodies that are setting standards for such technology;

(C) any limitations of such technology (including any supply chain or cybersecurity limitations) identified by industry-led standards-setting bodies that are setting standards for such technology; and

(D) how to best work with entities across the Federal Government, State governments, local governments, and Tribal Governments to leverage such technology, including with regard to siting, deployment, and adoption.

(2) DRAFT REPORT; PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Task Force shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Task Force is established under subsection (a), publish in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission a draft of the report required by paragraph (1); and

(B) accept public comments on such draft and take such comments into consideration in preparing the final version of such report.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHAIR.—The term “Chair” means the Chair of the Commission.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) NOT TRUSTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “not trusted” means, with respect to an entity, that—

(i) the Chair has made a public determination that such entity is owned by, controlled by, or subject to the influence of a foreign adversary; or

(ii) the Chair otherwise determines that such entity poses a threat to the national security of the United States.

(B) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Chair shall use the criteria described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 2(c) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1601(c)), as appropriate.

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

(5) TASK FORCE.—The term “Task Force” means the 6G Task Force established under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 in the RECORD on this particular bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 2449, the FUTURE Networks Act led by Representative MATSUI and Representative ALLEN.

United States leadership in 6G technology is critical for both our economic and national security.

This bill would direct the FCC to establish a 6G Task Force made up of both public and private-sector participants to develop a report on the standards development process and possible uses of sixth-generation technology. This task force will ensure that the United States has a unified position to cement our leadership in 6G, which is so critical.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2449, the FUTURE Networks Act. This bipartisan legislation is an important step to protect Americans and our communication networks from threats posed by rapidly evolving next-generation technologies. It also ensures that the standards used to build technological advancements are designed from the start to be safe and secure.

H.R. 2449 establishes a task force at the Federal Communications Commission to study sixth-generation, or 6G, technologies to identify potential supply chain and cybersecurity vulnerabilities. The task force will include government, public interest advocates, academics, and industry.

The United States leads the world in the innovation of secure and resilient next-generation technologies, a position congressional Democrats have fought hard to sustain. Among other things, House Democrats have worked to increase the safety of our networks and supply chains by examining the security of mobile networks and educate consumers about cybersecurity vulnerabilities and risks. The FUTURE Networks Act is yet another important step to support America's leadership in a secure and reliable future.

By directing the FCC to engage in the exploration of 6G technology in the early stages of development, the FUTURE Networks Act will enable American values to be embedded within the global framework for this technology and to ensure it will be available to all Americans.

I thank Communications and Technology Subcommittee Ranking Member MATSUI and Representatives ALLEN and WALBERG for their bipartisan work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2449, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for yielding.

As vice chairman of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, I rise today in support of the bipartisan FUTURE Networks Act, which I proudly introduced with my colleagues, Rep-

resentative MATSUI and Representative WALBERG.

This commonsense legislation would direct the FCC to bring together industry leaders, public interest groups, and government experts to establish a 6G Task Force.

As we all know, 6G is the future of telecommunications, and we must ensure that the United States is a global leader in this emerging technology. Failure to do so would put our adversaries, like the Chinese Communist Party, in the driver's seat. We cannot allow that to happen.

I come from the world of business and just like in business we want the best, most qualified individuals to have a seat at the table. By establishing a 6G Task Force, we can bring together America's brightest industry leaders, stakeholders, and innovators to collaborate on the future deployment of 6G and strengthening our wireless networks.

This is a matter of economic and national security. I was proud to help lead the FUTURE Networks Act this Congress. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2449.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), the ranking member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DINGELL for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FUTURE Networks Act, and I thank Representatives ALLEN and WALBERG for our joint effort in making this a very bipartisan bill.

I introduced this bill to ensure America continues our leadership and standard setting in the global technology race.

Mr. Speaker, 6G is going to be a global evolution in the way we communicate. If we lead the race for next-generation wireless, then this global technology will be based on our values, democracy, open markets, and transparency.

If we fall behind, our foreign adversaries will have a new way to expand their reach. That means less openness, less security, and more top-down control.

This risk is real. Already, China is leading in the 6G patent race, filing about 35 percent of patents globally.

To stay the global leader, America must invest in innovation and convene our best and brightest to map the road ahead.

This is increasingly true as artificial intelligence redefines our society and drives rapid change, including in our communications infrastructure.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, 6G networks will leverage AI to meet the connectivity demand of American consumers and businesses. Mr. Speaker, 6G also can support smart cities and supercharge augmented reality applications for education, healthcare, and manufacturing.

Given such transformative potential, we must be proactive and make sure America sets the gold standard for this next-generation technology. That is why I am so glad to see this bipartisan bill moving forward today.

The FUTURE Networks Act ensures our brightest minds in industry, government, and academia are collaborating on the strategically vital development of 6G. The race to 6G is not just about faster phones; it is about national security, the economy, and America's standing on the world stage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of suspending the rules and passing this important legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2449, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I commend Representative ALLEN, the vice chair of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee; Representative MATSUI, the ranking member; and also my good friend, Mr. WALBERG, for this very important bill. I encourage Members to vote "yes" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2449.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ADVERSARY COMMUNICATIONS TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 906) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to publish a list of entities that hold authorizations, licenses, or other grants of authority issued by the Commission and that have certain foreign ownership, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 906

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 "Foreign Adversary Communications Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. LIST OF ENTITIES HOLDING FCC AUTHORIZATIONS, LICENSES, OR OTHER GRANTS OF AUTHORITY AND HAVING CERTAIN FOREIGN OWNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish on the internet website of the Commission a list of each entity—

(1) that holds a license issued by the Commission pursuant to—

(A) section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)); or

(B) the Act of May 27, 1921 (47 U.S.C. 34 et seq.; commonly known as the "Cable Landing Licensing Act") and Executive Order 10530 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; relating to the performance of certain functions vested in or subject to the approval of the President); and

(2) with respect to which—

(A) a covered entity holds an equity or voting interest that is required to be reported to the Commission under the ownership rules of the Commission; or

(B) an appropriate national security agency has determined that a covered entity exerts control, regardless of whether such covered entity holds an equity or voting interest as described in subparagraph (A).

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue rules to obtain information to identify each entity—

(A) that holds any authorization, license, or other grant of authority issued by the Commission (other than a license described in subsection (a)(1)); and

(B) with respect to which a covered entity holds an equity or voting interest that is required to be reported to the Commission under the ownership rules of the Commission.

(2) PLACEMENT ON LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Commission issues the rules required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall place each entity described in such paragraph on the list published under subsection (a).

(c) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT EXEMPTION.—A collection of information conducted or sponsored by the Commission to implement this section does not constitute a collection of information for the purposes of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Paperwork Reduction Act").

(d) ANNUAL UPDATES.—The Commission shall, not less frequently than annually, update the list published under subsection (a), including with respect to any entity required to be placed on such list by subsection (b)(2).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.—The term "appropriate national security agency" has the meaning given such term in section 9 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1608).

(2) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term "covered country" means a country specified in section 4872(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(4) COVERED ENTITY.—The term "covered entity" means—

(A) the government of a covered country;

(B) an entity organized under the laws of a covered country; and

(C) a subsidiary of an entity described in subparagraph (B), regardless of whether the subsidiary is organized under the laws of a covered country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on this particular bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 906, the Foreign Adversary Communications Transparency Act, led by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my good friend.

Entities with ties to our adversaries—China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea—are threats to our communications networks, unfortunately, but it is a reality.

This legislation requires the FCC to publish a list of those entities holding a license, authorization, or other authority granted by the FCC. Understanding which adversaries are in our networks and the threats they pose, is necessary to securing our networks.

I thank Representative WITTMAN, a great Member, for his leadership on this bill, which passed last Congress by voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support this very important and necessary bill. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 906, the Foreign Adversary Communications Transparency Act. At the end of last year, we learned that Salt Typhoon, a cyber espionage operation backed by the Chinese Communist Party, infiltrated several American telecommunications networks to gain access to detailed information on former Vice President Harris and other political figures, as well as access American surveillance information.

This is extremely disturbing and a stark reminder of the lengths to which foreign adversary countries will go to use our media and communications networks to disrupt and divide us, weakening our economy for their own benefit. Whether it is through communications equipment, the networks themselves, or social media, we have seen these operations time and time again, which is why we must stay vigilant to minimize these risks or avoid them altogether.

Fortunately, today, we are taking additional action to address these and future threats. H.R. 906 would require the Federal Communications Commission to publish a list within 4 months indicating any entities with ties to China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran that hold wireless and undersea cable licenses that power our country's mobile and fixed communications networks.

The bill would also require the FCC to issue rules in 18 months to help it attain foreign ownership information for the remaining authorizations, licenses, and grants that the agency issues. The FCC would then publish on its list any additional entities with ties to China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran no later than 1 year after the new rules are adopted. The FCC would also