

page the number of studies that have been done over these many years.

However, in that same report, they went on to say:

This conclusion was reached despite the large volumes of case reports, case series, anecdotes, and patient testimonials reviewed that attest to perceived clinical improvement during antibiotic therapy.

Large volumes are just dismissed and laid aside as if they were trivial. It was dismissed and didn't make it into the final report, except for that sentence.

Dr. Horowitz has said that:

In fact, increasing the dose of antibiotics and/or extending the length of treatment clearly did help a certain percentage of my patients. Their fatigue, headaches, joint and muscle pain, and cognitive symptoms improved.

Among clinicians—and I have met with dozens of them—Dr. Horowitz is not alone at all in those findings.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need scientifically-based answers and a comprehensive probe that goes wherever the data suggests. And this is especially important for my own constituents. In New Jersey, over the last 15 years, about 55,000 people have had cases of Lyme.

This bill before us accelerates the process of helping Lyme patients by establishing an interagency working group on Lyme disease with diverse opinions—which is very important—in a transparent and open manner and creates a strategic plan to guide existing Federal Lyme disease research and treatment programs.

Of particular significance, the House bill that we will vote on today for the first time identifies and seeks to address chronic Lyme disease.

Mr. Speaker, the CDC says:

Approximately 10 to 20 percent of patients treated for Lyme disease with a recommended 2-4 week course of antibiotics will have lingering symptoms of fatigue, pain, or joint and muscle aches.

I would respectfully submit that they are symptoms of something that has a root cause.

The CDC refers to chronic Lyme as "Post-treatment Lyme Disease Syndrome," and many people have been dismissed and told, Oh, you are a hypochondriac. And yet there are so many cases, it can't be dismissed.

This bill is a great step forward for chronic Lyme patients, especially those who have suffered for decades with this debilitating disease, again, only to be told that their illness does not exist.

Again, I want to thank my good friend, CHRIS GIBSON, for his leadership and for the leadership of our House Republicans and our friends on the other side of the aisle. This is a bipartisan bill, and I do hope Members will support it robustly.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my thoughts on H.R. 4701, the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014.

H.R. 4701 would create a new working group to review efforts on Lyme disease and

other tick-borne diseases within the Department of Health and Human Services. I support efforts to advance research and public input in this area, but I remain concerned that today's legislation is not the best way to advance these goals. Specifically, I have concerns that H.R. 4701 could unnecessarily politicize federal activities on Lyme disease and potentially result in recommendations that are not supported by a strong, scientific evidence base.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take a careful look at H.R. 4701 and make changes to address these concerns before considering it further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4701, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

ANTI-SPOOFING ACT OF 2014

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3670) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3670

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 "Anti-Spoofing Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON INACCURATE CALLER ID INFORMATION.

(a) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE UNITED STATES.—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by inserting "or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States," after "United States,".

(b) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(including a text message sent using a text messaging service)" before the period at the end;

(2) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by inserting "(including a text message sent using a text messaging service)" before the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) TEXT MESSAGE.—The term 'text message' means a real-time or near real-time message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted from or received by a device that is identified as the transmitting or receiving device by means of a telephone number. Such term—

"(i) includes a short message service (SMS) message, an enhanced message service (EMS)

message, and a multimedia message service (MMS) message; and

"(ii) does not include a real-time, two-way voice or video communication.

"(E) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—The term 'text messaging service' means a service that permits the transmission or receipt of a text message, including a service provided as part of or in connection with a telecommunications service or an IP-enabled voice service."

(c) COVERAGE OF OUTGOING-CALL-ONLY IP-ENABLED VOICE SERVICE.—Section 227(e)(8)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)(C)) is amended by striking "has the meaning" and all that follows and inserting "means the provision of real-time voice communications offered to the public, or such class of users as to be effectively available to the public, transmitted using Internet protocol, or a successor protocol, (whether part of a bundle of services or separately) with interconnection capability such that the service can originate traffic to, or terminate traffic from, the public switched telephone network, or a successor network."

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(e)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking "Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009, the Commission" and inserting "The Commission".

(2) DEADLINE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this section not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission prescribes regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON. 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 materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Chairman Emeritus BARTON for his leadership on this issue.

Caller ID spoofing is growing at an alarming rate in this country. This new technology allows criminals to falsify deliberately the telephone number and the name relayed on caller ID information to make it appear as though those criminals are calling from our bank or our credit card company, or even from a governmental agency.

Imagine that. I get a telephone call on my cell telephone, and under caller ID, I think it comes from my bank or my credit card company, or even worse, I suppose, from a local governmental agency.

A recent case in New Jersey resulted in a resident's reportedly being scammed out of more than \$5,500 by a caller, a criminal, falsely claiming to be a Federal tax agent attempting to collect back taxes.

What a frightening experience for the innocent receiver of that telephone call. According to investigators, the victim's caller ID showed the number of the local police department. This has got to stop.

Today's bipartisan legislation will strengthen and improve the Truth in Caller ID law to help protect consumers in a greater way from scammers, spammers, and unscrupulous telemarketers.

I commend Chairman Emeritus BARTON, of Ennis, Texas, Republican, and Congresswoman GRACE MENG, Democrat, of Queens, New York, for their hard work and leadership on this issue.

I want the American people to know that on the Energy and Commerce Committee, where Chairman BARTON and I serve, more bipartisan legislation is passed out of that committee and reaches the floor of the House, and then goes over to the United States Senate and is passed in the United States Senate and goes to the President of the United States for his signature, than legislation from any other committee of Congress.

Now, much of what we do on the Energy and Commerce Committee does not make the headlines because much of what we do is eminently bipartisan in nature. And that is the history of the committee, the oldest standing committee in the House of Representatives, having first been established in 1795.

That is the tradition of bipartisanship, when the chairman, Mr. BARTON was the chairman of that committee. It continues under the chairmanship of Mr. UPTON of Michigan, and this includes the ranking member, Mr. WAXMAN, and the ranking member of the subcommittee. On both sides of the aisle we have a tradition on Energy and Commerce to make sure that our legislation is bipartisan in nature.

I came to this issue as the result of the nefarious situation in New Jersey. I also came to this issue at the request of Congresswoman MENG of New York City, and I want to thank the Congresswoman for coming to me.

I certainly believe that this legislation is in the interest of the American people. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this consumer protection legislation.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act. This is a bipartisan, pro-consumer bill that addresses the increasing problem of scam artists faking caller ID information to defraud consumers.

These bad actors scramble or spoof caller identification information for the purpose of impersonating legiti-

mate individuals or institutions such as law enforcement officials or a bank. They then use these fraudulent identities to obtain sensitive personal information from unsuspecting consumers.

Vulnerable populations such as seniors, veterans, and recent immigrants have been especially targeted by these attacks.

The bill makes three important changes to strengthen existing law and protect consumers. First, it broadens current law to address spoofing in the context of international calls.

Second, it changes the definition of Internet Protocol-enabled voice services to cover new forms of technology criminals have employed making Internet-based calls.

Finally, the bill broadens the scope of the existing law to cover text message spoofing.

These changes will make the 2009 enacted Truth in Caller ID Act a more effective tool to combat caller ID spoofing and protect consumers.

Before reserving my time, I do want to commend Congresswoman MENG for her work on this issue. I want to commend Mr. LANCE, and I want to also congratulate Congressman BARTON for working together on this commonsense bill.

Not only does the legislation enjoy bipartisan support in the House, but the sponsors have also worked very closely with Federal agencies and industry stakeholders and consumer groups to develop true consensus around this proposed legislation. This is the way this institution ought to work.

I urge my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 3670, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I am the only other speaker left on my side, and I reserve the right to close. So I would yield to the gentleman from Utah or the gentlelady from New York if they wish to speak.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, and I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act, which I authored along with Congressman BARTON and Congressman LANCE.

The bill addresses the problem of caller ID spoofing, which is the scrambling of caller identification numbers. It is a tool often used to defraud unwitting recipients of phone calls and text messages.

It is often stated that a measure of a society is how it treats its most vulnerable. Almost every day, I receive new reports of caller ID spoofing that harms the most vulnerable in our society. Immigrants, seniors, veterans, and those in need of help from law enforcement are all primary victims here. That is why this bill is endorsed by senior citizen groups, law enforcement groups, and consumer protection groups.

Shortly after entering Congress, I pursued this issue because of complaints from a local civic organization and seniors in my district. But I quickly realized it is affecting Americans in all corners of our country, in all of our districts.

I think the fact that this is plaguing so many of our communities is a big reason why we have so much bipartisan support here for this bill.

H.R. 3670 is an update to the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009. That legislation first criminalized malicious caller ID spoofing. But since the passage of that law, scammers have used legal loopholes and new technologies to circumvent it, thus, malicious caller ID spoofing is on the rapid rise again.

So it is time to strengthen and tighten existing law and shut down the routes by which it is being circumvented, and that is what our bill does. H.R. 3670 sets forth three important changes to current law.

Number one, the bill broadens current law to prohibit caller ID spoofing from foreigners. This is crucial because U.S.-based companies now spoof calls to U.S. residents with intent to do harm, but originate such calls from outside of the United States.

Number two, the bill broadens current law to include new Internet-based Voice Over IP services that enable callers to make outgoing only calls from computers and tablets to mobile and landline phones. This is a technology that was undeveloped in 2009 when the Truth in Caller ID Act was adopted and, therefore, unaccounted for in the law. But it has now grown and has contributed significantly to the caller ID spoofing problem.

Number three, finally, our bill broadens current law to include text messaging.

In closing, I would like to thank Mr. BARTON and Mr. LANCE for working with me to write this bill, Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN and Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO for all their guidance and leadership, the Communications and Technology Subcommittee members, most of whom gave this bill great time and support, and all the other cosponsors.

I would also like to thank the committee and personal staffs for all of their hard work.

I urge a "yes" vote for H.R. 3670.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is not spoofing when we say we are going to do something about those individuals that do try to spoof the American public.

As has been pointed out, we passed a law back in, actually, it was the 2009 act, but we passed it in 2010, the Truth in Caller ID Act, to mitigate the effects of caller spoofing.

As you well know, you look on your caller ID and you see that an innocent or innocuous individual or company is calling you, as has been pointed out. It could be the police department, could

be the Pizza Hut, could be almost anything, so you take the call and that is not what it is. In many cases they are trying to defraud our elderly in some scam or something like this. So we passed a law that we thought would handle it. But it needs to be updated, and that is what this bill does.

As has been pointed out, it makes it illegal to initiate these calls from outside the United States. It makes it illegal to do it over the Internet with a Voice Over Internet Protocol-based system. And it also broadens the jurisdiction to include text messaging.

As we well know, Mr. Speaker, text messaging is ubiquitous now on our Blackberrys and our iPads and iPhones and all of our personal telecommunication devices.

This bill has bipartisan support. The subcommittee chairman, Mr. WALDEN, is an original cosponsor. The subcommittee ranking member, Ms. ESHOO of California, is a cosponsor. Chairman Emeritus on the Democratic side JOHN DINGELL is a cosponsor. I am an original sponsor.

So this is one of these instances, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans and Democrats are united. Chairman UPTON, the full committee chairman, and Mr. WAXMAN, the full committee ranking member, are totally supportive.

□ 1830

There is every indication that, if this body passes this bill this evening, it will go to the other body, the United States Senate, and we fully expect it to pass it. This is one of those rare birds in this Congress that might actually be signed by the President of the United States.

There is no known opposition to the bill. Our stakeholders, as Mr. MATHESON has pointed out, support it. Google supports it. The FCC supports it. AT&T, CTIA, Microsoft, USTelecom, Vonage, Verizon, and AARP are just some of the more popularly known stakeholders that support the bill.

So I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, that we unanimously pass H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act of 2013, and send it to the Senate for its consideration.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3670, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING,
AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC
LICENSES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5161) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5161

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 “Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014” or the “E-LABEL Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Communications Commission (referred to in this section as the “Commission”) first standardized physical labels for licensed products such as computers, phones, and other electronic devices in 1973, and the Commission has continually refined physical label requirements over time.

(2) As devices become smaller, compliance with physical label requirements can become more difficult and costly.

(3) Many manufacturers and consumers of licensed devices in the United States would prefer to have the option to provide or receive important Commission labeling information digitally on the screen of the device, at the discretion of the user.

(4) An electronic labeling option would give flexibility to manufacturers in meeting labeling requirements.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC LABELING.

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 720. OPTIONAL ELECTRONIC LABELING OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘electronic labeling’ means displaying required labeling and regulatory information electronically; and

“(2) the term ‘radiofrequency device with display’ means any equipment or device that—

“(A) is required under regulations of the Commission to be authorized by the Commission before the equipment or device may be marketed or sold within the United States; and

“(B) has the capability to digitally display required labeling and regulatory information.

“(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROMULGATE REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014, the Commission shall promulgate regulations or take other appropriate action, as necessary, to allow manufacturers of radiofrequency devices with display the option to use electronic labeling for the equipment in place of affixing physical labels to the equipment.”.

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) to provide for electronic labeling of devices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act. This legislation that I introduced is a bipartisan and bicameral measure that marks an important step forward in modernizing our laws to reflect today’s information and communications technology marketplace.

Over the past 20 years, there has been tremendous growth and innovation in both the communications and manufacturing industries. Smartphones, tablets, and other revolutionary devices come equipped with functionalities we could only imagine just a short time ago. In the midst of this innovation era, it is critical that our laws recognize these advancements and are updated to foster continued investment and opportunities for future development. The E-LABEL Act will facilitate this effort.

The E-LABEL Act establishes a timeline for the FCC to move forward with a rulemaking to permit the use of electronic labels instead of physical labels to certify that devices with screens have been approved for commercial use. Not only will this give manufacturers greater flexibility to design innovative products that consumers demand, but by some estimates, e-labeling will save manufacturers over \$80 million a year. Consumers will also benefit from efficiencies created by e-labeling. E-labeling can expand consumer access to relevant device information and enhance the overall quality and availability of equipment identification records through supporting software. The E-LABEL Act represents good policy for both manufacturers and consumers and should be advanced without delay.

I thank Ranking Member ESHOO, Congressman WELCH, and Congresswoman BLACKBURN for their support on this measure. I also thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN for their continued support and leadership in modernizing our communication laws for the digital age. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

This bipartisan bill will modernize the Federal Communications Commission’s device certification rules by eliminating the requirement for device manufacturers to include etched labels on the outside body of each electronic