almost 2 million people who were killed.

TAX DAY

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in advance of tax day to address the U.S. Tax Code and its impact on our economy.

There is no escaping the fact that our Tax Code is written in a manner that is burdensome to individuals. It is complex and unruly. However, I want to speak briefly about the dire effects that it has on small businesses.

Over 28 million small businesses in this country are the true economic drivers. As the tax changes continue to plague small businesses, we have a major problem. Instead of concentrating on servicing their customers, growing their company, or creating jobs, they are overwhelmed with tax provision changes. This is a never-ending story.

When that small business in Nevada diverts efforts and resources to deal with tax compliance issues, they are not focusing on why they are in business. They need a Tax Code that is simpler, fairer, and flatter.

As the debate surrounding tax reform continues, let's make sure that our Tax Code doesn't impact job creation.

JACKIE ROBINSON DAY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is Jackie Robinson Day, declared such by Major League Baseball, but it should be declared such by the United States of America.

On April 15, 1947, Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier. For 80-some odd years, there were no African American players in the major leagues. Branch Rickey put Jackie Robinson on the Brooklyn Dodgers and baseball became integrated. It truly became America's national pastime.

Today, Major League Baseball players will all wear number 42, a number retired and allowed to be worn only on this day in honor of Jackie Robinson on the occasion of integrating Major League Baseball.

Jackie Robinson was a great American and a great athlete. He lettered in four sports at UCLA. He was a great major league player with the Brooklyn Dodgers and was honored by being inducted into the Hall of Fame.

Today there is a Jackie Robinson Foundation that gives young people scholarships to go to college and to do good deeds. He was very much interested in moving America forward in civil rights, and he did all he could.

I was fortunate to travel to Cuba with the President. I met his widow, Rachel, and his daughter, Sharon, who gave me a button—and this is a replica of it—designating April 15 as Jackie Robinson Day. I think we should all think about his contributions to America and what contributions we can make to America to make us a more perfect Union.

Thank you, Jackie Robinson.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF PORTER TOWNSHIP, CLINTON COUNTY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 175th anniversary of Porter Township, Clinton County, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, which was founded in 1841 and named for the current Governor at the time, David Porter.

The township was settled by Scotch Irish pioneers and was known in its early days for the Washington Iron Works, built in 1809 and operated until 1878.

Like so much of Clinton County, Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, and the Commonwealth as a whole, the township has been also dependent on the timber industry over its 175-year history. To this day, the timber industry remains vital, contributing an estimated $90 million per year to the county's economy.

At 175 years old, Porter County is older than 24 States. This is, indeed, a milestone to celebrate. The celebration begins this weekend, on Saturday, with an opening ceremony that will include guest speakers, a hymn sing, and an ice cream social. Further events are planned through the end of the year, including a 5K Color Walk/Run and tours of township farms.

Again, congratulations to the officials and residents of Porter Township on this huge milestone.

LET'S MOVE FORWARD AND PASS A BUDGET

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last year, Congress put aside political grandstanding and actually made some progress: a budget agreement that was supposed to be a framework for 2 years. It wasn't a perfect agreement, but it kept us from going off a cliff. It did some good for the folks we represent. It set aside much of the damaging across-the-board cuts and gave Federal agencies, businesses, and workers some certainty and predictability.

Congress simply passing a budget at this point is a bit like a dog playing the piano. The song may not sound perfect, but it is a dog playing the piano. Congress actually passed a budget.

But here we go again. As I stand here, we, once again, don't have an annual budget. I struggle to explain to my constituents how Congress is, once again, snatching defeat from the claws of victory and how this dysfunction remains the norm.

The solution here is simple. Let's stick to the compromise made just a few months ago. Let's stick with what a majority of the House and Senate actually backed just a few months ago. Let's avoid shutdowns and dysfunction and get to work on moving this economy and this Congress forward.

CONDITION OF THE GENERAL FARM ECONOMY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week the Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing—and will be holding more—on the condition of the general farm economy.

We see prices of commodities going down extremely from a high just a couple of years ago. Indeed, farm income is down approximately 56 percent, according to the USDA.

Steps need to be taken to ensure stability in the ag economy because it is a large part of the export market for us, and the stability of U.S. food prices and the economy in rural America rely on it.

We need to have the type of policy that helps keep business in America doing well. It isn't just devising policy here in Washington, D.C., but also not making a regulatory burden and causing the prices of inputs to continue to spiral upward as we watch farm prices at the gate go down.

We need to do much more to have a friendly atmosphere for business. That includes agriculture in this country. And we hope to come up with solutions as we put the spotlight on the Agriculture Committee in the coming weeks.

IMMIGRATION POPULATION SETS RECORDS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent study shows the immigrant population, both legal and illegal, has grown to record levels, now surpassing 15 percent in one-third of the States. And in six States—California, Florida, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, and Texas—the population of immigrants and their children is over 25 percent.

A report by the Center for Immigration Studies found that since 1970, the number of immigrants and their children has increased six times faster than the overall population. Congress needs to analyze these facts as it considers assimilation, cost of government services, and the impact immigration has on jobs and the economy.

America has the most generous immigration system in the world. However, our immigration policies must put the interests of American workers and taxpayers first.

NO RATE REGULATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. 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 on H.R. 2666.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 672 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2666.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

From the first indication that the Federal Communications Commission intended to reclassify broadband Internet access service as a title II service subject to utility regulation, the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology has made it a priority to ensure that the FCC bureaucracy never has the authority to actually get in and micromanage and regulate rates.

The Internet is a model of innovation, flourishing under decades of light-touch or no-touch regulation. That is how it has flourished, Mr. Chairman.

□ 0915

In recent years, as the FCC has repeatedly attempted to regulate the management of Internet traffic, the potential reach of those regulations has grown, prompting concerns that the FCC would retreat to the world of rate regulation that typified the monopoly telephone era.

Unfortunately, these fears proved well-founded when the FCC announced in early 2015, Mr. Chairman, that it would reclassify the Internet as a utility-style service as part of the newest net neutrality rules—rules that are currently being challenged in the courts, I might add.

I would like to begin by addressing one of the most common attacks against this legislation, Mr. Chairman: that we are attempting to ''gut'' the FCC's authority to implement net neutrality rules. That simply is not the case.

We are supportive of clear, bright-line rules of the road for ISPs and the way they treat Internet traffic. We are for that. In fact, last year I released a discussion draft bill, along with Chairman UPTON and Senator THUNE, that would codify those very rules.

What we don't support is the use of outdated, ill-suited regulations to achieve those goals. This bill isn't intended to touch the net neutrality rules, and, in fact, an amendment I offered up in committee markup goes so far as to make an explicit exemption to ensure that the bill would not impact the FCC's work to ban paid prioritization. What this bill does is prohibit the FCC from regulating the amount charged to a consumer by an ISP for the provision of broadband service, a fact made clear by our definitions.

There is another objection, Mr. Chairman, we have heard repeatedly, and that is that the FCC had chosen to forbear from several of the provisions in title II and that the Chairman of the FCC had promised not to regulate rates anyway, so this bill is really unnecessary.

Again, this is simply not the case. The FCC did forbear from various sections of title II, but the authority to regulate rates through enforcement was and is still very much on the table. In addition, while Chairman Wheeler did promise before our subcommittee and multiple other committees of the Congress that he would not regulate rates, there was nothing to bind him or his successors to that commitment.

The need for the certainty of a statutory ban on rate regulation became even clearer just a few weeks ago when the bill's sponsor, Representative KINZINGER, actually asked the Chairman of the FCC, Chairman Wheeler, whether he believed the FCC should have the authority to regulate rates. Chairman Wheeler's response: ''Yes, sir.''

Given the philosophy of the Chairman himself, it is clearly more pressing than ever that this bill becomes law. The FCC cannot and should not be able to regulate the rates charged by ISPs to their customers. This sort of regulatory overhang clouds the decisionmaking of providers and dissuades them from offering innovative, pro-consumer pricing plans and service offerings, lest the Commission come back after the fact and penalize them.

Take T-Mobile's Binge On service as a prime example. Consumers are able to access video offered by any participant in the program without that data counting toward their monthly usage limits or charges. Edge providers win because their content is viewed more often. The service provider wins because they actually attract more customers. It is called the marketplace. It is innovation in the marketplace responding to what consumers want. Most importantly, consumers win because they are able to access the desired content with no cost or penalty.

Sounds pretty good, doesn't it?

Now, I am not here to advocate for one company over another, but this is called innovation in the marketplace. This is what entrepreneurship is all about. But, unfortunately, under the opaque rules of the FCC, T-Mobile had no way of knowing whether this sort of Binge On pricing scheme would violate the Commission's rules. They didn't know.

And while T-Mobile has taken this risk, many providers may now choose not to do so, ultimately depriving customers of choices they otherwise would have. You see, everybody is a little afraid, does this Chairman or the next Chairman come back, after the fact, and say: Well, you know, that is really not something we think is too dandy to do, so we are going to penalize you. It is called after-the-fact regulation.

So, as an unfortunate corollary to this chapter of Internet history, the same kind of flip-flop we are concerned we will see on rate regulation is exactly what we have seen with respect to Binge On. You see, Chairman Wheeler was ''okay with it'' until he decided maybe not.

As a former businessowner myself, I can tell you that you can't make business additions based on a hope and a prayer of your regulator. I was actually regulated by the FCC. I knew the rules. I followed them. They were clear. They were bright-line.

In an incredibly innovative marketplace, which the Internet thrives in, can you imagine having the lack of clarity and the ability to go back after the fact and, in effect, rate regulate? This will stifle competition, innovation, and consumer choice.

Finally, I would like to address charges that this bill would leave customers helpless to overcharge, or worse, by ISPs. We would all share that concern. We don't want that, and this bill provides protection.

The notion that the FCC, an agency that didn't have authority over Internet service providers' rates until last year—until last year—is the only line of defense between customers and fraud is, frankly, silly. It is a silly claim.

Customers have gotten along just fine without the aid of the FCC regulating rates; and this notion that the FCC is the only cop on the beat for consumers would come as a surprise—a real surprise—to many States attorneys general and consumer advocates