

of four of our subcommittees that are direct evidence of a very busy and productive session in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This package includes several measures that protect consumers and set Congress' sights forward to fostering next-generation technological development.

We will consider a measure introduced by Full Committee Vice Chairman BLACKBURN, to enhance penalties for the use of automated ticket scalping software. For too long, consumers have been gouged, as scalpers have used software to buy large numbers of event tickets—oftentimes preventing consumers from purchasing them at face value and then charging a 1,000 percent markup to resell those same tickets. This thoughtful legislation, the BOTS Act, is a targeted measure to prevent this practice and to ensure that consumers have fair access to tickets at reasonable prices.

We will also consider a measure authored by Mr. LANCE, along with Mr. KENNEDY, to ensure that online consumer reviews are no longer subject to gag orders—a practice ultimately affecting consumers as it hinders transparency and accountability in product reviews. Our legislation, the Consumer Review Fairness Act, does what it says and will help put a stop to this bad practice.

We will also consider a resolution that makes some important findings with respect to the Internet of Things. Back home in Michigan, folks are turning to smart devices to improve their access to health care, education, transportation, and other services that simplify their lives. This resolution sets forth Congress' unified belief that innovation in this space must be allowed to flourish and that the government must also take advantage of technology.

Similarly, we are putting forward a resolution authored by committee members Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CÁRDENAS that encourages a unified strategy around advanced financial technologies. The FinTech industry has changed how consumers engage in commerce and control their financial information as it lowers cost and increases financial access worldwide. This chamber's support for consumer empowerment through innovation is solidified with this resolution.

On the Health front, today we are also considering Mr. GUTHRIE's Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act. H.R. 921 would ensure that team doctors, trainers, and other licensed health care professionals are covered by their malpractice insurance when providing care to their athletes outside of their primary state.

We will also vote on Mr. KINZINGER's H.R. 1301, which originated out of the Communications and Technology subcommittee, and will ensure amateur radio operators are not prohibited from pursuing their passion simply because they live in a deed-restricted community. Amateur radio plays an important role in emergency response, often able to establish communication in disaster areas when traditional communications networks fail. I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense bill.

Last, but certainly not least, we will consider a measure from Rep. BOB Latta to help provide certainty for innovators and entrepreneurs who are seeking to develop and license the next generation of nuclear technologies. These technologies may provide breakthroughs in safety and efficiency over the technology in use today. We should ensure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has

the expertise and resources to review and license the latest in advanced reactor technologies and this bill would do just that.

Individually, each of these bills are important but taken together they are evidence of the fine, bipartisan lawmaking that has come to define this committee, and further evidence of our ongoing bipartisan record of success.

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. 5104, 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.

#### CONSUMER REVIEW FAIRNESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to prohibit the use of certain clauses in form contracts that restrict the ability of a consumer to communicate regarding the goods or services offered in interstate commerce that were the subject of the contract, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5111

*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 "Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016".*

#### SEC. 2. CONSUMER REVIEW PROTECTION.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:  
(1) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) **COVERED COMMUNICATION.**—The term "covered communication" means a written, oral, or pictorial review, performance assessment of, or other similar analysis of, including by electronic means, the goods, services, or conduct of a person by an individual who is party to a form contract with respect to which such person is also a party.

(3) **FORM CONTRACT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "form contract" means a contract with standardized terms—

(i) used by a person in the course of selling or leasing the person's goods or services; and  
(ii) imposed on an individual without a meaningful opportunity for such individual to negotiate the standardized terms.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The term "form contract" does not include an employer-employee or independent contractor contract.

(4) **PICTORIAL.**—The term "pictorial" includes pictures, photographs, video, illustrations, and symbols.

(b) **INVALIDITY OF CONTRACTS THAT IMPEDE CONSUMER REVIEWS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), a provision of a form contract is void from the inception of such contract if such provision—

(A) prohibits or restricts the ability of an individual who is a party to the form contract to engage in a covered communication;

(B) imposes a penalty or fee against an individual who is a party to the form contract for engaging in a covered communication; or

(C) transfers or requires an individual who is a party to the form contract to transfer to any

person any intellectual property rights in review or feedback content, with the exception of a non-exclusive license to use the content, that the individual may have in any otherwise lawfully covered communication about such person or the goods or services provided by such person.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to affect—

(A) any duty of confidentiality imposed by law (including agency guidance);

(B) any civil cause of action for defamation, libel, or slander, or any similar cause of action;

(C) any party's right to remove or refuse to display publicly on an Internet website or webpage owned, operated, or otherwise controlled by such party any content of a covered communication that—

(i) contains the personal information or likeness of another person, or is libelous, harassing, abusive, obscene, vulgar, sexually explicit, or is inappropriate with respect to race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, or other intrinsic characteristic;

(ii) is unrelated to the goods or services offered by or available at such party's Internet website or webpage; or

(iii) is clearly false or misleading; or

(D) a party's right to establish terms and conditions with respect to the creation of photographs or video of such party's property when those photographs or video are created by an employee or independent contractor of a commercial entity and solely intended for commercial purposes by that entity.

(3) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent that a provision of a form contract prohibits disclosure or submission of, or reserves the right of a person or business that hosts online consumer reviews or comments to remove—

(A) trade secrets or commercial or financial information obtained from a person and considered privileged or confidential;

(B) personnel and medical files and similar information the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(C) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(D) content that is unlawful or otherwise meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(C); or

(E) content that contains any computer viruses, worms, or other potentially damaging computer code, processes, programs, applications, or files.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—It shall be unlawful for a person to offer a form contract containing a provision described as void in subsection (b).

(d) **ENFORCEMENT BY COMMISSION.**—

(1) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.**—A violation of subsection (c) by a person with respect to which the Commission is empowered under section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)) shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) **POWERS OF COMMISSION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) **PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.**—Any person who violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(e) **ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Subject to paragraph (2), in any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of

any person subject to subsection (c) in a practice that violates such subsection, the attorney general of the State may, as *parens patriae*, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating the civil action against a person described in subsection (d)(1).

(ii) CONTENTS.—The notification required by clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The Commission may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1) against a person described in subsection (d)(1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(I) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(II) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(3) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(4) PREEMPTIVE ACTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—If the Federal Trade Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of subsection (c), the attorney general of a State may not, during the pendency of such action, bring a civil action under paragraph (1) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

(5) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(A) VENUE.—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(6) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other consumer protection officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

(f) EDUCATION AND OUTREACH FOR BUSINESSES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence conducting education and outreach that provides businesses with non-binding best practices for compliance with this Act.

(g) RELATION TO STATE CAUSES OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to af-

fect any cause of action brought by a person that exists or may exist under State law.

(h) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit, impair, or supersede the operation of the Federal Trade Commission Act or any other provision of Federal law.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATES.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that—

(1) subsections (b) and (c) shall apply with respect to contracts in effect on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) subsections (d) and (e) shall apply with respect to contracts in effect on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of an efficient market is the free flow of information to consumers. The Internet has added hundreds of billions of dollars to the economy, and much of this is due to the ready access that it affords consumers and businesses access to information.

Government officials spend a lot of time worrying about how to ensure that the independent information sources about product and service qualities are available. So the truly great thing about consumer reviews is that, as long as they are reliable sources of information, they are made available at no cost to the consumer or to the taxpayer.

□ 1715

But this benefit is in trouble if we allow businesses to prevent information from ever becoming public. Many of us might hesitate before we give that negative review. Others might be eager to let everyone know just how bad their brunch was, but it probably never crosses anyone's mind that they could be fined if they tell the truth. After all, Americans are used to our freedom of speech.

In one extreme example brought to us by TripAdvisor, travelers were subjected to a \$5 million fine if any "actual opinions and/or publications are created which, at the sole opinion of the businessowner tends directly to injure him in respect to his trade or business . . ."

Now, this is clearly designed to frighten those who read it and frighten them into silence, and those who don't see it might be surprised to hear from

a collection agency asking for \$5 million after posting a negative review.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act outlaws these gag orders. The prohibition is narrowly tailored to only those contracts where there is no opportunity for meaningful negotiations between the consumer and the business. In other words, it only applies to true form contracts. And the bill doesn't interfere with Web site operators' ability to manage the contacts and reviews on their own Web sites. Reasonable management of online reviews is necessary to ensure that they convey useful information as opposed to irrelevant or offensive content.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support free speech and support the passage of H.R. 5111.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank Mr. LANCE and Mr. KENNEDY for cosponsoring this bill, and I am pleased to join my colleague in support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act. This bill protects consumers' ability to provide honest reviews of products and services.

Chairman BURGESS is right in saying that if you get a notice that you now owe \$5 million probably just about for anything, you would be surprised; but if it was because you said something truthful based on your experience about a business, that would be particularly egregious.

Lots of mothers have told their children, "If you don't have something nice to say, say nothing at all," but the current practice now takes that way too far.

Businesses have snuck so-called non-disparagement clauses in terms of service agreements, and consumers don't really have a choice when it comes to those form contracts. In fact, they often don't realize they have just given up their right to speak openly about a bad experience. Imagine hiding language in form contracts to stop a bad Yelp review, for example.

For instance, a hotel in New York included a line in its guest policy that customers could be fined \$500 for leaving a bad review online. It seems ridiculous to me that a company would punish a consumer who wants to air complaints, particularly since hotel prices in New York are high enough already, and now you could be slapped with a fine for saying the service wasn't up to par.

This bill would put a stop to that anticonsumer practice. It would stop nondisparagement clauses from being placed in form contracts. Consumers should be able to voice their criticisms, and allowing reviews can help other consumers make informed choices. I look at those. The Consumer Review Fairness Act protects consumer speech, and I look forward to passing this legislation.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), the author of the bill and vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this consumer protection measure along with my cosponsor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The Consumer Review Fairness Act allows Americans to exercise their First Amendment rights regarding consumer experiences without fear of retribution. This issue comes right from the heart of the 21st century economy. It is easier than ever for consumers to make informed choices on which business or service to use by consulting Web sites and apps that publish crowdsourced reviews of local businesses and restaurants.

Consumer reviews are a powerful informational tool because consumers place a high value on the truthful reviews of other consumers. The trouble is that a number of businesses have become frustrated by online criticism and some have employed the questionable legal remedy known as nondisparagement clauses to retaliate against consumers. These are often buried in fine print, fine print that even these glasses couldn't discern.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act would void any nondisparagement clause in consumer contracts if that clause restricts consumers from publicly reviewing products or businesses accurately and would give the Federal Trade Commission the tools it needs to take action against businesses that insert these provisions into their contracts. It also would ensure companies are still able to remove false and defamatory reviews. And so it is narrowly tailored, but it is fairly tailored.

A few months ago I visited Bovella's Pastry Shoppe in Westfield, New Jersey, in the district I serve here. Bovella's has the highest Yelp review of any bakery in that part of New Jersey. The good people at that bakery have earned reviews from their hard work and excellent consumer service. They get a lot of business from people who turn to Yelp for insight on the best bakery in town. This crowdsourcing system thrives because of its integrity. People trust it. Bad actors who bully consumers are ruining the system that helps small businesses across this country.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE and Dr. BURGESS and Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY for their leadership in moving this forward. I certainly thank my cosponsor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). I thank the entire Committee on Energy and Commerce staff and the subcommittee staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this legislation.

This will protect the consuming public in a way that is really what we are trying to do in the 21st century because so much of what we do is based

upon the Internet, based upon apps, and it is important that this Congress make sure that we are up to date in this regard. Please, let's pass this bill to the benefit of online consumers.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the cosponsor of this consumer-friendly legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), my colleague, for yielding and for her leadership on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. Her efforts in fighting for consumer protection rights and privacy, including her support for this bill, are tireless.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016. The Consumer Review Fairness Act is a solution to a problem consumers across America are facing. In an unjust effort to stop consumers from posting honest reviews online, some businesses have resorted to hidden contract clauses prohibiting any negative feedback for a product, service, or experience. These so-called nondisparagement clauses allow companies to sue reviewers simply for posting their candid opinions online. This is a problem I have heard about firsthand from a major company in my district, Mr. Speaker, TripAdvisor, whose members depend on an open, honest, and fair online forum.

Like every American, those members have an undeniable right to voice their concerns when an experience or product fails to meet their expectations. Secret nondisparagement clauses limit our free speech and subject unsuspecting individuals to crippling lawsuits from businesses desperately trying to preserve their own reputation.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act makes these clauses illegal and voids any contract that contains a nondisparagement clause. It would allow the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the law and take action against any business that inserts these provisions into their contracts.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill preserves the rights of businessowners to take action against untruthful or dishonest reviews. Businesses still have a right to ensure that no confidential information is unfairly posted and may seek recourse in cases of defamation, libel, or slander.

I think it is fair to say that most of us in this Chamber today have looked at a consumer review prior to purchasing a product or service. In some way or another, we have relied at least some or in part on those reviews, both good and bad. If consumers want to post a truthful review online, they should not fear retribution just because their review is negative.

Mr. Speaker, there are several more people I would like to thank, including, of course, the gentleman from New Jer-

sey (Mr. LANCE) for his leadership and partnership in this effort; the subcommittee chair, Mr. BURGESS, and his staff; Chairman UPTON; Ranking Member PALLONE; and, as I said, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would like to thank also my good friend, ERIC SWALWELL, who has led legislative efforts on this issue for years. Lastly, and certainly not least, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my gratitude to the majority and minority staff of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for their hard work and engaging in good faith discussion to help get this bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I advise the minority that we have no additional speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act is a step forward not only for protecting consumers' speech, but for, really, the millions of consumers who rely on the reviews, the opinions of others, and believe that you get a fair mix of reviews, good and bad, that will enable you to make better purchasing decisions.

This bill passed on a bipartisan basis through both the subcommittee and full committee, and I look forward to passing it today. I want to thank all those who were involved in making this happen.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support free speech and support the passage of H.R. 5111.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016.

One of the most amazing aspects of the Internet is its ability to allow for the sharing of information, and consumers often rely on the reviews of others to make purchasing decisions. This system only works if consumers have access to all information available from across the nation, including both positive and negative reviews. We simply cannot allow companies to bully or attempt to silence customers who want to offer negative but honest assessments of products or services.

I was outraged when I first heard last Congress that companies were doing exactly that, using buried contractual terms, known as nondisparagement clauses, to try to block or punish customers for writing negative reviews online. To end this practice I introduced H.R. 5499, the Consumer Review Freedom Act of 2014, a narrow bill designed to outlaw nondisparagement clauses and empower the government to stop companies from using them while maintaining the ability of businesses to sue for traditional defamation. This Congress, Representative Darrell Issa and I introduced a bipartisan version of this legislation.

Today the House is considering H.R. 5111, very similar to our Consumer Review Freedom

Act but with some improvements. I want to thank Representatives Leonard Lance and Joe Kennedy for introducing this legislation and working diligently to move it forward. The Senate has already passed essentially the same bill, and so I hope once the House acts today the Senate can quickly pass H.R. 5111 and send it to the President's desk for his signature. This will be an important step in protecting a vital source of information for consumers across the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5111.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act, which would protect consumers' First Amendment right to share their experiences with a product or service online. Millions of Americans go online every day to read candid experiences from like-minded consumers, and many also share their reviews on everything from restaurants to clothing to hotels and services.

American consumers should feel confident in providing honest reviews, as the First Amendment protects their right to express their opinions. As a former small business owner, I know that listening to customer feedback is crucial for success, and that constructive criticism is sometimes more helpful than praise. Unfortunately, some businesses have found ways to bully consumers with costly penalties and lawsuits in an effort to hide negative reviews. Instead of trying to improve their own practices, these bad actors are taking their mistakes out on their own customers.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act would stop this unethical practice by prohibiting businesses from penalizing consumers for sharing a review they don't agree with. Our modern day economy is dependent on the free flow of information, and this bill will ensure consumers' rights to openly review products and services are not infringed upon.

I would like to thank my colleagues for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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. 5111, 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.

#### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ABOUT A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives about a national strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 847

Whereas the Internet of Things currently connects tens of billions of devices world-

wide and has the potential to generate trillions of dollars in economic opportunity;

Whereas increased connectivity can empower consumers in nearly every aspect of their daily lives, including in the fields of agriculture, education, energy, healthcare, public safety, security, and transportation, to name just a few;

Whereas businesses across the economy can simplify logistics, cut costs in supply chains, and pass savings on to consumers because of the Internet of Things and innovations derived from it;

Whereas the Internet of Things, through augmented data collection and process analyses, optimizes energy consumption by increasing energy efficiency and reducing usage and demand;

Whereas the United States should strive to be a world leader in smart cities and smart infrastructure to ensure its citizens and businesses, in both rural and urban parts of the country, have access to the safest and most resilient communities in the world;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in developing the Internet of Things technology, and with a national strategy guiding both public and private entities, the United States will continue to produce breakthrough technologies and lead the world in innovation;

Whereas the evolution of the Internet of Things is a nascent market, the future direction of which holds much promise;

Whereas businesses should implement reasonable privacy and cybersecurity practices and protect consumers' personal information to increase confidence, trust, and acceptance of this emerging market;

Whereas the Internet of Things represents a wide range of technologies, in numerous industry sectors and overseen by various governmental entities; and

Whereas coordination between all stakeholders of the Internet of Things on relevant developments, impediments, and achievements is a vital ingredient to the continued advancement of pioneering technology: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States should develop a national strategy to encourage the development of the Internet of Things in a way that maximizes the promise connected technologies hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, and improve the Nation's collective social well-being;

(2) the United States should prioritize accelerating the development and deployment of the Internet of Things in a way that recognizes its benefits, allows for future innovation, and responsibly protects against misuse;

(3) the United States should recognize the important role that businesses play in the future development of the Internet of Things and engage in inclusive dialogue with industry and work cooperatively wherever possible;

(4) the United States Government should determine if using the Internet of Things can improve Government efficiency and effectiveness and cut waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(5) using the Internet of Things, innovators in the United States should commit to improving the quality of life for future generations by developing safe, new technologies aimed at tackling the most challenging societal issues facing the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 847, the Internet of things, kind of a novel concept. The Internet of things represents a significant opportunity for economic growth and for innovation. It represents an opportunity for job creation across virtually every industry and every sector in the United States. The integration of the Internet and networked sensors into physical objects and things creates opportunities for new conveniences, creates opportunities for increased productivity, and substantial efficiency gains throughout our economy. According to McKinsey & Company, the Internet of things has a potential economic impact of \$4 trillion to \$11 trillion by the year 2025.

□ 1730

As the technology develops and matures, Internet connectivity is capturing more than just objects and traditional household items such as refrigerators, thermostats, and televisions. Today, Internet connectivity is being integrated into industrial processes, transportation routes, workforce practices, supply chain logistics, city operations, and much more. These advancements have been particularly beneficial to the manufacturing sector, where they are enabling greater workplace productivity, factory floor efficiency, and enhanced employee safety.

As a physician who has served people in north Texas for over 25 years before I came to Congress, I see great potential for the Internet of things, particularly in the healthcare space. Internet-connected devices, machines, and applications are creating opportunities for better quality and more efficient care. In addition to providing these benefits, connected healthcare devices help reduce healthcare costs and other health-related expenses that have long been a drag on our economy and on consumers' wallets.

In recognizing the potential for the Internet of things, H. Res. 847 establishes our commitment to realizing that potential through strategic investments that ensure that the Internet of things becomes the engine for job creation, innovation, and economic growth that it promises to be.

Through a national strategy, stakeholders can engage in a more collaborative discussion and resources can be used more effectively, more efficiently to foster the future development of the Internet of things market.

Importantly, a national strategy will foster more consumer confidence, more