

H.R. 4665 would ensure that the outdoor recreation economy is measured and is accounted for by the Federal Government as part of the country's gross domestic product, as it has done for many other economic sectors.

The work that is directed to be done by the Department of Commerce, in consultation with other Federal agencies, would not require new employees and would use existing funds within that agency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4665.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 4665, the Outdoor REC Act, recognizes the important contributions of outdoor recreation to our economy. Outdoor recreation provides an estimated 6 million direct jobs, including an estimated 200,000 jobs in my home State of Illinois. It promotes travel and tourism. Ultimately, getting Americans outside to enjoy our Nation's natural wonders promotes an appreciation for our environment.

This bill would build on efforts at the Department of Commerce to understand the economic impact of outdoor recreation by directing a report to Congress, helping inform policy and industry.

I want to thank Representatives Beyer, Reichert, Welch, and McMorris Rodgers for their work to advance this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4665, the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act of 2016.

The REC Act would allow for the first ever economic analysis of the outdoor recreation industry. Over 140 million Americans participate in outdoor activities each year, such as biking, hiking, hunting, fishing, and boating, to name just a few.

Studies have shown that outdoor recreation is a driving force in our economy and that the industry is continuing to grow. I have seen this firsthand in my district, which is home to 100 miles of coastline and beaches, a large tourism sector, and endless opportunities to go outside and enjoy our beautiful landscape.

Yet, despite the estimated billions in annual consumer spending on outdoor recreation and millions of jobs created, there is a lack of data on the full economic impact of the industry. For instance, there is a large manufacturing component that goes hand in hand with the outdoor recreation industry. Much of the gear and apparel used in outdoor activities is made and sold right here in the United States to the tune of millions of dollars.

The REC Act would ensure that this data and the entire outdoor recreation

industry is fully studied so that we can make informed policy and business decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4665.

□ 1515

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4665 is indeed a bipartisan bill, which my colleagues Congressman DAVE REICHERT, Congresswoman CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Congressman PETER WELCH, and I introduced.

The bill would direct the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis to measure, analyze, and report on the full economic impact attributable to the outdoor recreation economy. In the United States, this economy is a major driver of job creation and growth. Hiking, biking, fishing, hunting, kayaking, climbing, BASE jumping, you name the outdoor sport, it is generating revenue for our country.

In northern Virginia, we are blessed with great outdoor opportunities like the W&OD Trail and the Mount Vernon Trail, and we are very excited by the recent development of the Capital Trails Coalition, which is looking at how to foster increased interconnectedness of all the trails in the national capital region.

Mr. Speaker, as an avid hiker, this is very personal to me. I am now at 1,435 miles out of the 2,189 miles of the Appalachian Trail, and over those 1,435 miles, I often experience the outdoor economy firsthand with the number of backpacks, sleeping bags, stoves, water filters, diners, small motels, the many, many ways we find to spend money while on the trail.

Beyond the recharge of just being outside, I love getting to know the small towns and the forest communities along my hikes from Georgia to Maine. I know that my time spent there puts a lot more tax dollars back into these communities and into the local businesses, boosting the economy.

According to an estimate by the Outdoor Industry Association, the outdoor recreation economy generates more than \$646 billion in consumer spending and, we have already heard, more than 6 million jobs. Unlike other major sections of the U.S. economy, however, the Federal Government, until this year, did not track the contributions of the outdoor recreation sector to economic growth, and that left policymakers and business leaders in the dark. This data is going to help quantify the economic importance of outdoor recreation and help inform the decisions that affect the businesses and the 142 million Americans who play and work outside each year.

We deeply believe that no child should be left inside, and H.R. 4665 will ensure that our policymakers, our decisionmakers have the data to under-

stand how we can best make this part of our economy flourish. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for his over 1,000 miles traveled on the trail, so he is clearly an expert on this topic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on the legislation, and 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. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4665, 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.

IMPROVING RURAL CALL QUALITY AND RELIABILITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2566) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2566

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 "Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. ENSURING THE INTEGRITY OF VOICE COMMUNICATIONS.

Part II of title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 262. ENSURING THE INTEGRITY OF VOICE COMMUNICATIONS.

"(a) REGISTRATION AND COMPLIANCE BY INTERMEDIATE PROVIDERS.—An intermediate provider that offers or holds itself out as offering the capability to transmit covered voice communications from one destination to another and that charges any rate to any other entity (including an affiliated entity) for the transmission shall—

"(1) register with the Commission; and
"(2) comply with the service quality standards for such transmission to be established by the Commission under subsection (c)(1)(B).

"(b) REQUIRED USE OF REGISTERED INTERMEDIATE PROVIDERS.—A covered provider may not use an intermediate provider to transmit covered voice communications unless such intermediate provider is registered under subsection (a)(1).

"(c) COMMISSION RULES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall promulgate rules to establish a registry to record registrations under subsection (a)(1).

“(B) SERVICE QUALITY STANDARDS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall promulgate rules to establish service quality standards for the transmission of covered voice communications by intermediate providers.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In promulgating the rules required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

“(A) ensure the integrity of the transmission of covered voice communications to all customers in the United States; and

“(B) prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of covered voice communications.

“(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REGISTRY.—The Commission shall make the registry established under subsection (c)(1)(A) publicly available on the website of the Commission.

“(e) SCOPE OF APPLICATION.—The requirements of this section shall apply regardless of the format by which any communication or service is provided, the protocol or format by which the transmission of such communication or service is achieved, or the regulatory classification of such communication or service.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the regulatory classification of any communication or service.

“(g) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or expand the authority of a State public utility commission or other relevant State agency to collect data, or investigate and enforce State law and regulations, regarding the completion of intrastate voice communications, regardless of the format by which any communication or service is provided, the protocol or format by which the transmission of such communication or service is achieved, or the regulatory classification of such communication or service.

“(h) EXCEPTION.—The requirement under subsection (a)(2) to comply with the service quality standards established under subsection (c)(1)(B) shall not apply to a covered provider that—

“(1) on or before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, has certified as a Safe Harbor provider under section 64.2107(a) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

“(2) continues to meet the requirements under such section 64.2107(a).

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED PROVIDER.—The term ‘covered provider’ has the meaning given the term in section 64.2101 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

“(2) COVERED VOICE COMMUNICATION.—The term ‘covered voice communication’ means a voice communication (including any related signaling information) that is generated—

“(A) from the placement of a call from a connection using a North American Numbering Plan resource or a call placed to a connection using such a numbering resource; and

“(B) through any service provided by a covered provider.

“(3) INTERMEDIATE PROVIDER.—The term ‘intermediate provider’ means any entity that—

“(A) enters into a business arrangement with a covered provider or other intermediate provider for the specific purpose of carrying, routing, or transmitting voice traffic that is generated from the placement of a call placed—

“(i) from an end user connection using a North American Numbering Plan resource; or

“(ii) to an end user connection using such a numbering resource; and

“(B) does not itself, either directly or in conjunction with an affiliate, serve as a covered provider in the context of originating or terminating a given call.”.

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 in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today in support of H.R. 2566, the Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act of 2016. This bill addresses a serious problem that impacts so many of our rural constituents: telephone calls that are not completed or, if they are, they are of poor quality.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has spent a great deal of time over the past 5 years looking to the future of technology, all the great and innovative things it will bring, all the ways in which it will change lives. While these new and exciting offerings are an important piece of the future, we can't ignore the very real technological problems that exist today. As we talk about 5G service and the Internet of Everything, let's not forget that for some folks the big technological advancement they are hoping for is to be actually able to receive all of their voice calls.

The problem for rural customers comes when someone tries to call them but something goes wrong. Somewhere in the handoff and the delivery of traffic, calls to rural customers are being dropped or degraded. The caller continues to hear ringing on their end, but the call never makes it to the intended recipient. As our witnesses told us during the committee's consideration of the bill, this isn't just an inconvenience for them—it results in lost business or much worse.

The simplest explanation for what happens is that the long-distance and voice traffic starts with one provider, who then hands off the call to a third-party router, who will ultimately deliver it to the end provider serving the person who is being called. This process is typically seamless, typically high quality, and is typically transparent to the American consumer. However, in rural and hard-to-serve areas, it can be expensive to move traffic to remote customers, so the provider who originates the call will look for the least expensive option for delivering the call. In some cases, these least-cost routers simply cut corners to offer the lowest prices, which means that the call can be low quality or not connected at all.

This is a national problem affecting all of our constituents. So many of my colleagues shared letters that they received or stories that their constituents shared about how call failure or poor call quality has impacted their businesses or their lives.

One of our witnesses operated a telephone company that serves rural customers in Ohio, and he has told us that he has lost customers over call completion issues. When his customers don't receive their calls, they get angry with him, even though he typically doesn't have any control over the path that the call must take to get to the network. In fact, he has made major network upgrades to improve his service to his customers, but when his customers miss a call, who do they contact? Not the least-cost router who abandoned the call traffic somewhere along the line. They call the provider or they find a new provider. In his case, he has lost a major business client because of call completion issues despite the fact he had not done anything wrong.

The committee also heard from a witness who discussed another very real consequence of a call not going through. When a family tries to reach relatives in a rural area, particularly elderly relatives, they are unable to do so because the calls aren't completed. Understandably, this causes serious concern to the callers, who often turn to the local police department for help. As a result, the police must take time out of their day to check on the intended call recipient, who is typically fine other than the fact that their phone service is failing them.

Today we consider the legislation authored by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG). We have an opportunity to make a significant step forward in the fight to ensure that rural customers get the same high-quality voice service that others simply take for granted. By requiring the network providers in the middle to adhere to service standards, we also greatly improve the likelihood that calls are delivered to where they are supposed to go. By requiring these intermediate providers to register with the Federal Communications Commission, we deter fraudulent and bad actors that abuse the system and drop or degrade calls.

I was very pleased to hear of the strong bipartisan support for this measure, and I am optimistic we can make a big difference in the way rural consumers receive their telephone calls.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for his work on behalf of his constituents and the rural consumers across the country.

Reliable access to communications networks is a cornerstone of our telecommunications policy, and this bill takes steps to ensure that every person gets their telephone calls completed. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

I also rise to support H.R. 2566, the Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act of 2016, a bipartisan piece of legislation introduced by Representative DAVID YOUNG and cosponsored by a

host of people, including members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Representatives WELCH and LOEBSACK. This bill has a basic goal: ensuring that all Americans' phone calls go through.

Several years ago, the Federal Communications Commission found that telephone customers were having significant problems with call completion in rural areas. Consumers were reporting false busy signals, calls not arriving, or long pauses after dialing the number. This matters not just for rural Americans, but also for people like my constituents in the Chicago area who want to reach loved ones across the country. We need reliable telephone service to keep us all connected.

Call completions are often related to intermediate providers, the middleman hired to route calls. H.R. 2566 requires intermediate providers to register with the FCC and comply with service quality standards. This is a very important step to make sure that we can stay connected to one another. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG), the principal author of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in support of the Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act I introduced in a bipartisan manner with my colleague from Vermont, Representative PETER WELCH.

Each month as I meet with Iowans in each of the 16 counties making up the great Third District of Iowa, I hear how rural America is struggling. The recent economic downturn has led to people leaving rural areas to seek opportunities elsewhere.

In my home State of Iowa, rural communities are working to reverse these trends by attracting new businesses and amenities and opportunities for their residents. Now, communication is key to any business' success in reaching customers; yet in our rural communities across America, calls are not getting through or the connection and the quality are poor.

Telephone companies often rely on intermediate providers to route calls from large networks to local service providers, sometimes to mixed results. But dropped, looped, poor-quality calls do not just hurt small businesses and consumers; they also hurt our families in need of emergency assistance and public services.

Mr. Speaker, a family facing an emergency must be able to trust they will be able to reach assistance no matter where they live. Improving rural call completion rates and quality is essential to ensuring families in rural America have access to the services and amenities offered in large urban areas. These services are important to ensuring the survival of small towns

and granting Americans the choice to live and thrive in whatever community is best for them and their family—rural or urban.

H.R. 2566, the Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act, would help fix this significant problem facing rural America from dropped, poor-quality calls. The bill requires providers to register with the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, in order to meet quality standards that ensure reliable phone service in rural areas. It also prohibits providers from using intermediary routing services not registered with the Federal Communications Commission.

By addressing these problems, Congress can help provide Iowans and others and all Americans in rural communities with reliable phone service to conduct business, respond to emergencies, and live their lives.

I thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member ESHOO for their attention to this important matter. Again, I want to thank my colleague from Vermont, Representative PETER WELCH, for his bipartisan leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill to help our citizens living in rural America.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2566, the Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act of 2016, because it addresses an issue I hear about frequently: call quality in rural areas.

□ 1530

As the Representative for the First District of Georgia, I know the challenges that people living in rural areas face when it comes to the quality of their phone calls.

With telecommunications infrastructure being focused in larger and more urban areas, people living in rural parts of the country are often forced to deal with spotty and inconsistent service. This bill makes great strides in shoring up the communications infrastructure in rural areas and encourages great stability with phone services to people living in those areas.

This bill will help those who are underserved and will have a positive ripple effect on everything from public services and public safety. Call completion in rural areas has been an issue for years, and with this legislation, the FCC is giving a clear message that we can and will do more for a large population of the United States.

I applaud Chairman UPTON, Chairman WALDEN, and the rest of the Energy and Commerce Committee for their continued dedication in shoring up America's telecommunications

needs in a positive and growth-oriented manner.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2566, and I commend my good friend, Congressman YOUNG, for his work on this legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. 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 want to thank the authors of this bill for bringing it forward. It is an important concept and one that deserves our attention. I urge all Members to vote "aye" on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, 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. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2566, 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.

ANTI-SPOOFING ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2669) 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. 2669

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 2016".

SEC. 2. SPOOFING PREVENTION.

(a) EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by striking "in connection with any telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service" and inserting "or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States, in connection with any voice service or text messaging service".

(2) COVERAGE OF TEXT MESSAGES AND VOICE SERVICES.—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service" and inserting "voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service";

(B) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by striking "telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service" and inserting "voice service or a text message sent using a text messaging service"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) TEXT MESSAGE.—The term 'text message'—

"(i) means a message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted to or from a device that is identified as