- 1 NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
- 2 RPTS WOJACK
- 3 HIF128170
- 4
- 5
- 6 OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL TRADE
- 7 COMMISSION: STRENGTHENING PROTECTIONS FOR
- 8 AMERICANS' PRIVACY AND DATA SECURITY
- 9 WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2019
- 10 House of Representatives
- 11 Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce
- 12 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 13 Washington, D.C.
- 14
- 15
- 16

17	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a.m.,
18	in Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Janice
19	Schakowsky [chairwoman of the subcommittee] presiding.
20	Members present: Representatives Schakowsky, Castor,
21	Kelly, O'Halleran, Lujan, Cardenas, Blunt Rochester, Soto,
22	Rush, Matsui, McNerney, Dingell, Pallone (ex officio),
23	Rodgers, Upton, Burgess, Latta, Guthrie, Bucshon, Hudson,
24	Carter, Gianforte, and Walden (ex officio).
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

25 Staff present: Billy Benjamin, Systems Administrator; 26 Jeff Carroll, Staff Director; Evan Gilbert, Press Assistant; 27 Lisa Goldman, Counsel; Waverly Gordon, Deputy Chief Counsel; 28 Tiffany Guarascio, Deputy Staff Director; Alex Hoehn-Saric, 29 Chief Counsel, C&T; Zach Kahan, Outreach and Member Service 30 Coordinator; Meghan Mullon, Staff Assistant; Alivia Roberts, 31 Press Assistant; Tim Robinson, Chief Counsel; Chloe 32 Rodriguez, Policy Analyst; Ben Rossen, FTC Detailee; C.J. 33 Young, Press Secretary; Jordan Davis, Minority Senior 34 Advisor; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Minority Staff Assistant; 35 Melissa Froelich, Minority Chief Counsel, CPAC; Bijan 36 Koohmaraie, Minority Counsel, CPAC; and Brannon Rains, 37 Minority Staff Assistant.

Ms. Schakowsky. The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce will now come to order. We will begin with member opening statements, and I will begin for 5 minutes.

So, good morning, and thank you to the Federal Trade Commission for being with us this morning. It is really an honor to have all of you here. It means a great deal to us.

44 The FTC is an independent agency created by Congress to 45 protect the American people. Recent media reports have 46 focused on the Federal Trade Commission's potentially record-47 breaking fine of Facebook. The fact of the matter is that I 48 believe that the public information known about this case 49 underscores the need for comprehensive privacy legislation. 50 And we are really going to focus, at least I am, on privacy 51 legislation and what we can do.

52 And while I appreciate the Commission's work on and 53 action on the Facebook case, I believe the reality is that a 54 large fine in a single case does not meaningfully solve the 55 problems that consumers face because of the FTC's lack of 56 tools it needs to fulfill the mission to protect consumers in 57 today's economy. The FTC needs increased funding and the 58 APA, Administration Procedures Act -- I can't stand those 59 acronyms, okay -- the rulemaking authority, at a minimum, to 60 restore consumers' confidence in today's digital and brick and mortar marketplace, the FTC should be able to pursue 61

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

62 multiple investigations both large and small.

63 And, Chairman Simons, I want to thank you and offer my 64 support for APA rulemaking that you said that you wanted to 65 see. We know the American people are counting on us to act. 66 According to a recent survey, 67 percent of American adults 67 want the government to act to protect them and to protect 68 their privacy. But as it stands right now, the FTC does not 69 have authority to obtain civil penalties for initial 70 violations for most unfair or deceptive practices, making 71 matters much worse.

72 The Federal Trade Commission has only 40 full-time staff 73 devoted to privacy and data security. Contrast that with the 74 United Kingdom Information Commissioner's Office which has 75 about 500 employees for a country about one-fifth of the size 76 of the United States. And unfortunately, Chairman Simons, 77 unlike other recent administrations you have not appointed a 78 chief technologist, and, in fact, only five people at the FTC 79 right now are identified as technologists.

Energy and Commerce Democrats feel we have an obligation to provide a solid piece of legislation that protects consumer privacy. We have begun conversations now with the Republicans as well, and I am very hopeful that legislation will be bipartisan and I am looking forward to working with all of you on the Federal Trade Commission in designing this

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

86 legislation. We welcome the commissioners today to learn how 87 we can assist them in fulfilling their mission, our joint 88 mission. I want to yield the balance of my time to 89 Congressman Lujan.

Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Chairwoman Schakowsky. And I
thank Chairman Pallone, Ranking Members Walden and Rodgers,
for this important hearing today on privacy and data
security.

94 Let me start with just a few numbers: 500 million, 148 95 million, and 87 million. These are the numbers of consumers 96 impacted by the Marriott, 500 million; Equifax data breaches, 97 148 million; and the Facebook-Cambridge Analytica scandal, 87 98 million. These massive numbers represent real people, people 99 whose trust and privacy has been violated. Most of them not 100 been made whole, still vulnerable today.

101 Here is another number, 21. It has been 21 years since 102 Congress passed even limited privacy legislation, the 103 Children's Online Privacy Act. In 1998, America Online had 104 14 million subscribers, Google was a month old, and Facebook 105 didn't even exist. These numbers make it real; we must act 106 to pass comprehensive data privacy and security legislation. 107 And most recently in 2017, when we discovered and 108 learned about the breach with Equifax back in September of '17, there were hearings held in October of '17. 109 It appeared **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

110 that there were commitments made in this committee to the 111 American people that action would be taken before the holiday 112 season and here we are today, still where no action taken and 113 that is why this hearing matters so very much.

And so with that, Madam Chair, I thank you for the hearing. I urge us to act. And I thank the commissioners for their testimony and I look forward to today's discussion. And I yield back. Ms. Schakowsky. Would anyone else on the Democratic side want the time that is remaining? Otherwise, I yield back and I now recognize the ranking member, Ms. McMorris Rodgers, for her opening statement.

121 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and 122 welcome to everyone, the chairman and the commissioners from 123 the Federal Trade Commission.

124 Today's hearing is very important. Whether through 125 deceptive advertising, fraud, or other schemes, bad actors 126 regularly try to game the system and destroy trust. The FTC 127 has been one of the top cops on the consumer protection beat 128 for decades. I am glad that you are here to discuss the 129 Commission's vital mission to protect consumers and promote 130 competition and innovation especially as it relates to one of 131 the most important issues today, our privacy.

In America's 21st century economy, our days start and end by exchanging our information with products that save us NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

time, keep us informed, connect us with our communities. 134 135 Many of us start our day by asking Alexa or Siri, "What is 136 the weather today?" Then we browse Facebook and Instagram, 137 open some emails, read the news, check for traffic updates on our iPhones, and if the traffic doesn't look too bad there is 138 139 time to order groceries to be picked up or delivered after 140 work. And that is just before we walk out the door. All day 141 long we are sharing our information with the internet 142 marketplace. And for people who use health trackers and 143 apps, it might not even stop when you go to sleep.

144 This free flow of information drives much of the 145 innovation and technology growth here in the United States. 146 Bottom line, we make choices every day to be connected, and when we do we must be able to trust that our privacy is 147 148 protected. We deserve to know how our data is being 149 collected, how it is being used, and who it is being shared 150 with. There shouldn't be so many surprises and these 151 protections shouldn't change depending upon which state we 152 are in.

153 In a recent survey, 75 percent of respondents said 154 privacy protections should be the same everywhere they go. 155 The vast majority of Americans want the same protections 156 whether they live in Eastern Washington, San Francisco, New 157 Jersey, or Illinois. That is why I have been advocating and **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

leading for a national standard for data privacy that, one, doesn't leave our privacy vulnerable in a patchwork; two, increases transparency and targets harmful practices like Cambridge Analytica; three, improves data security practices; and four, is workable for our nation's innovators and small businesses.

164 So, today, I look forward to hearing from the Federal 165 Trade Commission which is the main cop on the beat to enforce 166 privacy standards, promote transparency, and hold companies 167 accountable. The FTC's mission is to protect consumers and 168 promote innovation. Our four principles for data privacy law 169 are in line with the mission. It is about protecting consumers from concrete harms, empowering the choices that 170 171 they make, and also promoting new technologies that we 172 haven't even dreamed of yet. This Congress should lead on 173 writing privacy rules of the road. I remain ready and 174 willing to work with my colleagues on this committee for a 175 bipartisan solution that puts consumers and their choices first. 176

177 In various proposals, some groups have called for the 178 FTC to have additional resources and authorities. I remain 179 skeptical of Congress delegating broad authority to the FTC 180 or any agency. However, we must be mindful of the 181 complexities of this issue as well as the lessons learned

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

182 from previous grants of rulemaking authority to the

183 Commission.

184 The FTC's jurisdiction is incredibly broad. Its 185 authority extends beyond just big tech, touching almost every 186 aspect of our marketplace from loyalty programs at your local 187 grocery store to your favorite coffee shop. The existing statutory rulemaking authority given to the FTC by Congress 188 189 must also be part of the discussion. Had the FTC undertook 190 rulemaking efforts on any number of issues we will discuss 191 today, even starting 8 to 10 years ago, those efforts could 192 have already been completed. The history of the FTC's 193 authority is important and it should not be transformed from a law enforcement agency to a massive rulemaking regime. 194

195 To understand the pain this could cause, look no further 196 than GDPR in Europe. Investment in startups in Europe is 197 down 40 percent and thousands of U.S. firms are no longer 198 operating in the EU because they can't take on the millions 199 of dollars in compliance cost. If we decide to increase 200 FTC's resources and authority to enforce privacy law, then 201 this committee must exercise its oversight of the Commission 202 to its fullest. Oversight must be a part of the conversation 203 so Congress does its job to review and hold the FTC

204 accountable.

205

Thank you, everyone, for being here and I look forward **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

to our discussion. Ms. Schakowsky. The gentlelady yields
back. And now I recognize the chair of the full committee,
Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes.

209 The Chairman. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Federal Trade Commission plays a critical role in 210 211 protecting American consumers and promoting competition in 212 the marketplace. It is a relatively small agency, but the 213 breadth of its mission is vast. As the nation's consumer 214 protection agency, the FTC works to protect consumers from a 215 variety of unfair and deceptive practices including false 216 advertising, illegal telemarketing, unfair debt collection 217 and fraud.

218 Last year, the FTC received nearly three million 219 complaints from consumers who reported losing around one and 220 a half billion dollars to fraud. Seniors particularly were 221 preyed upon by criminals pretending to need money to bail 222 their grandchildren out of jail. Veterans were tricked into 223 giving their credit card information to a thief who claimed 224 to work for the Veterans Choice Program, just as examples. 225 And these two examples of the thousands of frauds the FTC 226 face every day, many are perpetrated through robocalls which 2.2.7 I am working to address through the Stopping Bad Robocalls 228 Act.

229

But that is not the only way fraudsters commit their **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

230 offenses and the FTC needs more support and more authority to 231 prevent scams and enforce the law. The FTC is also the 232 nation's primary enforcer in the area of privacy and data 233 security. Talk about a daunting job. When you consider that 234 companies today monitor every move we make, they are tracking 235 where we go, who we are with, our private conversations, our 236 health, the websites we visit, and increasingly what we do 237 inside our homes. And as we have learned from the concerning privacy issues surrounding Cambridge Analytica and Facebook 238 239 and from massive data breaches like the one at Equifax, there 240 is little reason to believe that consumers can trust these 241 companies with our personal data.

242 The FTC can and should be doing more to protect 243 consumers and Congress needs to give the FTC the tools it 244 needs to be more effective. That starts with resources. The 245 FTC has fewer employees today than it did in the 1980s when 246 the internet did not exist. It has just 40 employees 247 responsible for protecting the data of 300 million Americans. 248 I think that is just unacceptable, particularly when you 249 consider that the United Kingdom, which has a much smaller 250 population, has more than 500 people who protect the privacy 251 and data of its residents.

252 So we have to give the FTC the resources it needs to 253 become a global leader on privacy and data security. The FTC **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

254 also needs more authority to prevent privacy abuses from 255 happening in the first place and to ensure that companies 256 properly secure the personal data entrusted to them. Too 257 often, the FTC can do little more than give a slap on the wrist to companies the first time they violate the law. 258 That 259 is because it lacks the authority to impose a monetary 260 penalty for initial violations.

261 Currently, the FTC can only order a company to stop the 262 bad practices and promise not to do it again. And if we 263 really want to deter companies from breaking the law, the FTC 264 needs to be able to impose substantial fines on companies the 265 first time. To make matters worse, there are no strong and 266 clear federal privacy laws and regulations that establish a 267 baseline for how companies collect, use, share, and protect 268 consumer information. The FTC lacks the ability to issue 269 such regulations, leaving Americans left to the whims of 270 corporations.

271 Companies should not be gathering consumer information 272 without a good reason and should have clear consent when they 273 use that information for purposes a consumer would not 274 reasonably expect. When I search online about the side 275 effects of a medicine, I don't expect that information to be 276 shared with advertisers, data brokers, or insurance 277 companies, and it shouldn't be shared unless I say so.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

278 Companies also need to protect the data they collect so 279 Americans are not as vulnerable to identity theft, scams, and 280 other unfair and deceptive acts as they are today. So 281 Congress should pass, or must pass strong, comprehensive privacy legislation, and this committee intends to take that 282 283 The legislation that we pass should give consumers action. 284 control over their personal data including giving consumers 285 the ability to access, correct, and delete their personal 286 information. And it should shift the burden to companies to 287 ensure they only use the information consistent with 288 reasonable consumer expectations.

So I look forward to hearing from all the commissioners about how the FTC can better fulfill its mission in this important area of consumer protection. And unless somebody wants the time, there is not much left -- yeah, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

294 Ms. Castor. Well, I thank the chairman of the committee 295 for yielding the time.

And I just wanted to start out by saying that America needs a modern online privacy law and the Federal Trade Commission needs the tools and resources to effectively enforce law and hold bad actors accountable. And I think, I encourage you all today to also discuss the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act because I think it is in need of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

302 substantial updates, especially looking at how we enforce it, 303 the sham safe harbor provisions, and your opinions on 304 adopting some reasonable collection parameters. So thank you 305 and I yield back.

The Chairman. And I yield back, Madam Chair.
Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back and now I
will recognize the ranking member of the committee, Mr.
Walden, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Walden. Good morning, Madam Chair. Thanks for having this hearing. I want to welcome our commissioners as well for being here from the Federal Trade Commission. Thank you. We will be informed by your testimony and we appreciate the work you do at the FTC.

315 We know you're tasked with broad and important 316 responsibilities and it is a jurisdiction that spreads out 317 over almost every aspect of the United States economy from 318 large household name technology companies at Silicon Valley 319 to small mom and pop shops in rural America. But recently 320 concerns surrounding data security and data privacy including 321 questions about what information is collected, how companies 322 use that information, who that information is shared with, 323 and what protections exist for consumers have demanded more 324 and more congressional attention and appropriately so.

> In the last Congress, this committee held very high-**NEAL R. GROSS**

> > COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

325

326 profile hearings around incidents involving data security and 327 data privacy issues with CEOs. They sat right there from 328 Equifax; Mark Zuckerberg was there for 5 hours from Facebook; 329 we had those from Twitter as well. We also held hearings 330 focused on securing consumer information, on understanding 331 algorithmic decision making, exploring the online advertising ecosystem and how it operates, and an oversight hearing with 332 333 you, the FTC. Privacy was a premier issue during these 334 hearings, but as we learned this is also a tough issue to 335 legislate on. Privacy does not mean the exact same thing to 336 each and every person.

337 I want to echo the sentiments of my colleague, 338 Representative Rodgers, who outlined the vast benefits 339 consumers also get from the use of their information online. 340 It is a goods for services exchange. We don't always know 341 that but we do benefit from that. We cannot lose sight of 342 the tremendous benefits consumers get from use of those data: 343 access to top tier journalism, affordable and quickly 344 delivered products, telehealth and research initiatives, and 345 much, much more.

Here in the United States we have a thriving startup ecosystem and a regulatory environment that enables small businesses to grow and compete in no small part because the free flow of information. And as a result, companies **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

innovate, they create jobs in America, and offer consumers options and convenience that most of us never dreamed would be possible.

353 I believe it is important we work together toward a bipartisan, federal privacy bill and we are ready and willing 354 355 to tackle crafting such a bill. I think we were informed by 356 our hearings in the last 2 years and are more than prepared 357 now to move forward to write legislation in a bipartisan way. 358 A federal privacy bill must set one national standard. 359 Allowing a patchwork of state laws will not only hurt 360 innovation and small businesses, but will limit consumers' 361 options online. Consumers expect a seamless online 362 experience and I do not want to see that taken away.

363 We must protect innovation and small businesses. We 364 should learn from Europe where large companies are only 365 getting larger and unfortunately small companies are getting 366 smaller or disappearing altogether online. You know, 367 JPMorgan Chase & Company CEO Jamie Dimon recently said Dodd-368 Frank created a moat around his company, which is exactly 369 what we risk doing with the likes of Google and Facebook and 370 the big ones, because they will always be able to comply and 371 they will just get bigger if we don't craft the law 372 correctly.

373

We must enhance security for consumers. Companies must **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

374 have reasonable practices in place to protect consumer

375 information, period. We must increase transparency.

376 Consumers deserve to know how their information is collected, 377 how it is used, and how it is shared. And we must improve When companies fail to keep their promises 378 accountability. 379 or outright misuse consumer information, those companies must 380 be held accountable. This goes to the heart of the 381 enforcement issues. Federal Trade Commission accomplishes 382 its consumer protection mission through law enforcement, by 383 bringing action against companies who engage in unfair or 384 deceptive acts or practices. And we know you have a big 385 decision before you right now involving one of those 386 companies.

387 Through advocacy, through consumer and business 388 education efforts, you do it all. The FTC can file 389 injunctions, you can levy civil penalties, and you can seek 390 remedies on behalf of consumers to redress harms. Federal 391 Trade Commission generally operates a highly effective, 392 bipartisan agency, returning millions directly to consumers 393 after they are defrauded, and I look forward to hearing an 394 update on those efforts. I also look forward to hearing 395 about the consumer protection hearings and the agency has 396 learned about privacy harms and risks.

397 Every agency has challenges and recent court changes in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

398 cases have changed the direction of some agency activity to 399 refocus on due process. I am encouraged that these types of 400 improvements would help small businesses understand their 401 rights when faced with the full force of the FTC. I believe 402 the FTC is the right agency to enforce new privacy law with 403 appropriate safeguards and process improvements to ensure 404 strong, consistent enforcement.

405 Some have suggested the quick answer is more money, more 406 rulemaking authority, and more employees. There is no quick 407 fix, I would argue. I would like to hear from the chairman 408 about his views on unbounded rulemaking at the FTC and 409 whether the agency can compete for talent with the big tech 410 companies that are moving to the D.C. area. And we must 411 consider market realities and ask if there is more effective 412 ways to get experts to the FTC for unique cases.

So, Madam Chair, thanks for having this hearing. I think it is really important and we look forward to working with you and others on the committee to get this right and get it into law. And I yield back.

Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back. And the chair would like to remind members that pursuant to committee rules, all members' written opening statements shall be made part of the record.

421 Next, I am going to introduce all of our witnesses, but

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I want to tell all of you that I had a standing-room-only
FTC-sponsored scam workshop in my district along with
Congressman Brad Schneider, which was amazing, and I would
encourage all members to consider doing that. The turnout
was unprecedented and people really appreciated it. So thank
you.

So let me introduce our witnesses. The honorable Joseph
Simons, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission;
Commissioner Christine Wilson; Honorable Commissioner Rebecca
Kelly, Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, sorry; Commissioner Noah
Joshua Phillips; Commissioner Rohit Chopra. We are happy to
have you all and we want to thank our witnesses for joining
us today. We look forward to your testimony.

435 And at this time, the chair will now recognize each 436 witness for 5 minutes to provide their opening statements. 437 Before we begin, I would like to explain the lighting system. 438 I think probably most of you know that the light will 439 initially be green at the start of your opening statement, 440 then it will go to yellow when you have 1 minute, and then it 441 will go to red. And we would appreciate it very much if you 442 would end in those 5 minutes. So, Chairman Simons, you are 443 recognized for your 5 minutes.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 444 STATEMENTS OF JOSEPH J. SIMONS, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE
- 445 COMMISSION; CHRISTINE WILSON, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL TRADE
- 446 COMMISSION; REBECCA KELLY SLAUGHTER, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
- 447 TRADE COMMISSION; NOAH JOSHUA PHILLIPS, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
- 448 TRADE COMMISSION; ROHIT CHOPRA, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL TRADE
- 449 COMMISSION
- 450
- 451 STATEMENT OF JOSEPH SIMONS
- 452

Mr. Simons. Chairman Schakowsky, Ranking Member Rodgers, and distinguished members of the subcommittee, it is an honor and a privilege to appear before you today, and especially with my esteemed colleagues, my fellow

457 commissioners.

The FTC is a highly effective, independent agency with a broad mission to protect consumers and maintain competition in most sectors of the economy. On the competition side, examples of our vigorous enforcement program include cases like Impax and AbbVie where we successfully attacked anticompetitive conduct by pharmaceutical companies. Ms. Schakowsky. If you could hold just for a minute.

465 We got the message, and if you will put the signs down,

466 appreciate it.

467 Thank you. Go ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

468 Mr. Simons. Yes. We successfully attacked 469 anticompetitive conduct by pharmaceutical companies, 470 achieving a \$448 million judgment in the latter case. We 471 also recently filed an important case against a company 472 called Surescripts, a health IT company with a monopoly over 473 e-prescribing that is maintaining and acquired that monopoly 474 through exclusionary conduct.

And on the research and policy front, our extensive Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century have involved more than 350 panelists and more than 850 public comments. On the consumer protection side, we are very active as well, with matters ranging from student debt relief scams to various types of false advertising and many other cases in between.

482 But today I would like to focus my remarks on data 483 security and privacy. As you have said, the FTC has been the 484 primary federal agency charged with protecting consumer 485 privacy since 1970 with the passage of the FCRA. From the 486 growth of the internet to the mobile device explosion to the 487 arrival of the Internet of Things and artificial 488 intelligence, we have continuously expanded our focus on 489 privacy to reflect how consumer data fuels these changes in 490 the marketplace.

491

Our primary legal authority in this space is Section 5

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

492 of the FTC Act, which prohibits deceptive or unfair 493 commercial practices. But Section 5 is an imperfect tool --494 imperfect tool. For example, Section 5 does not allow the 495 Commission to seek civil penalties for first-time privacy It does not allow us to reach nonprofits and 496 violations. 497 common carriers even when their practices have serious 498 implications for consumer privacy and data security.

499 These limitations have a critical effect on our ability 500 to protect consumers, which is why we urge Congress to enact 501 privacy and data security legislation enforceable by the FTC 502 which grants the FTC civil penalty authority, targeted APA 503 rulemaking authority, and jurisdiction over nonprofits and Irrespective of any new legislation, 504 common carriers. 505 however, we will continue to use every tool currently at our 506 disposal to address consumer harm including authorities given 507 to us by the Congress like the Children's Online Privacy 508 Protection Act and the Safequards Rule.

We have aggressively pursued privacy and data security cases to date bringing more than 65 data security cases as well as more than 60 general privacy cases. For example, we recently brought cases against two companies whose alleged lax security practices resulted in a breach of eight million consumers' data. And in March, the FTC announced a record \$5.7 million civil penalty as part of its settlement with

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

516 video social networking app Musical.ly for collecting 517 children's personal information online without first

518 obtaining parental consent.

519 To complement our efforts, we also engage in policy initiatives in the privacy and data security areas. 520 In 521 addition to the hearings I mentioned, which included 4 days 522 of panels that specifically addressed consumer privacy and 523 data security, we recently issued 6(b) orders to several 524 internet service providers to evaluate their privacy 525 We will use the information we learned from this practices. 526 study to better inform our policy and our enforcement work.

527 Finally, many of our privacy and data security

528 investigations in cases involve complex facts and

529 technologies and well-financed defendants. And as we told

530 you in response to Chairman Pallone and Schakowsky's resource

531 letter, it is critical that the FTC have sufficient resources

to support its investigative and litigation needs

533 particularly as demand for enforcement in this area continues

to grow. We are committed to using every resource

effectively to protect consumers and to promote competition,

to anticipate and respond to changes in the marketplace, and

537 to meet current and future challenges.

538 We look forward to working with the subcommittee and the 539 Congress and I am very happy to answer your questions. Thank NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 540 you so much.
- 541 [The prepared statement of Mr. Simons follows:]
- 542
- 543 ********** INSERT 1*********

544 Ms. Schakowsky. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, sticking 545 within the time, too, appreciate that.

546 And now, Commissioner Wilson, you are recognized for 5 547 minutes.

548

549 STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE WILSON

550

551 Chairman Schakowsky, Ranking Member Ms. Wilson. 552 Rodgers, Chairman Pallone, and Ranking Member Walden, thank 553 you for the opportunity to testify. It is an honor to appear 554 before you and the distinguished members of the subcommittee 555 for the first time since I joined the Commission 8 months Today I would like to highlight two areas where I 556 aqo. 557 respectfully believe Congress could assist the FTC in 558 fulfilling its mission to protect consumers. First, 559 enactment of privacy legislation, and second, clarification 560 of the FTC's authority under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act. 561 With respect to privacy legislation, I agree with 562 Chairman Simons' opening statement on this topic. I too 563 encourage Congress to enact privacy legislation to be 564 enforced by the FTC. Businesses need clarity and certainty 565 regarding rules of the road in this important area. The 566 passage of the California Consumer Privacy Act and the 567 prospect of potentially conflicting bills in myriad states **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

568 have created confusion and uncertainty in the business 569 community. And in light of the fact that online commerce is 570 not just national, but international in scope, I encourage 571 Congress to include preemption in any federal privacy 572 legislation. Even more importantly, consumers need clarity regarding how their data is collected, used, and shared. 573 574 Privacy legislation should address these concerns and could 575 help build public trust around data collection and use. 576 Privacy legislation is also necessary to address the 577 emerging gaps and sector-specific approaches created by 578 evolving technologies. For example, HIPAA applies to medical 579 offices but not wearables, apps, or websites like WebMD. 580 Data protections should be based on the sensitivity of the

581 data, not the entity or mechanism through which it is

582 collected.

583 And while privacy is important, so is competition. 584 Federal privacy legislation must be carefully crafted to 585 maintain competition and foster innovation. GDPR may have 586 lessons to teach us in this regard. Preliminary research 587 indicates that GDPR may have created unintended consequences, 588 including a decrease in investment and startups and 589 entrenchment of dominant players in the digital advertising 590 market. Reports also indicate that compliance with GDPR is 591 costly and difficult for small businesses and new entrants.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

592 U.S. legislation should seek to avoid these negative 593 There are three other elements I believe consequences. 594 should also be included in federal privacy legislation: civil 595 monetary penalties, which Congress has provided for in other statutes that are enforced by the FTC including COPPA and the 596 Telemarketing Sales Rule; jurisdiction over nonprofits and 597 598 carriers which collect, common carriers which collect 599 significant volumes of sensitive information; and targeted, 600 narrow APA rulemaking authority so the FTC can enact rules to 601 supplement legislation and to permit adjustments in response 602 to technological developments.

603 Turning to section 13(b) of the FTC Act, I think it is important for Congress to provide assistance through 604 605 clarification of the FTC's authority under section 13(b) of 606 our statute. Decades of cases have established two key 607 principles. First, the FTC may bring actions in federal 608 district court to obtain injunctive relief, and second, the 609 authority to grant injunctive relief confers upon courts the 610 full panoply of equitable remedies including equitable 611 monetary relief.

Our ability to protect consumers relies heavily on this authority, but recent decisions have raised questions about the scope of our authority that conflict not only with longestablished case law, but also with the clear intent of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

616 Earlier this year, a case in the Third Circuit Congress. 617 held the FTC can't seek injunctive relief when the challenged 618 conduct is not ongoing or imminent, but fraudsters frequently cease their unlawful conduct when they learn of impending law 619 enforcement actions. The Third Circuit standard could 620 prevent us from seeking relief in federal district court in 621 622 these circumstances, even if we can show the conduct is 623 likely to recur based on past practices.

624 And another concerning development arose in the Ninth 625 Circuit where a judge questioned the FTC's authority to 626 obtain equitable monetary relief under section 13(b). But 627 courts have long held that granting the FTC authority to seek 628 injunctive relief also gives courts the authority to grant 629 the full range of equitable relief. We believe this 630 interpretation more accurately reflects congressional intent. 631 We thank you for your assistance and I look forward to 632 answering your questions. 633 [The prepared statement of Ms. Wilson follows:]

634

635 ********COMMITTEE INSERT 2*********

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

636 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. And now we recognize

637 Commissioner Slaughter for 5 minutes.

638

639 STATEMENT OF REBECCA KELLY SLAUGHTER

640

Ms. Slaughter. Thank you Chair Schakowsky, Ranking Member Rodgers, Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden, and distinguished members of the subcommittee for inviting us here today. I am Rebecca Kelly Slaughter and I am so pleased to be here with my colleagues on behalf of the FTC.

I want to begin by echoing Chairman Simons and most of my fellow commissioners, and ask Congress to pass a comprehensive federal privacy law that would give the FTC civil penalty authority, targeted APA rulemaking authority, and jurisdiction over nonprofits and common carriers. We have some of these powers in limited degree already and where we have them, we use them responsibly.

In particular, where Congress has granted us privacy related rulemaking authority, the Commission has used to put out clear rules, engage in meaningful, participatory notice and comment, and amend our rules to keep up with technological developments. For example, the FTC has rulemaking authority under COPPA. We put out an initial rule and have since adapted it to address innovations that affect

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

children's privacy, social networking, online access via
smart phone, and the availability of geolocation information.
As we have made these changes, we have conducted workshops
and sought input through formal notice and comment.

664 The rule provides clear quidance to firms on how they can comply with the law and then we enforce the law 665 consistent with the rule, for example, in our settlement with 666 667 Musical.ly that the chairman referenced, a company that is now known as TikTok, earlier this year. The Graham-Leach-668 669 Bliley Act also gives us some limited privacy related 670 rulemaking authority for information held by certain 671 financial institutions.

In March, the Commission sought comment on proposed amendments to the safeguards and privacy rules under this law. Based on our experience, we determined that the rules could benefit from modernization. We analyzed different models for strengthening them and we sought input from stakeholders regarding the best way to implement new requirements.

Just as you in Congress are doing, we at the Commission are reflecting carefully on the types of substantive privacy provisions that might best protect consumers today and in the future. The public hearings initiated by Chairman Simons have been a showcase for these debates.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

684 I want to briefly highlight one of my own observations 685 for your consideration. Much of our Section 5 authority and 686 some of our privacy rules up to this point have been grounded 687 in the principles of notice and consent. The notice and 688 consent framework began as a sensible application of basic 689 consumer protection principles to privacy. Tell consumers 690 what you are doing with their data, secure consent, and keep 691 your promises.

692 But in order for a notice and consent regime to be 693 effective each element must be meaningful. Notice must give 694 consumers information they need and can understand, and 695 consumers must have a choice about whether to consent. Today, notice is mostly in the form of lengthy, click-through 696 697 contracts. Few consumers have the time and legal training 698 required to understand them and consumers often have no 699 choice but to say yes to these contracts.

700 They must cede all control over their data to access 701 services critical to their everyday lives. They don't have 702 the option to turn to a competing, more privacy-protective 703 In other words, when it comes to our digital lives, service. 704 neither notice nor consent feels particularly meaningful 705 As you consider better protections for consumer today. 706 privacy, I want to encourage solutions that don't place all the burden on consumers as much as the existing framework 707

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

708 does.

709 Finally, amidst the important ongoing discussions of the 710 resources allocated to our agency, I want to conclude by 711 highlighting what a good return on investment the FTC is for 712 In fiscal year 2018, the Commission's the American consumer. budget was \$306 million and our actions returned over \$1.6 713 714 billion to consumers. So, for every dollar the American 715 taxpayer gave to the FTC, staff returned five. We welcomed 716 the recent letters from Chairs Schakowsky and Pallone asking 717 what the Commission could do with more resources and the 718 Commission's response illustrated the good use to which we 719 could put additional funding.

720 Approximately two-thirds of our budget goes to our greatest asset, staff pay and benefits. Unfortunately, our 721 722 headcount has declined over the past decade even as demands 723 on the agency have increased. The letters that we sent 724 illustrated what we could do with an additional 50 or 75 or 725 100 million dollars, some of which would allow us to bring 726 our staffing levels up to where they were in 1982, well 727 before the internet, and still below where they were in the 728 1970s.

729So I look forward to working with the committee on both730sides of the aisle as you think about this important

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

731 legislation and I look forward to taking your questions.

(202) 234-4433

- 732 Thank you.
- 733 [The prepared statement of Ms. Slaughter follows:]
- 734
- 735 ********COMMITTEE INSERT 3*********

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you very much, and now
Commissioner Phillips is recognized for his 5 minutes.

738

739 STATEMENT OF NOAH PHILLIPS

740

741 Mr. Phillips. Thank you. Chair Schakowsky, Ranking 742 Member Rodgers, Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, 743 distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for the 744 opportunity to appear before you today. I am honored to be 745 back here with my fellow commissioners to highlight the 746 important work that the FTC and its talented staff do on 747 behalf of American consumers. I realize that privacy is one 748 of the main topics that we are going to talk about today and 749 I look forward to answering any questions that you have.

750 But, first, I want to highlight what the FTC has been 751 doing in an area that is critical to all Americans, health 752 care. Americans are concerned about their health care. A]] 753 of us spend more time than we should trying to find a doctor 754 who takes our insurance, shopping for the best prescription 755 prices, dealing with insurers, and so on. And all too often 756 we pay more than we should with the annual cost of health 757 care accounting for nearly 18 percent of annual GDP. The FTC 758 has focused on health care for decades. In my nomination

759 process, I called for this Commission to continue that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

760 essential work and I am pleased today to report that we have. 761 On the competition side, the Commission has been very 762 busy. Following the FTC's Supreme Court victory in the 763 Actavis case, which subjected pay-for-delay settlements to antitrust scrutiny, we have worked hard to rid the market of 764 765 this anticompetitive conduct. Pay-for-delay settlements 766 delay generic entry, preventing earlier consumer access to 767 cheaper pharmaceuticals, and forcing Americans to pay higher 768 prices for the drugs they need. The Commission has obtained 769 several orders prohibiting such settlements, including two 770 this year that included the final remaining Actavis

771 defendants.

772 Just weeks ago, this Commission reached a decision in 773 its case against the generic manufacturer Impax which entered 774 into a pay-for-delay settlement with Endo, a brand 775 manufacturer. On a unanimous basis, we rendered the first 776 FTC opinion on pay-for-delay settlements since the Actavis 777 case, banning Impax from engaging in this harmful conduct. Ι 778 know that stopping anticompetitive conduct and pay-for-delay settlements has also been a focus of this committee, and I 779 780 appreciate the chairman, ranking member, and Congressman 781 Rush's recognition of this important issue.

782 This Commission is fighting anticompetitive conduct in 783 court. We recently obtained a federal court judgment

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

784 ordering AbbVie to pay nearly \$500 million in relief to 785 consumers overcharged for AndroGel, as a result of AbbVie's 786 anticompetitive manipulation of our civil justice system. And as the chairman mentioned, just weeks ago we sued 787 Surescripts, a monopolist we allege employed illegal vertical 788 789 and horizontal restraints to maintain its monopolies over two 790 e-prescription markets. In addition to targeting the cost of 791 health care, this case addresses important competition issues 792 like two-sided markets, network effects, and innovation 793 harms.

794 Our consumer protection work on health care also 795 provides results to consumers who too often get duped into 796 buying bogus products and services, sometimes even foregoing 797 needed care. Stopping deceptive health claims, providing 798 quidance to business, and educating consumers continue to be top priorities for this Commission. 799 Last month, the FTC 800 settled with defendants charged with deceptively marketing 801 cognitive improvement supplements using sham websites and fake clinical studies and endorsements. Our actions stopped 802 803 the scam which reaped over \$14 million from unsuspecting 804 consumers.

805 The FTC also recently cracked down on deceptively 806 advertised amniotic stem cell therapy which its promoters 807 claimed could treat serious diseases including Parkinson's, **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

MS, and heart attacks. The FTC just mailed checks over half a million dollars to victims. We also recently brought charges against defendants who claimed that their Nobetes pill could treat diabetes even after the FDA and FTC warned them that they needed scientific evidence which they didn't have. The list goes on.

814 We are focused on protecting consumers in the opioid 815 crisis and have brought several actions to return money to 816 consumers who were duped into treatments that weren't real. And as our work on the opioid crisis shows, the FTC leverages 817 818 our resources and partners with other agencies to maximize 819 Working with the FDA as we did on opioids, we our impact. 820 jointly issued 13 warning letters to companies marketing e-821 liquids used in e-cigarettes in packaging that resembled kid-822 friendly food products like juice boxes, candy, or cookies. 823 Like yours, our goal is to protect kids.

I hope this testimony has been helpful to you in showing how the FTC makes a daily impact on the lives of American consumers both by protecting their wallets and their health. Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

828 [The prepared statement of Mr. Phillips follows:]

829

830 ********COMMITTEE INSERT 4*********

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

831 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you very much. And last, but not 832 least, Commissioner Chopra, it is your 5 minutes.

833

834 STATEMENT OF ROHIT CHOPRA

835

Mr. Chopra. Thank you. Chair Schakowsky, Ranking Member Rodgers, and members of the committee, thank you for holding this hearing to examine the Federal Trade Commission's role in policing digital markets against misuse and abuse of data.

841 Today, I want to talk about a market failure affecting 842 families, businesses, and the labor force: terms of service, 843 the contracts that we theoretically read and evaluate online. 844 The FTC and Congress need to confront these take-it-or-845 leave-it contracts particularly when it comes to potentially 846 unfair terms. Many terms of service consist of thousands and 847 thousands of words written in legal jargon. According to 848 some estimates, if Americans had to read all of these 849 contracts it would take them approximately 250 hours per 850 year.

851 Studies overwhelmingly confirm that we just don't read 852 these terms and we are now becoming numb to companies 853 imposing regulations that make us cede our rights and even 854 our property. For example, terms of service for streaming 854 NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

855 music apps have given companies access to your contacts and 856 photos, even though it is a music app. To use certain, 857 quote, free photo sharing apps, the maker of the apps 858 reserves the right to use your name, likeness, and image even 859 for commercial purposes. Other terms of service slip in 860 language that says the company will absolutely ignore "do not 861 track" settings in your browser.

These non-negotiable contracts are giving firms the right to fingerprint your device, often allowing them to create a dossier on you even if you don't register for an account. These contracts aren't just claiming the right to monetize your personal information and property, they also revoke many of your legal rights and can even allow firms to change terms at any time whenever they want.

Contracts are and should be a critical foundation of commerce. They help parties bargain and put their promises on paper. But when contracts aren't negotiated, they can easily become riddled with one-sided terms, and both dominant players and unscrupulous firms can exploit their position to the detriment of fair competition.

875 Now the FTC has a strong tradition of restricting unfair 876 contract terms. In the 1980s, during the Reagan

administration, the FTC banned a slew of terms and consumer

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

878 credit contracts including confessions of judgment where

(202) 234-4433

879 consumers waived all of their defenses in court if they were 880 sued. The FTC found that terms like these were the product 881 of an unequal bargain where consumers could not protect their 882 interests.

883 More recently, both the FTC and Congress have cracked 884 down on gag clauses on a bipartisan basis. Non-disparagement 885 provisions in take-it-or-leave-it contracts that forbid us 886 from posting truthful reviews online for products and 887 services are now banned. This is a boon for consumers and 888 competition. Buyers will be able to find out what others 889 have experienced, and sellers that invest in quality in 890 customer service will be rewarded in the market. It is time 891 for us to own up to the fact that today's digital contracts 892 can lead to a race to the bottom.

893 In addition to making use of the FTC's existing 894 authorities, Congress should also look for ways to stop 895 companies from exploiting their bargaining position through 896 these contracts. For example, we can look to reforms enacted by other developed countries, such as the 2010 law in 897 898 Australia that allowed consumer protection and competition 899 authorities to enforce laws on more unfair contract terms. 900 I would suggest that there are two aspects that warrant 901 our attention. First, we need to look at the circumstances 902 that these contracts are imposed and whether one side has **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 903 more power, information, or leverage. Second, we need to 904 look at the terms themselves, particularly any one-sided 905 terms that unreasonably favor the drafting party. It will be 906 especially critical to closely scrutinize the terms imposed 907 in take-it-or-leave-it contracts on entrepreneurs and small 908 businesses like app developers and online merchants, 909 especially when they can see their data taken away or their 910 rights removed. This can impede fair competition and we 911 should look closely at it. 912 Thank you and I look forward to all of your questions. 913 [The prepared statement of Mr. Chopra follows:] 914
- 915 ********COMMITTEE INSERT 5*********

916 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you all. We have now concluded 917 witness opening statements for our panel. We will now move 918 to member questions. Each member will have 5 minutes to ask 919 questions of our witnesses and I will start by recognizing 920 myself for 5 minutes.

921 So we know the FTC does not have enough resources to 922 devote to privacy and data security enforcement. The FTC has 923 only about a thousand employees altogether to fulfill the 924 dual mission of competition and consumer protection which is 925 less than what the agency had, as we heard earlier, in 1983. 926 Of those, only about 40 people are charged with protection 927 of privacy and security of American consumers. I can find 928 that pretty shocking. The American people deserve more and 929 better.

So my question is for Chairman Simons. You have said
before that you believe the FTC must, quote, vigorously
enforce, unquote, the laws entrusted to it. How can the FTC
vigorously protect consumer privacy when it has only 30

934 lawyers working on behalf of the whole country?

935 Mr. Simons. Thank you, Chairman. So like you have said 936 before, we are a small agency but we fight above our weight. 937 So we are very aggressive with the resources that we have, 938 but if we had more resources I guarantee that we would put

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

939 those to very good use.

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

940 In terms of -- one thing to keep in mind, I think 941 particularly with respect to the legislation that you are 942 considering, is that would significantly, no matter who you 943 talk to, really, that would significantly expand our 944 authority. And in particular, if that legislation is passed, 945 there is no question that we would need very substantial 946 increases in our resources.

947 And as you said in your opening statement, Madam 948 Chairman, the U.K. authority has 500 employees dedicated to 949 privacy and even the Irish authority has about 140. So us 950 starting at 40 and then trying to enforce something similar 951 to what they are enforcing with their authority, obviously, 952 you know, shows a gap.

953 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay, thank you.

As you had mentioned, Mr. Chairman, earlier this year we sent a letter to the FTC to get more information about how the Commission would use additional resources and I ask unanimous consent to put that in the record. Hearing none, so ordered.

- 959 [The information follows:]
- 960

962 Ms. Schakowsky. Your response indicated that the 963 Commission could hire 160 more staff with \$50 million in 964 additional funding or 360 more staff with an additional \$100 million funding. You also said that a hundred new attorneys 965 focused on privacy and security would allow the FTC 966 significantly to boost its enforcement activity and also 967 968 improve the agency's ability to monitor compliance of 969 companies already under the order.

970 So I am concerned about this issue of monitoring 971 compliance with existing orders because we have all seen how, 972 for example, Facebook continues to rampantly abuse consumer 973 privacy despite being under an order with the Federal Trade 974 Commission. So the question, Chairman Simons, is how does 975 the FTC make sure that companies comply with orders that 976 require a comprehensive program to protect privacy and 977 security?

Mr. Simons. Yes, so thank you, Chairman. One of the really great things about the FTC as an institution is that it has a history of engaging in self-critical examination. And the privacy program, looking back at the FTC as a whole, is a relatively young program. So we are seeing what is happening with some of these orders.

984 And this also was explored at our hearings and we are 985 taking that to heart and increasing the provisions in our NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

986 model orders to beef up, for example, assessor provisions so 987 the assessors actually have a much more fulsome role and we 988 can get the benefit of their investigation. And also, we are 989 creating a provision that requires certification by a senior officer in the company. And in order to make that 990 991 certification, the officer is under an obligation to actually 992 conduct an investigation and gather evidence regarding their 993 compliance with the order.

Ms. Schakowsky. Let me ask Commissioner Chopra, does the FTC have the resources and authority necessary to effectively monitor compliance and enforce its existing orders? I am concerned that the FTC doesn't even require anyone to submit assessments to the agency after the first one.

Mr. Chopra. Well, of course we are using a century-old law to do much of our privacy and data security work, so obviously authority and resources will help. Of course, we are all aware no amount of resources is really going to -- we don't know how much we will actually be able to tackle the vast problem that we have at hand.

1006 So, in addition to resources, you know, bright line 1007 rules that really give clear guidance and have real teeth and 1008 accountability and especially penalties will also help us 1009 advance that mission. The more blurry it is, the more it is

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1010 going to be harder to enforce, the more some firms will be

1011 able to get through loopholes and small firms will suffer.

1012 So I also encourage you to think about not just having 1013 the FTC enforce some of these rules, but other parties as 1014 well. We need those force multipliers.

1015 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. Now I yield to the ranking 1016 member of our subcommittee.

1017 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Thank you, Madam Chair. And 1018 again, thank you, everyone, for your testimony here.

1019 Chairman Simons, last month the FTC held a hearing on 1020 the FTC's approach to consumer privacy. Your remarks focused 1021 on the fact that privacy violations can cause a range of 1022 I believe any federal privacy bill should focus on harms. 1023 protecting consumers from concrete harms. What did you learn 1024 from the hearing about specific harms that can help us craft 1025 an enforceable privacy bill?

Mr. Simons. Thank you, Representative. What I would say is that we learned quite a bit at those hearings. We learned that there is a widespread consensus among stakeholders in the privacy community to support the federal privacy legislation that you are talking about, you know, you

1031 as a committee.

1032 And they are also talking about how to -- notice and 1033 comment, notice and choice has been a primary vehicle as we **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

discussed and folks in the hearings emphasized that it really should also turn on assessments and accountability. And so, we are focused on that as well and also de-identification of data. Those are the things that came up at the hearing and that were most recommended by a broad group of people.

1039 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Great, thank you.

1040 Commissioner Phillips, can you explain why it is 1041 important for a federal privacy approach to be risk-based and 1042 what harms we should as Congress be protecting against?

1043 Mr. Phillips. Congressman Ranking Member, thank you for 1044 that question. The tradition of the United States since 1970 1045 with respect to privacy has been a risk-based one. We have 1046 chosen to look at particular areas where risk is heightened, 1047 like information about kids or health information, and single 1048 out those areas for special and heightened treatment. That 1049 to me makes all the sense in the world.

1050 This conversation that we are having about a broader 1051 consumer privacy law because it reaches broader and because 1052 it potentially applies to a far broader swath of data, some 1053 of which may raise similar kinds of risk, some of which may 1054 make less, to me means that we have to have a really serious 1055 conversation, and in particular that Congress needs to have 1056 really a serious conversation what the problems are we want 1057 to solve, what the wrongs are that we want to right.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

So one of the things that I have heard today is a concern about, let's say, transparency, right. Consumers don't have the time to look over a long policy. Maybe they don't understand the legal jargon. Are there things that we can do to increase that level of awareness and maybe also provide more clarity for business? That could be a good outcome.

But I think what is critical to this debate is two things. The first, leaving aside the tools of how we solve the problem, let's agree on the problems we want to solve, say, transparency, or at least do our best to solve, and then let's think about how to build a scheme around that.

1070 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. As a follow up, is there a risk 1071 of delegating too much rulemaking authority to the FTC that 1072 creates uncertainty for industry, particularly the small

1073 businesses and startups?

Mr. Simons. Thank you again for that question. I think there is and to me the risk exists on two levels. The first is really a basic constitutional one, which is the privacy debate is really interesting because it is one where there is a lot of general agreement on the need for something, but a lot of disagreement on the specifics.

1080So let me take as an example, two consumers both pushed1081ads as they walk by a Starbucks. One consumer might

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1082 experience that as, "Great, that reminds me I want the latte and I want to get a dollar off." But the other consumer 1083 1084 might say, "Hey, that is really creepy. How did you know I 1085 was there?" Those are both very reasonable interpretations 1086 of the same facts, but what they demonstrate is that 1087 different people have different tastes for privacy. So in 1088 this context when you give broad rulemaking authority, you 1089 ask five of us or maybe even just three of us to decide what 1090 That is no substitute for the democratic process. we want.

1091 So that is the first thing. The second thing, which you 1092 mentioned and which is really important, is that whatever the 1093 rules are they ought to basically remain over time. And 1094 there is a chance that, you know, issues get politicized or 1095 people have very earnest disagreements and over time the 1096 rules shift. Whether you like more restrictive rules or less 1097 restrictive rules, we should all agree that having consistent 1098 rules over time makes sense.

1099 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Okay, thank you. I have more 1100 questions but my time is expired. I will yield back.

1101 Ms. Schakowsky. I now recognize Ms. Castro -- Castor

1102 for 5 minutes, sorry.

1103 Ms. Castor. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1104 Chairman Simons in his testimony mentioned the recent

1105 FTC fine of \$5.7 million against the video social networking

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1106 app Musical.ly -- it is now known as TikTok -- to settle allegations that the company illegally collected information 1107 1108 on children in violation of the Children's Online Privacy 1109 Protection Act. You said this is the largest civil penalty 1110 obtained by the FTC in a children's privacy case, but in 1111 actuality there really haven't been very many. And when you 1112 look at the circumstances here, I don't think the fine fits 1113 the crime.

You had reports that they were collecting location data on children that was discernible to people in the neighborhood. They made it very difficult to close accounts. They made it practically impossible to complain. They would not delete profiles after someone did close an account.

1119 So, and by the way do you all know the valuation of the 1120 Chinese company that owns TikTok? ByteDance, as of November 1121 2018, ByteDance was valued at \$75 billion. That means the 1122 FTC's record-setting fine was 0.0076 percent of ByteDance's 1123 value. No CEO is going to blink an eye at a fine that 1124 inconsequential. Companies will just see small FTC fines as 1125 the cost of doing business and will continue to elevate 1126 profits over privacy, especially when it comes to our kids. 1127 Commissioner Chopra and Commissioner Slaughter, you 1128 issued a joint statement in responses. You said, "Executives 1129 of big companies who call the shots at companies that break **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1130 the law should be held accountable," I guess personally 1131 accountable, and the FTC has gone after executives when they 1132 have direct control and are calling the shots here.

1133 Commissioner Chopra, why was it important to make that 1134 statement and is it clear the FTC has the authority to go 1135 after executives of tech companies for violating privacy 1136 laws?

1137 Well, let me just say that the FTC goes Mr. Chopra. after individuals all the time, especially when it comes to 1138 1139 small-time scammers. I do think we need to level the playing 1140 field a bit and make sure that in our investigations when it 1141 comes to privacy we are also looking at the role of individuals who made the decision that it was worth violating 1142 1143 the law in order to profit.

1144 So, I want to make sure that in our investigations we 1145 are investigating that and we are holding them accountable 1146 when we have clear evidence of a violation, because you are 1147 right. For some firms fines are a parking ticket and a cost 1148 of doing business and we cannot change behavior unless those 1149 penalties are painful and often that means finding out who at 1150 the top called the shots.

1151 Ms. Castor. Commissioner Slaughter, I want you to 1152 answer that but I also heard you loud and clear on the 1153 privacy policies. Everyone knows that these notice and **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1154 consent and privacy policies, they are simply not working, 1155 and it is particularly egregious when it comes to children 1156 and parents.

In COPPA, they are completely inadequate to protect children's privacy, and I am worried no matter how much that we revise those notice and choice provisions it will not be sufficient and companies will find ways to around it to get to our children's data without parents fully understanding what their children are agreeing to share.

The one answer was contained maybe in the FTC's 2012 privacy report that discussed reasonable collection limitations, which I understand to mean that companies only collect data that is consistent with the context of a particular transaction or the consumer's relationship with the business. It could also include limitations on sharing, sale, retention, and usage.

Should Congress include a reasonable collection limitation section in privacy legislation going forward? Ms. Slaughter. Thank you for the question,

1173 Congresswoman. Let me try to take both of those points

1174 quickly, mindful of your time. The first is, I agree with

1175 your point and my colleague's point that fines can't be

1176 meaningless to companies. If we care about them, they need

1177 to be enough to effectively both deter specific wrongdoing by

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1178 that company in the future and effectuate general deterrence. 1179 I would like to make a clarifying point because I have 1180 heard a couple of members talk about fines the FTC can levy. 1181 And just to be very clear, unlike some of our counterparts 1182 in Europe, we can't independently assess fines. Where we 1183 find a violation of an order or a rule, we can go to court 1184 and seek civil penalties and a court could assess penalties 1185 and then in order to avoid that process, we can negotiate 1186 with a company to reach an outcome that we think is fair and 1187 But those are negotiated penalties they are not levied just. 1188 fines, and I think that is a meaningful distinction.

1189 And, secondly, the statement that my colleague and I 1190 released in the TikTok case did go to the question of 1191 individual accountability, making sure our investigations 1192 effectively assess where it lies if enforcement is proper, 1193 and I think we also have to think about the injunctive relief 1194 that we provide in any particular case. I think about it as 1195 sort of a multi-legged stool, again how to best effectuate 1196 specific enforcement making sure this company doesn't violate 1197 the law again, and general deterrence, making sure other 1198 companies know that if they don't follow the law, the 1199 consequences will be meaningful to them.

1200 And then --

1201 Ms. Schakowsky. We are going to have to wrap. We are **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1202 going to have to wrap it up there.

1203 Ms. Slaughter. Okay, then the short version of your 1204 question about purpose limitations, I agree. I think they 1205 are really important.

1206 Ms. Castor. Thank you.

1207 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. The chair now recognizes 1208 Mr. Burgess for 5 minutes.

Mr. Burgess. Thank you. And thank you all for being here for this hearing. This is important. You are an important agency and this subcommittee does have an important role to fulfill as far as oversight of the important agency that you represent.

So, some other members have done a good job of articulating how for a very large company a fine simply is a cost of doing business and it is of no consequence and they are able to pick up and move on. I would like to focus just a little bit on smaller companies where the ability of the Federal Trade Commission to require compliance or even consent decrees may be a death knell for that company.

1221 And a company that comes to mind, a case that has 1222 interested me for some time, is LabMD. Most of you were 1223 probably not on the Commission when LabMD became a thing back 1224 in the -- a decade ago. And it has worked its way through 1225 the courts and, if I understand correctly, the most recent

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

was an Eleventh Circuit Court decision that actually put some of onus back on the FTC saying you have actually got to define these things that you want with what you want a company to comply.

1230 But, you know, LabMD that case stands out to me as the 1231 Here was a viable business providing a great object lesson. 1232 service to the urologic practices that depended upon the 1233 handling of lab tests and pathologic specimens and now that 1234 company is gone and it is gone because of a relatively arbitrary FTC decision. And then, ultimately, the guy that 1235 1236 pushed it all the way to the Eleventh Circuit, really, LabMD 1237 was not the one that was at fault.

So, Commissioner Phillips, you have talked about the healthcare issue, so assuming that you have some knowledge of, even though none of you were on the Commission when LabMD started, Chairman Simons said, you know, that the FTC -- what was the -- that you engage in self-critical examination, so what does your self-critical examination tell you as far as the LabMD case is concerned?

Mr. Simons. Congressman, thank you for the question. As you noted earlier, none of the five of us were here when the LabMD case was brought and I do want to reserve judgment on the work that others did. But I think your fundamental point is absolutely right, which is we need to think and, in

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1250 fact, the statutes that we enforce command us to think very 1251 critically about remedies and the impact that they have. 1252 Sometimes more are warranted. Sometimes less are 1253 warranted. Sometimes injunctive relief may be more 1254 important. Sometimes fines are more important. We have case 1255 law to guide us and we also have the benefit of experience. 1256 And I think critically that we need to learn from our 1257 experiences and sometimes that may militate in favor of 1258 changing what we are doing.

1259 The chairman mentioned earlier what we are doing on our 1260 model orders with respect to testing how well they are 1261 working. But it can cut both ways and I think that is 1262 something we always really need to take into account.

1263 Mr. Burgess. Well, it is just -- and when Mr. Walden 1264 was chairman of the full committee and we did have -- he 1265 referenced we had representatives from Facebook here

1266 discussing things with them, a consent decree for a company

1267 the size of Facebook is inconsequential. It doesn't affect 1268 them one way or the other. The fine that Ms. Castor

1269 referenced to the company with a bottom line of 67 billion or

whatever it was, that fine is inconsequential.

1271But for small businesses, the heavy hand of the Federal1272Trade Commission basically can spell the end of their

1273 business and in this case, unfortunately, it did. But even a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1270

1274 consent decree, which your consent decrees run a number of 1275 years, for a company to have to disclose that "Yeah, I want 1276 to handle your lab specimens. I want to handle your 1277 confidential medical data. Just so you know, I am under a 1278 consent decree from the Federal Trade Commission until 2032," 1279 that probably ends that company's ability to render that

1280 service. Would you agree?

1281 Mr. Phillips. I absolutely think that issues like the 1282 length of consent decrees need to be considered.

1283 Commissioner Wilson and I recently wrote in a case where the 1284 party had violated a consent decree in a really bad way, so 1285 we agreed with the penalty. But one of the things that we

1286 said together is that experience and law and the facts of the

1287 case, not necessarily by the way how it is publicly

1288 perceived, but the facts of the case and the applicable law

1289 and our experience as the agency ought to guide us in how we

1290 apply remedies.

1291 Mr. Chopra. Dr. Burgess, can I add?

1292 Mr. Burgess. Sure.

Mr. Chopra. I want to agree with your sentiment on this, which is we need to avoid ever appearing that we are strong-arming small defendants and letting large ones kind of off the hook. I think there needs to be an evenness in this, because you are right that even a subpoena can be very, very **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1298 costly for small firms.

1299 So I take also away that we need to think hard about 1300 where we are allocating our resources. Are we allocating our 1301 resources to a lot of small firms or are we really thinking 1302 and gaining credibility by challenging larger firms who 1303 commit harm on a wide scale and who have the resources to litigate? Because litigation, actually, also gives much more 1304 1305 credibility to the outcome rather than just sometimes 1306 settlements.

Mr. Burgess. Great. I have a number of other questions. I will submit those for the record. I yield back my time.

1310 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. The chair now recognizes1311 Representative Kelly for 5 minutes.

1312 Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1313 One of the key tools that FTC has used in enforcing 1314 privacy cases is deception authority, particularly when a 1315 company hasn't told the truth in its privacy policy. But 1316 there is no national law that requires companies to have a 1317 privacy policy in the first place. For instance, a recent 1318 report found that 85 percent of the apps and browser 1319 extensions in the Google Chrome Web Store didn't have a privacy policy at all. 1320

1321 Chairman Simons, do you believe it would be helpful to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1322 the FTC's ability to enforce the law companies were required

1323 to disclose their privacy practices?

1324 I think this is something that the Congress Mr. Simons. 1325 should definitely consider in its consideration of new 1326 federal privacy legislation. And what you have just said 1327 illustrates the imperfect nature and the lack of authority 1328 that we have, which is that our privacy program is based in 1329 large part on this deception authority that we have under 1330 Section 5, a hundred-year-old statute which was never designed or legislated with any intent toward privacy issues 1331 1332 that we see today obviously, so thank you for that.

Ms. Kelly. You are welcome. Even when a company has privacy policies, it practically takes a law degree to understand it or is so vague that it is meaningless to consumers. Some have suggested that it would be useful to provide consumers with clear, concise, and consistent disclosures that would make it easy to understand how companies use and share personal information.

Commissioner Chopra, do you think it would be helpful if a law required companies to label their privacy practices in a way that provided clear and consistent disclosures to consumers with wording and pictorial depictions like a 3 and a dollar sign if data was sold to a third party?

1345 Mr. Chopra. Yes. I think better disclosure that is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1346 clear is always good, but on top of disclosure we have to 1347 sometimes recognize that users sometimes actually have no 1348 choice, you know, when it comes to filling out their job 1349 application, when it comes to enrolling in school, they may 1350 not have a choice.

So I want us to also think about, you know, what are the types of terms that maybe should be presumptively unlawful or where there is a higher burden to bear or where some data is just off limits, because we don't want to disguise ourselves into thinking people can meaningfully compare all the time.

1356 Ms. Kelly. And my next question, is there something 1357 else that Congress can do to help consumers better understand 1358 how their data is used? And anyone can answer.

1359 Mr. Chopra. Yeah. Well, I will just add too that when 1360 it comes to deception we need to also think about dark 1361 patterns and other tactics that are being used to trick 1362 consumers into handing over their data. They use complex 1363 testing in order to nudge you. Often it is almost impossible 1364 to figure out how to close your account or delete your data 1365 and it raises very serious questions about whether it may be 1366 a violation of our deception standard, but more clarity would 1367 help.

Ms. Kelly. Okay. Turning to a different subject, I
 wanted to talk about the interception of privacy rights and NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

civil rights. Algorithms that profile users and target
content to specific groups can too easily result in
discriminatory practices against marginalized communities.
For example, investigative journalists have found that
employers advertise jobs exclusively to men on Facebook and
also build internal algorithms that negatively ranked women
for job placement.

1377 Nearly 2 years ago, the Tech Accountability Caucus, 1378 which I chair, wrote a letter to Facebook about their 1379 discriminatory ads that allowed people to exclude housing 1380 applicants based on protected characteristics like race, 1381 gender, and sexuality. I am glad that HUD finally took 1382 action on this case and that Facebook has ceased its practice 1383 of racial affinity advertising.

Again, Commissioner Chopra, would it be helpful if Congress explicitly applied existing civil rights laws to data privacy by, for example, prohibiting discriminatory uses of personal information?

Mr. Chopra. Yeah, this is really serious because with algorithms and machine learning they essentially allow some firms to either knowingly or unknowingly evade our antidiscrimination laws. It reinforces biases against rural

1393 going on behind those scenes is absolutely critical. And,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Americans, against people of color, so us to attack what is

(202) 234-4433

1392

1394 you know, no algorithm is going to be free of bias and we 1395 need to make sure that the digital economy is not reinforcing 1396 biases.

1397 Ms. Kelly. Thank you.

And, Madam Chair, I just wanted to let you know that joining me today are two young people very interested in privacy. One is from Tuesday's Children. Her father was a retired major in the Army who is now deceased. So they are listening in the back attentively to what we are going to do, so thank you and I yield back my time.

1404 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. The chair now recognizes 1405 Mr. Latta. No, is he not here? Oh, I am sorry. Mr. Walden 1406 showed up again and I am happy to recognize you for 5 1407 minutes.

1408 Mr. Walden. Thank you. I sort of snuck in from the 1409 other hearing. But thank you, Madam Chair.

And, Chairman Simons, it has been a few decades, but there was a time when the FTC, as we heard, was given broad rulemaking authority but stepped past bounds of what Congress and the public supported. This required further

- 1414 congressional action and new restrictions on the Commission.
- 1415 In testimony submitted for this hearing, the FTC
- 1416 supports APA rulemaking authority for privacy legislation.
- 1417 Do you have any concerns with Congress delegating broad

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1418 rulemaking authority to the FTC and would you support

1419 limiting that rulemaking authority to issues that cannot be

1420 foreseen by this Congress?

Mr. Simons. I have substantial concerns and please do not do it. Do not give us broad rulemaking authority, give us targeted rulemaking authority. Just as -- because we are worried about what exactly what you have described happening again and the agency becoming politicized and we want it, so what we really want to have is we want to have the Congress -

1428 Mr. Walden. Very specific.

1430

1429 Mr. Simons. -- come up with bipartisan federal privacy

legislation, have it fairly well defined, COPPA is a good

1431 model, and give us targeted rulemaking authority so that we

1432 can keep it up to date, make technical changes for

1433 developments in technology or in business methods. But

1434 please do not give us broad-based authority.

1435 Mr. Walden. All right.

1436 Mr. Simons. The last thing that we want to have is to

1437 have you dump that question on us, the big, broad question.

1438 Mr. Walden. Yeah.

1439 Mr. Simons. We would rather have elected officials do 1440 that.

1441 Mr. Walden. You know and too often when we face a tough

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1442 problem we do that to agencies. We say, "Yeah, we can't

1443 really figure this out, so we are just going to give you 1444 rulemaking authority. You go figure it out."

1445 Mr. Simons. Yeah.

1446 Mr. Walden. And then when you do, we object.

1447 Mr. Simons. Right. Please don't do that.

1448 Mr. Walden. Because you didn't get it right, even

1449 though we couldn't figure it out. And so, I think it is, the 1450 obligation is on our shoulders to be as refined and targeted 1451 as possible.

1452I guess I have sort of a yes or no question for all of1453you. One of the issues we are wrestling with as the Energy1454and Commerce Committee and looking at something nationwide,1455do you all support a federal preemption of existing state1456laws or can privacy work on a state-by-state patchwork basis?1457It strikes me the internet, this, you know, some of them

1458 described with tubes and all that, right?

1459 Mr. Simons. Right.

1460 Mr. Walden. It actually crosses borders -- who knew?
1461 And so, I am trying to figure out how it works if we don't do

1462 it a nationwide law. Do you, I mean --

1463Mr. Simons. Yeah, I share your concerns about the1464patchwork. And I think, you know, the sense of it would be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1465 that if the legislation is substantial enough --

(202) 234-4433

1466 Mr. Walden. Right.

Mr. Simons. -- then I think it makes sense to preempt.
But having said that, I also think that even if you preempt,
you should give enforcement authority to the state Attorneys
General.

1471 Mr. Walden. All right.

1472 Ms. Wilson, what is your guidance on this?

1473 Ms. Wilson. I agree that preemption is necessary. As 1474 you note, there are state boundaries that get crossed. There 1475 are national boundaries that get crossed. Consumers are 1476 looking for a seamless experience and, frankly, businesses 1477 We have heard examples of bills that have need quidance. 1478 conflicting provisions. For example, one state will say this 1479 is opt-in and another says it is opt-out. And businesses, 1480 literally, cannot comply with both of those state laws. And

1481 so, I believe that we do need federal privacy legislation

1482 that contains preemption.

1483 And I agree with Chairman Simons that the state AGs --

1484 Mr. Walden. Has to be robust.

1485 Ms. Wilson. -- who can assist in enforcing will act as 1486 a force multiplier as Commissioner Chopra noted.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1487 Mr. Walden. Yeah.

1488 Mr. Chopra. Mr. Walden, can I --

1489 Mr. Walden. Well, if I could just --

(202) 234-4433

1490 Mr. Chopra. Sorry. Well, go ahead.

1491 Mr. Walden. Yeah, we will get to you, but Ms.

1492 Slaughter?

1493 Ms. Slaughter. I am sympathetic to the desire for 1494 uniformity, consistency, clarity, and predictability in a 1495 national law. I would be concerned about a federal law that 1496 lowered standards that already exist in the states, so I 1497 think the appropriateness of preemption is best evaluated in 1498 terms of whether a federal law meets or exceeds the level of 1499 protections that states can provide and whether it allows 1500 them the opportunity to fill any gaps that may remain after a

1501 federal law is developed.

1502 Mr. Walden. Okay.

1503 Mr. Phillips?

1504 Mr. Phillips. Thank you, Congressman, or thank you,

1505 Chairman -- Ranking Member.

1506 Mr. Walden. Chairman in exile.

1507 Mr. Phillips. Yep. No, no, no. I hope I pulled that 1508 one back quickly enough.

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

1509 Mr. Walden. You are all right.

1510 Mr. Phillips. I think preemption is essential for a few 1511 reasons. The first is to give businesses the clarity that

1512 they need and the second is to meet the expectation that we

1513 have all been talking about, about aligning consumer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1514 understanding with what is going on. The more variability

1515 that you have, the less transparency, the less consumer

1516 power.

1517 Mr. Walden. Right.

1518 Mr. Phillips. The other thing we need to keep in mind 1519 is competition. Having multiple laws means multiple 1520 different compliance costs.

1521 Mr. Walden. Right.

1522 That is harder for smaller firms, easier Mr. Phillips. for big ones. Another thing to keep in mind -- I will finish 1523 1524 very quickly -- is international interoperability. We have 1525 to consider our national interests in cross-border data And, finally, with respect to establishing just a 1526 flows. 1527 floor that is a model that we have in HIPAA, and I think 1528 Congress ought to take a very careful look at how the HIPAA 1529 model works because the studies show that state HIPAA laws 1530 have inhibited the roll-out of electronic medical record use. 1531 They have inhibited innovation, and reduction of costs in 1532 the medical field, and startups are struggling with this.

I may be wrong, I may be right. People can take different views. But I think that is a very good area to look at the data, see what is going on, and see how it would apply here.

1537 Mr. Walden. Madam Chair, with your indulgence, could

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1538 our final commissioner weigh in? My time is expired.

1539 Mr. Chopra. Yeah, I just want to make sure I caution 1540 you that preemption can also have a lot of unintended 1541 In Illinois, for example, there is a biometric consequences. 1542 law. There are other laws that may not, may complement and 1543 not conflict. My own experience in this relates to the 1544 mortgage meltdown where broad preemption of state mortgage 1545 laws clearly wreaked more havoc because states that wanted to 1546 provide certain safeguards to their homeowners had that

1547 robbed of them.

1548 So I think it is important that we just make sure we are 1549 not making things worse and at the same time --

1550 Mr. Walden. That is a good point.

1551 Mr. Chopra. -- promoting lots of beneficial entry into 1552 the marketplace.

Mr. Walden. Yeah, I go back to my Jamie Dimon quote that said you can overregulate to the point only the bigs can afford to comply, and now you have snuffed out competition. So this is why it is hard. We want to get it right for our consumers, we don't want to snuff out innovation. So thanks for all the work you are doing there in helping us.

1559 And, Madam Chair, thanks for your indulgence in this and 1560 for having this hearing.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1561 Ms. Schakowsky. I now recognize the chairman of the

(202) 234-4433

1562 full committee, Mr. Pallone.

1563 Thank you, Madam Chair. The Chairman.

1564 Companies are collecting more data than ever and using 1565 it in ways that most consumers would never imagine. If I 1566 download a flashlight app, for example, it shouldn't need my 1567 precise location and it definitely shouldn't then go and sell 1568 that information to the highest bidder, all without my 1569 permission. Yet the FTC does not have the authority to enact 1570 rules that could establish reasonable limits on uses of data and no comprehensive federal law currently exists. 1571

1572 So I want to start with Chairman Simons. In your 1573 testimony you support federal privacy and data security 1574 legislation, which I appreciate, but some have argued that 1575 the FTC has not done enough with the authority it has been 1576 given. How can Congress be sure that the FTC will 1577 aggressively protect consumers if given new authority? 1578 Mr. Simons. My mantra is vigorous enforcement, so as 1579 long as I am the chairman we are going to vigorously enforce. 1580 I will have to say also that we have brought lots of cases 1581 in this area where we can. We have brought about, when you 1582 consider the full range of privacy authority that we have 1583 ranging from Section 5 to the FCRA to COPPA to Do Not Call to CAN-SPAM, we have brought over 500 cases. 1584

1585

So I would say we have been pretty active, but our

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

authority is limited as you describe and so if we get more

authority, we will need more resources.

1588The Chairman. Okay. Let me go to Commissioner Chopra.1589How important is it that comprehensive privacy

1590 legislation set reasonable limits on the way the data can be

1591 used such as through data minimization and restrictions on

1592 selling or sharing data beyond the consumers' reasonable

1593 expectations?

Mr. Chopra. Yeah, these bright line standards will also be easier to enforce. We will not have to go through as much extended investigation and also it will make it easier for businesses. So I think when you are being affirmative about what is inbounds and out of bounds, that is better.

1599 The Chairman. Okay. I am going to go back to the 1600 chairman again. Although privacy is an important issue, it 1601 is obviously not the only critical consumer protection issue 1602 within the FTC's jurisdiction. And topping the list of the 1603 FTC's nearly three million complaints were imposter scams, 1604 where a scammer pretends to be from the IRS or the Social 1605 Security Administration or another trusted organization to 1606 get people to turn over money or personal information. 1607 Consumers reported losing nearly \$488 million in these kinds of scams last year. So let me ask you, Chairman, 1608 1609 consumer education is important but the burden should not

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1610 fall on consumers to stop fraud. So what is the FTC doing to 1611 stop these scams and prevent them from becoming even more 1612 common? I mean these are the things that I hear about on 1613 regular basis from constituents, particularly seniors.

Mr. Simons. Right. Thank you for that question. There is no single fix to this pernicious scam, but so we try to implement a multi-pronged approach. We have substantial law enforcement to stop these things from occurring where we can find and sue the perpetrators. But we really do think that

1619 enforcement along with consumer and business education,

1620 consumer guidance and business guidance are important and so

1621 we tackle this on a two-front basis.

1622 The Chairman. All right.

1623 Mr. Phillips. Chairman, may I just add briefly to that? 1624 The Chairman. Sure, go ahead.

1625 Mr. Phillips. I really want to thank you for that question, in particular for the following reason. You have 1626 1627 been talking recently a lot about the need for resources. Ιt 1628 is important, especially as the headlines focus on particular 1629 issues with which we deal also to consider the ones like 1630 scams that don't always grab the headlines. That work has 1631 always been and should remain really important work that we 1632 do.

So when you think about resource questions, I would

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1633

encourage you to consider all the work that all the different bureaus at that FTC does and how important they collectively are to the national interest.

Mr. Simons. Yeah, can I just say one other thing? The FTC is a very busy place. People generally are not sitting down and doing nothing. They are all very highly active. They are all very highly productive. And so, if we are going to devote more resources, for example, to privacy, we would probably have to take them away from something like

1643 potentially going after some of these scams.

1644The Chairman. Unless we have more resources, but,1645believe me, I am the last person who thinks that federal

1646 agencies or the people that work there don't do anything. I

am constantly reminding people that they work very hard

1648 because oftentimes people think that government and

1649 politicians don't do anything, but, in fact, we all work very

1650 hard or most of us do.

1651 So thank you again. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1652 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, the gentleman yields back.

1653 And now I recognize Mr. Guthrie.

1654 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Madam Chair, for the

1655 recognition. Thank you all for being here. And I will agree

1656 with my friend, The Chairman, that people in our agencies do

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1657 work very hard and sometimes we need to make sure we give

(202) 234-4433

1658 them the right direction and how we as the policymakers would 1659 like for them to work.

And one thing that I have been concerned about as we move forward and we need to move forward on a privacy bill, I am for that, but the one thing I am concerned, I think Mr. Phillips mentioned that some of the smaller companies can't deal with it as much as some of the bigger companies.

1665 And so, I have talked about innovation and whatever the 1666 health care or anything here, kind of my common theme is how 1667 do we keep this innovation that is moving forward. And so, 1668 Chairman Simons, I believe any federal bill must ensure all companies no matter the size of their compliance department 1669 1670 can continue to innovate and compete. And what do you think 1671 about this concern and how should we consider this drafting 1672 legislation?

1673 Mr. Simons. So this is a really critical concern, thank 1674 you for raising it.

1675 Mr. Guthrie. And any of the others can answer too. I 1676 called and said your name, but others can answer if they 1677 would like to, to how we can make sure people can compete, 1678 but go ahead.

1679 Mr. Simons. Yeah, so what I was going to say is, so we 1680 have a dual mission, consumer protection including privacy 1681 and competition, so we are sensitive, really, to both. And **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

the thing that -- one of the things that we are very concerned about is the situation where, so, for example, if you require opt-in for certain kinds of information or maybe even all the information, that makes it much easier for hightech platforms that are consumer-facing to get that opt-in. And so, for a new company or a small company, it is very difficult to get that kind of opt-in and access to that data.

So that might constitute a very significant disadvantage for the small companies and the new entrants and cause a huge advantage for the existing high-tech platforms. And, in fact, I understand that a high-level competition official from the European Union is concerned about this because he thinks that business is being pushed by the GDPR to Google and Facebook.

1696 Mr. Guthrie. That was my next question. So concerned 1697 about what GDPR, what I have heard what you just said and how 1698 we guard against that. So I mean, just what you just kind of 1699 said, if Mr. Phillips or anybody else would like to talk 1700 about that because that was my next question in light of what 1701 we know about GDPR what should we be concerned about. And 1702 you just started going into that, so I wanted to make sure we 1703 finish that and if some others would like to talk to it as 1704 well.

1705

Mr. Phillips. Thank you. Congressman, I think this is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1706 such a critical question. The important thing to remember, 1707 while a lot of this debate focuses on a few very large firms, the use, the collection, the monetization of data is endemic 1708 1709 in the economy. It is everywhere. It is lots of little 1710 firms too. And I think the most essential thing to do is to 1711 go and consult with those firms and ask them, "Hey, how would 1712 this look for you?" You know, we want the small businesses 1713 to higher coders not lawyers. If you have five people and 1714 one of them is a lawyer, maybe that is not good for innovation and competition. So I think consulting with them, 1715 1716 asking how the rules apply to them, not just the big firms, 1717 is critical.

Mr. Chopra. Yeah, I would love to add just two points here. I think you are right that we have to think hard about competition. And one of the things I worry a lot about it is we are seeing a real slowdown in small business/new business formation even in the digital economy.

You know, many venture capitalists, many new firms that are starting are saying, you know, "The big guys actually have already taken all the key data. We are never going to catch up. We now have to create our business maybe just to sell to them." That can really distort innovation in our country and I am really, I am increasingly worried that our lack of attention to this issue is deterring lots of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1730 entrepreneurs from wanting to challenge those incumbents. So 1731 we need to think hard about that.

With respect to GDPR, GDPR uses essentially a principles-based regulatory scheme. So on one hand that might create some flexibility. On the other hand, it can also lead to uncertainty. And with bright line rules that actually is easier for everyone to comply with rather than huge complexity that only the largest firms can lawyer up to figure out.

1739 Mr. Guthrie. Okay. I am going to switch gears real 1740 quick about something in my home, one of my home industries 1741 which is Kentucky bourbon. And we have heard from a lot of 1742 our distillers and people who ship that counterfeiting 1743 distilled spirits is on the rise both domestically and 1744 abroad. I only have a few seconds. So this is a problem 1745 because consumers aren't getting the goods they purchased and 1746 counterfeit spirits can pose a serious hazard.

1747 Chairman Simons, can you speak to the FTC's ability to 1748 monitor and regulate these sales? I know they are through 1749 websites and it is difficult to do.

1750 Mr. Simons. Yeah, so this type of thing is obviously of 1751 concern to us. It is a deception. You know, it is 1752 counterfeiting, like you said. The primary agencies that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1753 have jurisdiction over this, I think, are actually the

(202) 234-4433

1754 Treasury Department and the DOJ who actually has criminal

1755 authority. So I think this is more of an issue for those

1756 agencies.

1757 Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Well, thank you very much and my 1758 time is expired and I yield back.

1759 Ms. Schakowsky. Now the chair recognizes Mr. O'Halleran 1760 for 5 minutes.

1761 Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Now I see it is afternoon and thank you 1762 Good afternoon. 1763 for appearing before us today. Your role in protecting 1764 consumers and competition is critical, particularly in a 1765 world where innovation and technology is rapidly advancing 1766 and consumers are faced with navigating the maze of new 1767 technological developments and regulations. Like my 1768 colleagues on this committee, I look forward to learning more 1769 from all of you about this work.

1770 This week, the FTC is celebrating National Small 1771 Business Week -- I thank you for doing that -- acknowledging 1772 the important contributions of small businesses, their 1773 owners, and in our communities. As you may know, the 1st 1774 district of Arizona is home to many small businesses, it is 1775 mostly a rural district, including mom and pop shops. Many 1776 of these business owners are located in those types of rural areas throughout the country. 1777

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1778 A critical role of the FTC is to provide consumer 1779 education and conduct and outreach. These efforts include 1780 providing practical and plain language guidance on many 1781 issues for small business owners, many of whom are not up to 1782 the speed that the larger businesses are. In fact, the FTC 1783 has conducted several roundtables over the past couple of 1784 years to educate small business owners on various matters 1785 including cybersecurity.

1786 It is my understanding that the Commission heard many 1787 concerns from small business owners about data security 1788 including concerns pertaining to the mobile phones and cloud 1789 devices. I would like to hear more about these initiatives 1790 and programs for small business owners and specifically how 1791 the FTC is tailoring its educational and outreach campaigns 1792 to those small businesses in rural areas and how to expand it 1793 also as you move forward.

1794 I have two questions. I want to start with Mr. Simons 1795 I believe these small business and then anybody can jump in. 1796 outreach initiatives are important for the FTC to continue. 1797 In your view, what more can the FTC do to build upon the work 1798 of these small businesses' initiatives moving forward? 1799 And the second question is, as you know, Congress is currently considering proposals to include in legislation on 1800 a range of issues impacting consumer privacy and data 1801 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1802 security. As the FTC considers enforcement actions against 1803 corporations who violate privacy laws, how does the FTC 1804 consider enforcement actions against small businesses versus 1805 those against larger companies? Mr. Simons?

1806 Mr. Simons. Thank you, Congressman. So let me start 1807 the last question first. So we have a standard for data 1808 security that is a reasonableness standard. It is not a one-1809 size-fits-all and we are very nervous about anyone who would suggest a one-size-fits-all standard, because as you can 1810 imagine a huge company can afford to spend hundreds of 1811 1812 millions of dollars on its data security because it has so 1813 much volume over which to spread it and the cost per unit is 1814 going to be trivial, right. But if you make small businesses 1815 do those same types of data security measures, they will be 1816 out of business. They wouldn't even come close to making 1817 money.

So it is really important that we do this reasonableness standard, we consider how small the business is, how costly it is to provide data security, and what kind of data the company has. If it is not very sensitive then you don't worry so much about the security, or you don't worry as much and what you would expect them to do in terms of data security measures would be a lot smaller.

1825 In terms of the outreach to businesses and consumers,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1826 this is a critical thing that we do. And people suggest to 1827 me sometimes that maybe you should divert some resources from 1828 that to doing more law enforcement, more litigation, for 1829 example, and I think that is a mistake. We really need to have this consumer outreach and outreach to the business 1830 1831 community and we could do more of it if we had more 1832 resources.

1833 Thank you, anybody else? Mr. O'Halleran. 1834 Ms. Slaughter. Thank you, Congressman. I would just add that I think there are elements of what are in the rules 1835 1836 and the laws that are important; there are also important 1837 questions about the application of prosecutorial discretion. 1838 When we see particular cases, I think it is incumbent upon 1839 us to consider what is the company that we are considering. 1840 How big is it? What is its compliance opportunities or 1841 costs, and take that seriously in making sure that our cases 1842 and, more importantly, our remedies are carefully tailored to 1843 the particular defendants we have in front of us; it is not a 1844 one-size-fits-all approach.

1845 Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you. And, you know, talking 1846 about smaller businesses for a second, I appreciate what you 1847 said about the issue, but they also fit into the entire 1848 security chain and privacy chain and how they blend into that 1849 is important for the overall security of the process. So it

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1850 is kind of, I worry about both ways, so.

1851 Mr. Simons. It is a balance you have to strike. You 1852 know, it is like most things in life, there are tradeoffs. 1853 Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield. 1854 Ms. Schakowsky. The chair now recognizes Mr. Bucshon 1855 for 5 minutes.

1856 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

1857 Health information is some of the most valuable data that is out there. It is very private, very personal, but 1858 1859 also very valuable to people. And I was a healthcare 1860 provider before. So, Chairman Simons, one of the focuses that I will have on a privacy bill, how we address health 1861 1862 information not covered by HIPAA and how does the Commission 1863 deal with this type of health information now and how should 1864 we be thinking through this issue when fitness trackers and 1865 other health apps are very popular and becoming more popular? 1866 Mr. Simons. Yeah, I mean if you are talking about the 1867 same data that is covered by HIPAA and you are talking about, 1868 you know, it is really, it is sensitive data, you have to 1869 think about treating it in a similar manner. And one of the 1870 things that I think is the real advantage of the federal 1871 privacy legislation that you were considering is that it would be broad-based and not cabined to particular types of 1872 1873 information. And so, I think that makes things easier to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1874 deal with.

1875 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, because, you know, there is going to 1876 -- I mean there is real-time glucose monitoring for 1877 diabetics, and people may not want people to know that they 1878 are diabetic and that information could be out there, or your 1879 blood pressure could be high and people may not know. I mean 1880 it is going to be real important that we figure how we 1881 protect that type of information, I think.

1882 Mr. Simons. Yes, I agree.

1883 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah.

1884 Ms. Wilson, do you have any comments? Commissioner 1885 Wilson?

Ms. Wilson. I agree that the Federal Trade Commission has long applied a risk-based approach to the evaluation of privacy and the more sensitive the information, the greater the protections it deserves. We have taken the same approach with federal legislation, children's information in COPPA,

1891 health information in HIPAA.

The gaps that you are mentioning concern me. Emerging technologies change the landscape and some of this very sensitive information is not currently covered under federal legislation. We can get at it through our Section 5 authority, but having guidance at the federal level would be very useful, and so greater authority in that area would help

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1898 protect this information more.

1899 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, because I mean we have been talking 1900 about, you know, how you have to click "agree" if you want to 1901 get a certain account, right, and that is probably true with 1902 devices that now monitor your health, right. And so that 1903 will be an area we have to look at too. People, you know, 1904 broadly as you mentioned that people should know if they put 1905 on a certain device that it may very well transmit health 1906 information to someone, and it may be in the paperwork and 1907 you may just not know.

1908 I will give you a second.

Ms. Wilson. So I completely agree. I think consumers are able to make decisions that are in their own best interest if they have information about the choices that they have. But there is a lot of consumer confusion right now. There is a lack of clarity about what is being done with

1914 their data. Greater transparency is an imperative.

1915 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, and even when they know maybe that 1916 their health information is going to be transmitted, they 1917 still should have some coverage for the privacy of that like 1918 under HIPAA.

1919 Mr. Chopra. I just wanted to add, something that makes 1920 this even harder is with artificial intelligence and machine 1921 learning. Even if we don't hand over our health information,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

companies may know our health information based on what we are searching in terms of our symptoms, geolocation of where we are going. So that is going to make it really difficult when formulas and algorithms are determined and it may even know our health conditions even if they have not been formally diagnosed.

Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, I mean if you have your phone on you and you show up at an oncologist's office that tells people kind of --

1931 Mr. Chopra. You have cancer.

1932 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, and I don't know how we protect 1933 that.

1934 Commissioner Phillips, do you have any comments on this? 1935 Mr. Phillips. I said earlier that one of the things 1936 that Congress has done over time is it has looked at areas of 1937 greater levels of risk and I think this is an area that 1938 deserves strong consideration, and I think I agree with all The one thing I would add is 1939 my colleagues when I say that. 1940 that I do think it is important not just to consider the what 1941 in terms of HIPAA, but how HIPAA has worked. HIPAA, the 1942 studies show, has sometimes prevented what can be really pro-1943 competitive and pro-consumer technology.

1944 Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, yeah.

1945 Mr. Phillips. You know, you fill out a form every time

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1946 you go to the doctor's office, every single doctor, and the 1947 doctors can't talk to each other so you have to repeat your 1948 symptoms to --

1949 Mr. Bucshon. Oh, I am very well aware of that problem. 1950 Mr. Phillips. And so, I do think when we talk about 1951 HIPAA we ought to think about how it is working and how it is 1952 not working.

Mr. Bucshon. Okay, thank you all, I yield back.
Ms. Schakowsky. I now recognize Congresswoman Blunt
Rochester.

1956 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and 1957 thank you all for your testimonies. First, before I get into 1958 my questions about privacy and data security, I want to ask 1959 you about our seniors who face scams especially through 1960 exploited practices like gift cards. And today I am 1961 introducing the Stop Senior Scams Act with my friend and 1962 colleague, Mr. Walberg of Michigan, who is across the aisle. And this bill is a House companion to a bill introduced by 1963 1964 Senators Casey and Moran earlier this year.

I know you and your staff are working with the Senators and I look forward to working with you further as we consider this bill on the House side. And, Commissioners, I just wanted to ask briefly if you are seeing a lot of this like on the rise in terms of the scams for seniors with these gift

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1970 cards? If you could just briefly and then we will jump into 1971 the other questions.

Mr. Simons. This is a big issue for us. You know, we are focused very much and have a high priority for scams dealing with the senior community. And we put out, we do a whole bunch of different things in terms of education. We put out guidance that, you know, if it is a gift card it is only supposed to be for gifts, right.

We have a program what we call Pass it On, which is an effort to, as one of my colleagues said, be a force multiplier. It is to get people in the seniors' community to help other people in the seniors community avoid these types of things. So this is something we are very focused on and outreach is very important in this regard.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. Great. I look forward to working with you on this. I want to shift to the privacy and data questions and I want to turn our attention to something that came up earlier when Representative Kelly was speaking. I think it was Commissioner Chopra who talked about dark patterns and that it is gaining a lot of notoriety.

And I really wanted to kind of focus on this, because for those who don't know what it is, and I am going to ask you, Commissioner Chopra, to actually share how you would describe this. How I have it is, it is a pattern, or for --

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1994 a dark pattern is a website or app design that is 1995 intentionally deceptive in order to push users into content, 1996 products, or even participate in data collection activities 1997 without their informed consent. And I can bet everybody in this room has been a victim to this. 1998 And even, ironically, 1999 if you Google dark patterns, later you will probably be 2000 affected by this. In the privacy space, many of my 2001 colleagues have touched on similar issues as it impacts 2002 consumers, children, and social media, but most recently even the IRS Free File had a connection to dark patterns. 2003 People 2004 seeking income-based assistance in filing their taxes were 2005 potentially steered unsuspectingly to products that were 2006 neither part of the IRS program or were free. And entities 2007 like Facebook we hear are -- that they are affected by it, 2008 but there are even more out there.

2009 So if you could talk a little bit about this practice. 2010 And then if you could also talk about what we in Congress 2011 should be doing to address it.

2012 Mr. Chopra. Sure. And, Congresswoman, I am not an 2013 expert on it, but my general understanding is that using 2014 various sorts of testing and tactics, firms can nudge 2015 consumers into choosing certain things or deterring them. 2016 And one of the, I believe the researcher who coined the term 2017 also uses the term "roach motel," --

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2018 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yes.

2019 Mr. Chopra. -- which is that you can check in, create 2020 an account but it is impossible to get out. And one of the 2021 things that I hope that we can really modernize some of our 2022 analytical tools, use different types of economics including 2023 behavioral economics, to understand how consumers actually 2024 can be harmed by this.

I am not positive, to be honest I am happy to answer questions for the record about whether our deception authority here is enough, but it is very troubling.

2028 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yeah, I was actually going to ask 2029 about deception authority, but you said you are not sure.

2030 One of the other questions, as the more that you all

2031 talked, when you talked about artificial intelligence,

2032 machine learning, geolearning, one of the questions I really

2033 have is from a workforce perspective. Are we in government,

do we have the skills, the capabilities, the training to be

able to be a step ahead of what is upon us now? I would love

2036 to -- yes, Commissioner Wilson?

2037 Ms. Wilson. So I think this is one of the great things 2038 about the Federal Trade Commission. We do have a history of 2039 engaging in competition and consumer protection R&D. And 2040 Chairman Simons, last summer, announced the competition and

2041 consumer protection hearings for the 21st century, and we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2042 have held hearings with dozens and dozens and hundreds of 2043 participants and comments focusing on things like AI and 2044 machine learning and algorithms and how these affect 2045 consumers and the kinds of harms that can be created.

And so, I think we are continuing to learn and to move up the learning curve and I think with that learning we can begin to identify precisely the resources that we need to fulfill our mission of protecting consumers.

2050 Ms. Blunt Rochester. My time has run out, but I had so 2051 many questions as well about behavioral research and study, 2052 but thank you so much for your testimony.

2053 Ms. Schakowsky. And of course all of the questions can 2054 be submitted for the record. We hope our witnesses will 2055 reply.

2056 And now let me recognize -- oh, Mr. Hudson has arrived.
2057 You have 5 minutes.

2058 Mr. Hudson. I thank the chairwoman and thank you to all 2059 the commissioners for your time today.

2060 Chairman Simons, as you have heard today, we are 2061 committed to protecting small businesses and promoting

2062 innovation. Some other agencies are using or considering

2063 regulatory sandboxes for new innovations. Can you explain

2064 this concept and whether you believe we should consider a

2065 similar approach for privacy regulations?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2066 So the regulatory sandbox as I understand Mr. Simons. 2067 it -- and thank you for the question, Congressman -- is a 2068 situation where small businesses would be able to -- play is 2069 not the right, I mean that is the analogy -- but to get 2070 started. And so, for example, people have proposed that for 2071 small businesses that they wouldn't have to comply with like, 2072 for example, maybe a federal privacy legislation that you 2073 pass in the coming months until they get to a certain size. 2074 And to be honest, I have thoughts positive and negative 2075 about that. So the positive is it cuts down, clearly, on the 2076 cost of getting into business and maybe allows people to grow 2077 that would never get off the ground. On the other hand, if 2078 the privacy legislation you pass really is protecting people, 2079 you know, small businesses can get a lot of sensitive 2080 information and you really worry about that. 2081 Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that answer. 2082 Mr. Phillips. Congressman. 2083 Mr. Hudson. Commissioner Phillips, do you support the 2084 use of regulatory sandboxes and what are the barriers you see 2085 to doing something similar like this? 2086 Mr. Phillips. So I think it is something very much

2087 worthy of consideration, but I want to add something and this

2088 may be my mistake, but I have a slightly different

2089 understanding of how at least internationally some of these

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2090 regulatory sandboxes at working.

2091 My understanding is and it may be how you structure it, 2092 it isn't necessarily just a shield for liability for small 2093 businesses, it is an opportunity maybe where the law is gray 2094 or something that is close to the line where under the 2095 supervision of the regulator the business can undertake an 2096 innovative thing that might be legally questionable. This is 2097 something they are pioneering in the United Kingdom right now 2098 It has been utilized in the financial space. on privacy.

2099 I do think consistent with and as a parent of small 2100 children allowing your kids to play in the sandbox that 2101 supervision is key, but I do think it is an opportunity to 2102 test, you know, where are there maybe some pro-competitive 2103 impacts to the conduct. The chairman is a hundred percent 2104 right that small businesses can present risks just like big 2105 businesses can. It is a question of how you structure it. 2106 But there is some, really, examples out there that I think 2107 you should consider.

2108 Mr. Hudson. Great. I appreciate that.

2109 Chairman Simons, as you know there are many other 2110 industries across the United States that are subject to 2111 various privacy laws. Some of the most familiar are the 2112 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act for the 2113 healthcare industry; Graham-Leach-Bliley for financial

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2114 services. Do you believe the FTC would have to exercise 2115 concurrent jurisdiction with the other federal agencies to 2116 implement a national privacy law and, if so, how would you 2117 recommend we do that?

2118 Mr. Simons. Well, I think it depends on what you pass, 2119 right, so you could pass a law that says yes or says no to 2120 that question. And also I think it depends on, you know, how 2121 much, you know, what you put in the law in terms of whether 2122 as a result of that whether you want to make, you know, what 2123 is now covered by HIPAA covered by your new privacy 2124 legislation or some of these other things, whether you want 2125 So it is kind of hard to say in a to fold that in or not. 2126 vacuum.

2127 Mr. Hudson. But if we follow that example, you know, 2128 how would we implement that, the HIPAA example?

2129 Mr. Simons. Oh, so you mean if you had these

2130 jurisdictions?

2131 Mr. Hudson. As far as agencies going to work together. 2132 Mr. Simons. We would just have to coordinate to make 2133 sure we don't step on each other. I mean we have lots of 2134 that. Like, for example, the FDA and the FTC are regulating, 2135 you know, drugs in different ways, but it is the same drug, 2136 you know, so that kind of coordination is common.

2137 Mr. Hudson. Got you.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Bouncing back to Commissioner Phillips, a difficult piece of this privacy discussion is the sharing of consumer data and downstream misuse. We know sharing information offers great benefits, but once a company shares that information, we see misuse from companies two or three steps down the supply chain.

2144 How does the Commission approach this issue and do you 2145 have any recommendations on this point for a federal bill? 2146 I think looking at the supply chain and Mr. Simons. 2147 understanding the full scope of companies involved in the use 2148 of data, which is breathtaking, right, in its scope, is 2149 critical. We need to understand how the data are being used. 2150 We also though need to understand that the point at which 2151 the consumer interacts with the company is a very critical 2152 point for transparency and things like that.

2153 Mr. Hudson. Thank you.

And, Madam Chairman, my time is about up, so I will

2155 yield back. I thank the commissioners.

2156 Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back.

I understand there is some desire by the panel of

2158 witnesses for a short break. I understand that so let's make

a maximum of 5 minutes and let -- and then they will come

2160 back, okay. Or maybe members as well would like to take that

2161 moment.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2162 [Whereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to 2163 reconvene at 12:37 p.m., the same day.]

2164 Ms. Schakowsky. The committee hearing will resume and I

2165 will recognize for 5 minutes, Mr. Lujan.

2166 Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2167 Commissioner Slaughter, rapid advancements in technology 2168 have transformed the way that companies use personal data. 2169 In just over a decade, we have moved from a world of desktop 2170 computers to one where each of us has devices always on, it seems always collecting data about everything we do and 2171 2172 everywhere that we go. It is vital that the FTC keep current 2173 on new technology and train its staff on emerging consumer 2174 protection issues.

2175 Despite the often-technical nature of privacy and 2176 security matters, the FTC has only five full-time staffers 2177 classified as technologists. How do technologists help the 2178 staff attorneys on privacy and data security cases?

Ms. Slaughter. Thank you for the question, Congressman. Technologists are extremely important. When we need to understand the material with which we are working in any particular case, and the more highly technical the field, the more highly technical the practices that we are investigating, the more we can benefit from the experience of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

a technologist.

2185

www.nealrgross.com

I think, I routinely try to rack my brain to

2186 think of cases we have encountered not just in the privacy 2187 and data security area, but across our mission in competition 2188 and consumer protection that don't involve some technological 2189 element and it is very difficult for me to think of any.

2190 Mr. Lujan. What role do technologists play in helping 2191 identify cases where someone might have violated the law?

2192 Ms. Slaughter. I think they can play an extremely 2193 valuable role. I mean we, our case identification comes from 2194 consumer complaints, it comes from press stories, it comes 2195 from experience of staff who identify issues, and

2196 technologists can apply a level of expertise to picking out 2197 technological-specific issues that might not necessarily 2198 occur to an attorney independently.

2198 occur to an attorney independently.

2199 Mr. Lujan. Commissioner Slaughter, do you know how many 2200 of the five technologists the FTC has work on privacy and 2201 data security enforcement?

2202 Ms. Slaughter. I am not actually entirely sure how to 2203 answer that direct question, but to the extent that you are 2204 suggesting that five technologists is not a lot for the scope 2205 of the work that we are obligated to do in privacy and data 2206 security, I agree that we could benefit from a lot more 2207 technological expertise.

2208 Mr. Lujan. Chairman Simons, do you know how many of the 2209 five technologists work on privacy and data security

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 2210 enforcement?
- 2211 Mr. Simons. My understanding is that one --

2212 Mr. Lujan. Your microphone, please.

2213 Mr. Simons. My understanding is that at one point or

another they all do.

2215 Mr. Lujan. Are there enough technologists for the FTC 2216 to do their work?

2217 Mr. Simons. We could certainly use more. And what we 2218 do with them, actually, is so they do original research.

They also educate our lawyers, so it is kind of a bit of a force multiplier. And in addition, they serve another very important function is where we don't have internal resources sufficient to help us with our cases, they identify experts for us outside the agency who we can then hire on a contract

2224 basis.

2225 Mr. Lujan. And one specific question to all the

2226 commissioners, do you agree that it would help the FTC's

2227 enforcement activities if there were more technologists

2228 working directly with staff attorneys?

- 2229 Mr. Simons. Yes.
- 2230 Mr. Lujan. Yes?

2231 Ms. Wilson. Yes.

2232 Ms. Slaughter. Yes. We put an economist on every case

that we consider both competition and consumer protection. I

(202) 234-4433

think we could benefit from technologists too.

2235 Mr. Phillips. Congressman, yes. But I just want to 2236 reiterate a point that the chairman made which is the use of 2237 outside experts. The thing about technology is there is a lot of it and a lot of it is different. If you bring someone 2238 2239 on permanently, they may have expertise in a given area, but 2240 if you use the money to hire on a case-by-case basis, you can 2241 be more tailored, more efficient, and look at more different 2242 kinds of technology.

2243 Mr. Lujan. Just as long as those experts don't have a 2244 conflict of interest with the space you are playing in?

2245 Mr. Phillips. Oh, of course you want to avoid conflict 2246 of interest in hiring outside folks.

2247 Mr. Long. Commissioner Chopra?

2248 Mr. Chopra. Yes, I agree with Commissioner Slaughter 2249 completely.

2250 Mr. Lujan. Appreciate that.

2251 Mr. Chairman, the last several FTC chairs have appointed 2252 a chief technologist to advise the commissioners on

2253 significant policy issues involving new technologies. You

have now been in charge of the agency for more than a year at

2255 a time when the FTC is addressing some of the most

2256 significant privacy and data security issues in the agency's

2257 history, and yet you have chosen not to appoint a chief

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2258 technologist to assist you on the Commission. Why not? 2259 Well, that was one of the first things I Mr. Simons. 2260 looked at upon becoming chairman. And what struck me right 2261 out of the box was that the chief technologist is appended to the Chairman's Office in a kind of unusual way in the 2262 2263 organizational chart. The chief technologist had no direct 2264 reports, no infrastructure for him or her, no staff. They 2265 weren't directly connected to the staff of the Bureau of 2266 Consumer Protection or the Bureau of Competition, and so that 2267 struck me as an odd organizational structure.

2268 And so, I talked to people in the Bureau of Competition 2269 and Bureau of Consumer Protection. The Bureau of Consumer 2270 Protection has its own technologist staff called the Office 2271 of Technology Research and Investigation. That is where the 2272 five technologists are housed. That group works extremely 2273 well with the people in the Bureau of Consumer Protection and 2274 they were going to be very upset if I moved those people out.

I was thinking about creating a Bureau of Technology. So rather than do that we created a technology task force in the Bureau of Competition which is going to have a technology fellow. And I have transferred the FTE from the chief technology officer to the technology task force in the Bureau of Competition so we have more boots on the ground in terms of dealing with these investigations that we are conducting.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2282 Mr. Lujan. But still very clear that more technologists 2283 would be of beneficiary, especially with the numbers that I 2284 shared earlier, 500 million, 148 million, 87 million just to 2285 name three examples.

2286 Mr. Simons. Yes.

2287 Mr. Lujan. Thank you for the time, Madam Chair.

2288 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you and now I recognize Mr.

2289 Gianforte.

2290 Mr. Gianforte. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you for being here for this important topic. 2291 2292 Last week, we had another subcommittee hearing on robocalls. 2293 And Montanans are getting bombarded with robocalls and they 2294 are sick and tired of them. One constituent in my district 2295 got a call from her little brother. Unfortunately, her 2296 little brother had died of a heroin overdose a couple of 2297 months earlier. This was a terrible situation for her and 2298 nobody should really have to go through this. This has to 2299 end.

I am just curious, Mr. Chairman, what is the Commission doing to stop robocalls like these?

2302 Mr. Simons. Yeah, thank you for that question. And, 2303 first of all, this is an issue for domestic tranquility in my 2304 own household. This is, to me, when I was coming into office 2305 this was probably the most important thing at least in that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2306 my wife was telling me about and then lots of other people 2307 too, and it is such an incredible inconvenience. And worse 2308 than that it is not just an inconvenience, it often leads to 2309 fraud.

2310 So our Do Not Call rule has been overcome by 2311 technological advances and so we have to find other ways to 2312 do it and we are proceeding on multiple fronts. We still 2313 continue to bring significant enforcement actions to shut 2314 these people down who are doing these robocalls; we coordinate with the FCC. And the other thing that we would 2315 2316 really like help from you in the Congress is to give us jurisdiction over common carriers, because there are some 2317 2318 common carriers that cater to this robocall traffic, 2319 particularly the traffic that originates from overseas. And 2320 if we had the ability to go after these common carriers, we 2321 could, I think, put a significant dent in these robocalls. 2322 Mr. Gianforte. Okay. We have the situation where these 2323 robocallers, if that is a noun, masquerade as local numbers. 2324 Mr. Simons. Yes. 2325 Mr. Gianforte. Would this common carrier authority 2326 allow you to go after those individuals and that behavior? 2327 Mr. Simons. Yes, in the sense that we could identify 2328 the carriers that are facilitating the robocallers and just 2329 stop them from, like in the case of the foreign ones stop

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

them from entering the U.S. telephone network at the outset.

2331 Ms. Slaughter. Can I just jump in there, Congressman,

and add that --

2333 Mr. Gianforte. Yes, Commissioner.

-- I think the chairman referenced how 2334 Ms. Slaughter. 2335 technological innovations have overtaken us and you mentioned 2336 this neighborhood spoofing problem. I think it is also worth 2337 Congress considering whether not just enforcement should be applicable to common carriers, but whether there should be 2338 2339 more onus placed on the cell phone carriers in the first 2340 place and more responsibility placed on them to stop some of this traffic that goes over their network, I think, in the 2341 2342 first instance even before you consider the enforcement on 2343 the back end.

2344 Mr. Gianforte. Okay, thank you.

2345 Commissioner Phillips, my understanding is that when the 2346 FTC seeks to recover ill-gotten gains from any entity that 2347 has violated FTC competition rules, the Commission seeks to 2348 recover the profits from the unlawful act. Is that correct 2349 and can you briefly explain how the Commission calculates

2350 ill-gotten gains?

2351 Mr. Phillips. Do you mean in the competition context?2352 Mr. Gianforte. Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2353 Mr. Phillips. Yes, and thank you for that

(202) 234-4433

2354 clarification. So let me give a little context and then give 2355 you the answer. The, traditionally, three things that we 2356 have considered in the context of whether to pursue ill-2357 gotten gains disgorgement in a competition case include 2358 whether the rule is clear, so whether it is serving that 2359 deterrent function that we want it to; second, we consider is 2360 there a reasonable basis to calculate it, and I will talk 2361 about how we have and, in fact, how it applied in a case that 2362 I mentioned earlier; and third, we consider whether there are other ways of remediating the issue, so civil lawsuits and 2363 2364 things like that also being out there.

2365 In the AbbVie case, which is a good example, what we did 2366 a lot of, you know, hard economic or like a lot of 2367 measurement to determine what they were making relative to 2368 what they would have been making without the anticompetitive 2369 conduct. In that case it was a sham litigation keeping drugs 2370 off the market. And so that is the differential at which we 2371 look, you know, what you made and what you would have made 2372 without doing the thing you weren't supposed to do.

2373 Mr. Gianforte. Okay, thank you.

2374 Chairman Simons, I am concerned with legislating for the 2375 sake of legislating and seeking to solve a problem that may 2376 not exist. I believe any federal privacy bill must focus on

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2377 specific harms. You talked to this earlier. Can you

(202) 234-4433

elaborate a little bit on why it is so important we focus on privacy harms to consumers in our attempt to legislate in this area?

2381 Mr. Simons. I mean I agree with you completely. Thank 2382 you for that question that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. 2383 And if you are going to, you know, you only want to create 2384 legislation for things that are causing problems and you have 2385 a fix for it. So in the privacy sector, however, the harm, I think, is very tricky and that is one of the reasons that we 2386 -- and also with data security one of the reasons we need 2387 2388 civil penalty authority, because it is hard to measure in any 2389 kind of precise, quantitative way if you are talking about, 2390 you know, a monetary relief.

And so, because of that factor you really need to do civil penalties and you need to think about is there a harm like a privacy invasion or something like that which is not monetarily -- you can't -- it is hard to quantify but it is still a harm. People, it still bothers people. It still, it can lead to other problems.

2397 Mr. Gianforte. Okay, thank you.

2398 On that I yield back, Madam Chair.

2399 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you and I now recognize Mr. Soto

for 5 minutes.

2401 Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairwoman.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2402 I think it is safe to say at this point that the 2403 internet is integral to our daily lives and has been for over 2404 20 years, which is why it is so shocking that there hasn't 2405 been a single law to regulate internet privacy directly 2406 during that time and beforehand. So it is my belief that the 2407 biggest threat to internet integrity is congressional 2408 inaction. We see a patchwork of statutes, 1914, FTC Act 2409 creating your Commission, who would have thought that 2410 President Woodrow Wilson would have such an influence on the 2411 internet? 1986, Electronic Communications Privacy Act to 2412 protect communications; also 1986, Computer Fraud and Abuse 2413 1998, Children's Online Privacy Act which was Act. 2414 referenced by Congresswoman Castor. 2003, the CAN-SPAM Act 2415 to protect us against unsolicited emails. 2416 Most of these predate the internet and pretty much all 2417 of them were created when dial-up was still the form of 2418 getting on the internet. So I just want to make a statement 2419 to say that you know, you all are charged with a really 2420 impossible task. You have to interpret these isolated 2421 moonstones to come up with this comprehensive privacy regime 2422 because Congress hasn't given you direction on it. 2423 So thank you for doing what is nearly impossible to do,

which is regulate privacy without laws to directly do that.

Even the courts have filled in the gap with Carpenter v. U.S.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2426 establishing cell phone privacy.

So, Madam Chairwoman, I hope that we will out of this committee be able to develop some key protections, making sure that companies have a duty of care, a duty to protect civil rights, and a duty to protect privacy. And that the penalties will be sufficient so it is more costly to pay for a breach than it is to pay for sufficient cybersecurity investments.

2434 Second, I hope that we establish that Americans have a 2435 right to control their information, a right to stop the use 2436 of their information if they choose so, and if they do, 2437 companies should have a right to charge for their services. 2438 And third, waivers should be put in plain language. I want 2439 to get out how we are determining damages. We heard a little 2440 bit of that discussion before.

I have read in the paper that there may be a fine against Facebook between three to five billion dollars.

2443 Chairman Simon, what is the total amount of that fine?

2444 Mr. Simons. Oh, I am sorry, Congressman, but I can't

talk about it an ongoing nonpublic investigation.

2446 Mr. Soto. What factors do you generally utilize in

2447 determining those types of damages?

2448 Mr. Simons. So you would look at the prior conduct, the 2449 culpability, the ability to pay, and the deterrent effect.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2450 Mr. Soto. Commissioner Chopra, if it was at the upper 2451 end of \$5 billion, do you think that would be a sufficient 2452 deterrent for the activities complained of?

2453 Mr. Chopra. I think it is not appropriate to comment on 2454 that. Obviously, deterrence is important. When it comes to 2455 violations of our rules, violations of our orders, nothing 2456 can be the cost of doing business.

2457 Mr. Soto. Turning to the TikTok settlement that

2458 Congresswoman Castor talked about, Chairman Simon, what were

2459 the factors utilized in determining that fine?

2460 Mr. Simons. I believe the ones I articulated.

2461 Mr. Soto. And --

2462 Mr. Simons. And the other thing too is that you know, 2463 this is a negotiation that resulted in a settlement. And we 2464 also have to take into account what the likely outcome would 2465 have been in court and if we couldn't have done better in 2466 court, then it makes sense to settle. And that is one of the 2467 issues that we face kind of generally is that historically 2468 the civil penalty awards have been quite low and so one of 2469 the things we are thinking about is a way to get them 2470 generally raised on average.

2471 Mr. Soto. So that is something else this committee has 2472 to work on then is to make sure that the civil penalties are 2473 a sufficient deterrent.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2474 Commissioner Slaughter, was the TikTok settlement a 2475 sufficient deterrent for on the behavior complained of? 2476 Ms. Slaughter. The statement that Commissioner Chopra 2477 and I put out in connection with that settlement explained 2478 that the investigation and, really, most of the negotiation 2479 of how to resolve that case took place before this slate of 2480 commissioners was constituted. And it is very difficult for 2481 us, I think as a general matter, to look back without having 2482 been part of a conversation to discuss it, so we were 2483 focusing on in the future whether it is -- not whether --2484 that it is important that our investigations, including of 2485 large companies, really ask all the questions that we need to 2486 determine where liability properly lies.

2487 Mr. Soto. Thank you for that. I want to turn to 2488 identity theft. We see in our notes 444,000 complaints of 2489 identity theft. Chairman Simons, do you know the cost to the 2490 economy or the loss to the economy that identity theft on the 2491 internet poses currently?

2492 Mr. Simons. I think the average is about \$150 per 2493 person.

2494 Mr. Soto. And so, do you have an overall figure for 2495 that or do we have to multiply it by 330 million?

2496 Mr. Simons. I don't other than it is quite large.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2497 Mr. Soto. Okay, thanks. And I yield back.

(202) 234-4433

2498 Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back and now I ask 2499 Mr. Carter for his 5 minutes.

2500 Mr. Carter. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And, Mr. Simons and Commissioners, thank you for being here. This is an extremely important subject as you well know and we in Congress are depending on you and we are relying on you to help us through this because it is something that we want to get right. And it is certainly something that our constituents and the citizens of our country need to have right and to be done by right.

2508 Mr. Simons, I want to ask you, where in the current law, 2509 where does the FTC's ability to enforce privacy or where does 2510 it end? I mean, you know, I have heard you say before that 2511 the FTC is the cop on the beat when it comes to privacy and I 2512 understand that. But, you know, where does your authority 2513 end at this point or under current law?

2514 Mr. Simons. Right. Thank you for that question, 2515 Congressman. So, our general Section 5 authority comes from 2516 that hundred-year old statute which was not designed, for 2517 sure, to deal with this kind of issue, so I credit my 2518 predecessors at the FTC for basically inventing a privacy 2519 program out of Section 5. I think they did a terrific job with the material they had available on them and it is based 2520 2521 largely on a deception authority.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2522 So we started out by saying you should have a privacy 2523 policy at your company and then if you divert from it then 2524 that is a deception and we can hold you accountable. And 2525 then we expanded that to include, for example, things that 2526 look like privacy torts at common law and we cover those 2527 under unfairness. But in terms of the general privacy 2528 authority, not including FCRA or COPPA or whatever, this is 2529 really it and it is pretty narrow.

2530 Mr. Carter. So you would agree that something more 2531 would help?

2532 Mr. Simons. Yeah. I mean that is why we are 2533 encouraging the Congress to adopt privacy legislation.

2534 Mr. Carter. Okay, and not only for that reason, but I 2535 mean, if we look at the other laws that are being proposed 2536 like in California and Europe, you know, here we have a 2537 situation where we really need something to be preemptive 2538 particularly in the case of what is being offered in

2539 California.

I mean it is very important that the Private Right of Action that is being proposed in California that that would be an additional punishment on top of the FTC action as I understand it. And certainly, we don't need plaintiffs' attorneys to be involved in this. We need the FTC to be the cop on the beat as you describe them.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2546 Mr. Simons. Yeah. I think what I have said before is 2547 that we should be the enforcer of that legislation that you 2548 are considering and you should allow the state Attorneys 2549 General to enforce as well, just as they do in lots of other 2550 areas in conjunction with us. They are a terrific partner 2551 and I would strongly recommend that.

2552 Mr. Carter. So you have the ability and you do take 2553 action on fining certain -- and posing financial penalties. 2554 How do you come about -- how do you come up with that? I 2555 mean how do you determine how much that is?

2556 Mr. Simons. Well, it depends on the case that is And just to be clear, we don't actually have any 2557 involved. 2558 fining authority ourselves like our counterparts do in 2559 Europe. We would have to go to court, actually, to get a 2560 fine paid unless it was pursuant to a consent settlement. 2561 Mr. Carter. Okay, so you have to go to court, so you 2562 have to justify it in court as to why you think it should be that much? 2563

2564 Mr. Simons. Yes, so that is the limiting factor in all 2565 of this. Anytime you are thinking about a settlement, if the 2566 settlement gets to a point where you say to yourself, "Gee, 2567 we probably cannot do nearly as well as this, or maybe we 2568 could do just about as well as this in litigation, but the 2569 litigation has lots of risks," so when you get to that point

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

then you really should settle. I mean that is the

2571 appropriate thing to do. Otherwise, if you are just going to 2572 go to court and irrespective of the settlement, then that 2573 really becomes almost unethical or potentially harassment. 2574 Mr. Carter. So when the financial penalty is imposed 2575 where does it go?

2576 Mr. Simons. So specifically for a civil penalty that 2577 would go to the Treasury, so that would be for an order 2578 violation or like in COPPA we have civil penalty authority. 2579 That would apply there. With respect to our 13(b) authority 2580 where we go in and get injunctive relief and we get consumer 2581 redress that gets disbursed to the consumers.

2582 Mr. Carter. Okay. Well, you know, again I would look 2583 at this as being a tremendous opportunity for us as Members 2584 of Congress to work in a bipartisan fashion to come up with 2585 something that would benefit everyone and certainly, you know, would benefit citizens. And if I get input of any 2586 2587 kind, certainly privacy is one of the things that is on top 2588 of the list. I mean constituents are consistently telling me, you know, we need this. We need this. And this is 2589 2590 something, you know, we don't want to stifle innovation or 2591 anything, but we do need our privacy protected.

2592 So thank you very much and thank all of you for your 2593 work on this, and I yield back.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back and now I recognize Mr. McNerney, patient Mr. McNerney, for 5 minutes. Mr. McNerney. Well, I thank the chairlady. And one of the problems of being last is that all the questions I wanted to ask have already been asked, so forgive me if I am repetitive here.

But Pete Olson, my Republican colleague Pete Olson, and I are co-chairs of the AI Caucus, and one of the areas that I am interested in is algorithmic biasing and data biasing. And we have discussed that a little bit already, but I know that the FTC has had a couple of hearings focused on AI and there was a report entitled, "Big Data: A Tool for Inclusion or Exclusion."

2607 Chairman, what steps is the FTC taking today to protect 2608 consumers from potential harm and bias in AI algorithms and -2609 -

2610 Mr. Simons. This is something we look at carefully and 2611 is a priority for us. We had a recent case, actually, 2612 involving a company that does background screening using 2613 algorithms and the algorithms improperly associated people 2614 with criminal records. So we got them to fix their 2615 algorithms, this is a form of AI. So this is something we 2616 are looking at. It is real.

2617 Mr. McNerney. Well, you don't have any authority over

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2618 algorithms and decision making on lethal use of force, say,

2619 in law enforcement, do you?

2620 Mr. Simons. I don't think so. I mean anything that is 2621 criminal we wouldn't have jurisdiction over.

Mr. McNerney. Okay. Is the agency developing any guidance or educational tools to help address the problem? Mr. Simons. I think we have business outreach that suggests that businesses think about these types of issues as they are, you know, and they look for biases and the results

2627 of their algorithms in AI.

2628 Mr. McNerney. Well, I know that Mr. Lujan asked a 2629 similar question regarding the importance of technologists. 2630 Is the Commission planning on hiring technologists in the AI 2631 field of specifically for bias?

2632 Mr. Simons. We don't have a specific plan to do that 2633 unless we get more resources. But what we do in the interim 2634 is we use our existing technologists on our staff to do 2635 outreach to the technology community and to talk to experts,

to have conferences, and to help them educate our staff.

2637 Mr. McNerney. But are there any other AI potential

2638 harms that the FTC is considering besides biasing?

2639 Mr. Simons. There probably are, but I just, you know, I 2640 can't think of it, as I said.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2641 Mr. McNerney. Anyone else on the Commission?

(202) 234-4433

2642 Mr. Chopra. Sure, Congressman. One other area we think 2643 about with respect to artificial intelligence is in our work 2644 to enforce laws against anticompetitive conduct. Sometimes 2645 algorithms and AI can help online sellers collude on price. 2646 It can lead to, you know, other anticompetitive conduct, and 2647 we are thinking about this across the agency.

2648 Mr. Simons. Yeah, one thing about that that is 2649 interesting is if AI allows companies to tacitly collude more 2650 easily that might be a justification for more aggressive 2651 merger enforcement in industries where that is occurring.

2652 Mr. McNerney. Chairman, does the Commission have the 2653 authority to structure civil penalties to be meaningful to 2654 large companies without devastating small companies? Do you 2655 have that authority?

2656 Mr. Simons. Yes. We have flexibility in that regard. 2657 Mr. McNerney. Okay, so you don't need any congressional 2658 legislation or anything like that.

Mr. Simons. Not to deal with the flexibility issue. 2659 2660 Thank you. I understand the agency held Mr. McNerney. 2661 13 hearings to evaluate practices of both Competition and 2662 Consumer Protection Bureaus. I know you are still in the 2663 process of receiving comments, but I do have a series of questions about these hearings especially because I know 2664 these hearings took up a significant amount of the resources 2665 **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

and the Commission has limited resources.

2667 Can you give me the top three takeaways from these 2668 hearings? What is the basis of what you have learned? 2669 Mr. Simons. So one of the things we learned is that 2670 merger retrospectives are really important and we got a lot 2671 of good testimony on that and that is something we really 2672 need. And if we got more resources that is one of the things 2673 we would do, and in particular merger retrospectives as 2674 relate to vertical mergers. That was highly recommended. 2675 I don't think really that is the literature, the literature 2676 on merger retrospectives is much greater on horizontal and is 2677 much less on the vertical merger side. So that was one. 2678 With respect to privacy and data security, we got a lot 2679 of feedback that we really do need civil penalty authority, 2680 that we need targeted rulemaking, and that we need 2681 jurisdiction over common carriers and nonprofits. 2682 Mr. McNerney. I mean a little schizophrenic about 2683 rulemaking, I mean you want the rulemaking to be targeted --2684 Mr. Simons. Yes. 2685 Mr. McNerney. -- but you don't want it to put you in a 2686 bind as well, so I understand that. 2687 Mr. Simons. No, so we would like -- at least my view is 2688 that these privacy issues involve very serious and 2689 significant societal and cultural value judgments, and those

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2690 should be made to the greatest extent possible by elected 2691 officials and not people who are unelected. So our view is 2692 that -- my view is that you should make those judgments. 2693 And we are happy to help you make them. We are happy to 2694 work with you. We are happy to provide analysis of the 2695 tradeoffs that any particular piece of legislation may 2696 present. But, you know, at the end of the day, our view is 2697 that Congress should do that and we should have authority to 2698 do rulemaking that allows us to keep the whatever you pass 2699 up-to-date and consistent with new technology and new 2700 business methods.

2701 Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Thank you, Chairwoman. 2702 Ms. Schakowsky. The gentleman yields back. And, Mr. 2703 Cardenas, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

2704 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much. Thank you very 2705 much, Madam Chairwoman, for having this important hearing 2706 with the FTC. My question to the FTC is that in 2018 FTC 2707 cases resulted in a total of about \$2.3 billion in refunds 2708 for consumers who lost money to frauds and other unfair or 2709 deceptive practices. I commend you for doing that especially 2710 when you look in light of the overall budget for FTC is about 2711 \$300 million per annum. But recent federal court decisions 2712 put the FTC's power to get compensation for consumers at a 2713 serious risk, particularly in cases where the company has

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2714 stopped violating the law. For example, my question is can 2715 one of you explain how these decisions limit the FTC's 2716 authority under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act?

Ms. Wilson. Sure, so this is a critical issue, thank you for raising it, and it is why I addressed it in my opening statement that the issue is that the Third Circuit has recently put in place a standard that would enable us to go after conduct in courts only if the conduct is ongoing or imminent.

2723 And so, if in the course of an investigation a defendant 2724 halts the conduct that we are challenging, say, a fraudster 2725 stops defrauding people or an advertiser suspends dubious advertising claims, then we are unable to go after that 2726 2727 conduct under the Third Circuit standard unless we are able 2728 to show that it is imminent. So even if the fraudster has 2729 engaged in fraud in the past but is not doing it at this 2730 moment, unless we can prove that it is imminent, we can't 2731 reach it.

2732 And this is a serious question that has been raised 2733 about the scope of our authority. We believe that this flies 2734 against a long line of cases saying otherwise, but we would 2735 appreciate clarification from Congress on the scope of our 2736 13(b) authority.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1,50 15(b) addition 10;

- 2737
- Mr. Cardenas. Okay, thank you.

(202) 234-4433

2738 Chairman Simons, how serious of an issue are these decisions for the FTC's enforcement of Section 5? 2739 2740 Mr. Simons. So if they were to become the law of the 2741 land, so to speak, this would be highly problematic for us. 2742 I think it would basically destroy our fraud program. We 2743 wouldn't be able to recover consumer redress --2744 Mr. Cardenas. Fraud as in protecting the consumers, 2745 protecting the people of America. 2746 Mr. Simons. Yeah, like you referenced to whatever it was, the 2.3 billion or whatever, we wouldn't be able to 2747 2748 recover that if these cases became law.

2749 Mr. Cardenas. Okay. What do these cases do to the 2750 FTC's ability to make consumers whole?

2751 Mr. Simons. They really just take it away.

2752 Mr. Cardenas. Okay, so basically the FTC in this as

what we are talking about at the moment is actually helping

2754 the American people set something right, so the FTC is

2755 actually a part of that.

2756 Mr. Simons. Yes, absolutely.

2757 Mr. Cardenas. Okay, so Congress could write clarifying 2758 law, right, that that is what Congress hopefully should and 2759 will do.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2760 Mr. Simons. Yes, we would love for you to do that.

2761 Mr. Cardenas. Yeah. Hopefully I can talk to some

(202) 234-4433

2762 congressional members and we will do that.

2763 Mr. Phillips. Congressman, could I add just one thing 2764 to that?

2765 Mr. Cardenas. Yes, please.

2766 Mr. Phillips. And I absolutely agree with my colleagues 2767 that clarifying longstanding precedent on the impact of 13(b) 2768 is essential. I want to add another thing. Next year the 2769 SAFE WEB Act is going to expire. This is an essential tool 2770 that we use to work with our partners abroad to do crossborder consumer protection including privacy enforcement. 2771 Ι 2772 think it is a no-brainer and you ought to consider that as 2773 well.

2774 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you.

2775 Mr. Chopra, do you have anything to add to that?

2776 Mr. Chopra. I agree with my colleagues completely.

2777 Mr. Cardenas. Good. That is great. Appointed by

2778 Democrat and Republicans and you all agree on this issue.

Good, good, good, good.

So when it comes to made in the USA, my time is limited so I will cut to the point and the question. I am concerned that the FTC settled on some cases for no money without so much as an admission of liability and some defendants effectively cheated consumers and got away with little more

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2785 than lying about products being made in America. That

(202) 234-4433

2786 obviously has a value on the streets of America. I

2787 personally love to buy made in America products.

But for someone to actually lie about it when they make the product, put it out to market, and then for there not to be any way of them having to pay a price for doing that for duping the American people, Chairman Simons, where are we at with that?

2793 Mr. Simons. Yeah, so historically for decades that has 2794 been the approach that the Commission has pursued in these 2795 made in the USA cases. They have only got injunctive relief. 2796 But we are now going to hold a workshop and look at what we 2797 need to do in terms of beefing up our remedies.

2798 Mr. Cardenas. So hopefully FTC will come out with a 2799 more aggressive, appropriately aggressive stance when it 2800 comes to people lying about made in America.

2801 Mr. Simons. That may very well be the outcome of the 2802 workshop.

2803 Mr. Chopra. Just like in privacy legislation where you 2804 are thinking about civil penalties to deter this conduct, 2805 Congress gave the FTC the power to activate penalties for 2806 made in USA violations 25 years ago. We have not yet turned 2807 that switch on and I hope that we can explore and potentially turn that switch on, because we need to deter this and put a 2808 2809 stop to it, because this absolutely harms every single honest

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2810 manufacturer in America who makes goods here at home.

2811 Mr. Cardenas. Yes.

2812 Ms. Wilson. If I could add one point, the cases that 2813 have been reported on this issue were decided and settled 2814 between staff and the parties before this slate of 2815 commissioners arrived, and as Chairman Simons noted in his 2816 statement, when the settlements were first announced. We do 2817 intend to look at this policy going forward, but the decision 2818 of many of the commissioners was to not upset the work that 2819 had already been done by staff in the previous slate of 2820 commissioners, but to look at this going forward.

2821 Mr. Cardenas. Madam Chair, if I can have 5 seconds.

If someone is willing to lie boldface about made in America, I as a grandparent am afraid that that product might have cheated on other things such as chemicals and other matters that might be involved in the net product that might end up in the hands of my grandchildren or any other American family. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, yield back.

2828 Ms. Schakowsky. Mr. Walberg, I am going to call on you, 2829 1 second.

Let me just point out to the committee that every single member on both sides of the aisle have shown up to this hearing. That doesn't happen all the time and I think it is a tribute to the issue, but also to our commissioners. So I

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2834 want to thank you.

2835 Mr. Walberg is waiving on to our committee. We are 2836 happy to have you and you have 5 minutes.

2837 Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and thank you 2838 for consenting to waiving me on this subcommittee. And while 2839 I am not on the subcommittee, certainly I have an interest in 2840 being a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Ι 2841 appreciate you allowing me this opportunity. Thank you, 2842 each of you, for being here today as well. You have a big job and we wish you well and we hope that we can be 2843 2844 supporters and fellow laborers in making the difference.

2845 I wanted to come here today to ask questions about a 2846 topic very important to me and my constituents and that is 2847 scams against targeting our nation's seniors. Michigan 2848 seniors in my case have spent a lifetime working to save for 2849 financially secure retirements. In the digital age, scams targeting seniors and their hard-earned money are growing in 2850 2851 number and sophistication and safeguarding vulnerable seniors 2852 needs to be a top priority. I am one. It is important to Today, Representative Blunt Rochester, who I believe 2853 me. mentioned this already, she and I will be introducing 2854 2855 legislation, the Stop Senior Scams Act, to help prevent fraudsters from targeting seniors with prepaid or gift card 2856 2857 scams.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2858 While the committee is working on legislation to address 2859 annoying robocalls and that scam our seniors into giving away 2860 their savings or personal information, gift card scams are 2861 another way fraudsters target seniors. Companies like Target 2862 or Wal-Mart are on the front lines against these scams, and 2863 their ability to educate their employees with best practices 2864 and training to recognize the signs of scam can make a huge 2865 difference in stopping a scammer. The Stop Senior Scams Act 2866 would create a forum at the Federal Trade Commission to communicate about best practices like this. 2867

And so, Chairman Simons, I would like to ask you if you could please talk about what the Commission is doing to prevent frauds and scams against seniors and how legislation like this Stop Senior Scams Act would align with the FTC's consumer protection mission.

2873 Mr. Simons. Thank you, Congressman. So this is a 2874 multipronged approach at the FTC. We engage in strenuous 2875 efforts going after these specific scams that target seniors. 2876 We have what is very important, I think, and very effective 2877 is a program of outreach to the senior community and we have 2878 a specific program that was designed called Pass It On, where 2879 we try to kind of essentially deputize senior citizens to help their fellow senior citizens avoid scams. 2880 So they are 2881 talking about it in their local communities and it is on top

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2882 of mind and they know what to watch out for. And your

2883 legislation, you know, it sounds like I couldn't agree more 2884 with the goals of it and I would be happy to work with you on 2885 it.

2886 Mr. Phillips. Congressman.

2887 Mr. Walberg. Yes.

2888 Mr. Phillips. If I could just add one thing, since we 2889 are here in a public hearing and hopefully the public is 2890 paying attention. What I want to say to American consumers 2891 about this critical issue to which you and Congresswoman 2892 Rochester have devoted such important attention, if a 2893 business tells you that you need to pay with a gift card, it 2894 could very well be a scam and people need to be on the 2895 lookout for that. We are going to be doing our jobs, but it 2896 is also important that we communicate to the public.

2897 Mr. Simons. Yeah, the real thing here is if somebody 2898 wants you to pay with a gift card and that is what you are 2899 telling you, it is probably a scam. Gift cards are for

2900 gifts, they are not for forms of payment.

2901 Mr. Walberg. From your lips to seniors' ears then.

2902 Mr. Simons. Yeah.

2903 Mr. Walberg. What developments, Chairman Simons, have 2904 there been in financial scams affecting seniors and how can 2905 the Commission help stop these scams from spreading to larger

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2906 groups of seniors?

2907 Mr. Simons. So these things are just evolving 2908 continually and it is, you know, you stop one type of scam 2909 and another type of scam arises. And so, the trick for us is 2910 to stay on our toes, pay attention to what is going on, and 2911 move to each succeeding new scam.

And one of the things that enables us to do that is our Consumer Sentinel database which is an incredible tool for law enforcement and particularly for dealing with scams. It has an enormous number of complaints in it and shared by us with the local state authorities across the country and it is a great asset.

2918 Mr. Walberg. Okay, any other comments?

2919 Mr. Chopra. I hope that we also start paying closer 2920 attention to how seniors are scammed online. More and more 2921 seniors are also participating in the digital economy, also 2922 connecting with family, and many, especially those who suffer 2923 from diminished capacity can be particularly at risk.

2924 Mr. Walberg. Well, I appreciate that. It is a big 2925 issue and it is not going away and it is expanding. So our 2926 efforts together will be very helpful for the constituents I 2927 represent and those all over this great country.

2928 So, Madam Chairwoman, thank you for allowing me this 2929 time.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2930 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Mr. Walberg.

2931 I just want to -- I am surprised none of you mentioned 2932 that the FTC does do these scam workshops. I don't know if 2933 they are everywhere, but we really have this amazing one in 2934 the Chicago area, Brad Schneider and I. And the FTC 2935 organized it, but brought in a representative of the Attorney 2936 General, various other state agencies, and it was 2937 spectacular. It was chaired by the Federal Trade Commission. 2938 So I don't know if it is in Mr. Walberg's district, but 2939 I would suggest that you ask for one of those. It was really 2940 good.

2941 Mr. Simons. And we would be thrilled to do it.

2942 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. And so, Mr. Rush was here

2943 earlier, but we welcome him back for his 5 minutes of

2944 questions. Mr. Rush?

Mr. Rush. Yeah, I want to thank you, Madam Chair. It has been one of the -- the means of committees that -- those that pull us in a different direction, and some of them when they come in, they come in right before it is over. So I know those who sit patiently were not overwhelmed with enthusiasm when they saw me walk through the door, but it is the way this place operates.

2952 So I want to thank you, Madam Chair, for holding this 2953 hearing. And I want to begin by asking unanimous consent to **NEAL R. GROSS**

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- offer into the record an October 2018 letter from the AMA.
- 2955 So I ask unanimous consent.
- 2956 Ms. Schakowsky. Without objection, so ordered.
- 2957 [The information follows:]
- 2958

2960 Mr. Rush. All right. I want to begin by saying that the FTC 2961 is one of my most favorite agencies in the federal 2962 government. I worked very closely with the FTC particularly

2963 when I chaired this subcommittee some years ago and did some 2964 really good work with the FTC.

2965 But I want to -- Chairman Simons, on October 26, '18, 2966 the AMA sent you a letter encouraging the FTC to monitor 2967 insulin pricing and market competition out of increasing concerns that the rapid rise on the price of insulin may be 2968 2969 attributed to anti-competitiveness rather than research and 2970 development. If, Mr. Chairman, as the letter alleges, if 2971 this is true, how would the FTC respond? And the second part 2972 on the question is have you investigated the claims made in

2973 the AMA letter?

2974 Mr. Simons. Thank you for the question, Congressman. 2975 So I can't respond specifically to any non-public 2976 investigation that is going on, but I will say this. We are 2977 very focused on pricing in the pharmaceutical sector. We 2978 monitor pricing on a monthly basis over a wide range of drugs 2979 to see if there are any anomalies like the one you just 2980 described, and we look specifically to see if they are caused 2981 by anticompetitive activity. And if they are, this is a source of case generation for us, so these are a source of 2982 2983 investigations. So that is the type of, exactly the type of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2984 thing that we could look at.

2985 Mr. Rush. Is there any one of the commissioners that 2986 might want to respond?

2987 Mr. Chopra. Yeah. I think the situation we see with 2988 insulin is it is not isolated. It really, we see it all 2989 I believe in the case of insulin it is really only over. 2990 three players, Eli Lilly, Nova Nordisk, Sanofi, who really 2991 have all the volume. The original patent was sold for three 2992 dollars generations ago.

We see a lot of challenges across the pharmaceutical market with respect to abuse of intellectual property. My colleagues talked about some of the work there. But we have to use all of our tools to crack down on anticompetitive conduct and the fewer and fewer players we have in the market that raises more concerns.

And it just bugs me that some of these treatments are old. Insulin is not dramatically different than it used to be and the fact that people can't get it affordably and are skipping out on it --

3003 Mr. Rush. Right.

3004 Mr. Chopra. -- it is literally killing them.

3005 Mr. Rush. Anybody else?

3006 Mr. Phillips, I understand you had some nice things to

3007 say about me earlier. I really appreciate it. It came

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3008 across my desk.

3009 Absolutely, Congressman. Mr. Phillips. In my opening 3010 statement I talked about the work that we are doing on a 3011 bipartisan basis at the FTC to help deal with the cost of 3012 health care, on the competition side included a lot of really 3013 good work over the last year, a half a billion judgment, an 3014 important antitrust case filed weeks ago, a decision on pay-3015 for-delay settlements which I know have been very important 3016 to you that we issued 5-nothing, just a few weeks ago. So I want you to know from me that the cost of health care and 3017 3018 rooting out anticompetitive conduct in the healthcare 3019 industry is and will remain a focus for all of us. 3020 Mr. Rush. Well, thank you. 3021 Madam Chair, thank you so very much for your indulgence 3022 and I yield back the balance of my time. 3023 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Mr. Rush. 3024 Just a little bit of business left. I request unanimous 3025 consent to enter the following testimony or letters, other 3026 information into the record. Without objection, so ordered. [The information follows:] 3027 3028 3029

Ms. Schakowsky. A letter for the record, Oversight of the Federal Trade Commission: Strengthening Protection for -oh, okay. A letter from the Electronic Privacy Information Center; a letter from Consumer Bankers Association; a letter from the Internet Association; a letter from the National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions; and a letter from the Confidentiality Coalition.

And, finally, I want to thank our ranking member. I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle. And I especially want to thank our witnesses, members of the Federal Trade Commission, for coming here today.

I remind members that pursuant to committee rules they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the record to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. I would ask each witness to respond promptly to any such requests that you may receive.

3046 And at this time, the subcommittee is adjourned.

3047 [Whereupon, at 1:26 p.m., the subcommittee was

3048 adjourned.]