U.S. Chamber of Commerce

1615 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20062-2000
uschamber.com

June 30, 2026

Marty Durbin Written Testimony

Hearing before the U.S. House Committee on Energy & Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade on "American Leadership in Emerging Technologies and Global Competitiveness"

Chairman Bilirakis, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the opportunity to share the views of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on American leadership in emerging technologies and global competitiveness. We commend the Committee for its continued leadership on the policies needed to strengthen American innovation, protect consumers, support small businesses, and ensure the United States leads in the development and deployment of emerging technologies.

New and emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, robotics, and quantum computing, are already reshaping many sectors of the economy. They help manufacturers improve productivity, small businesses compete at greater scale, health care providers deliver better services, energy companies manage complex systems, and financial institutions strengthen risk management and customer service. These technologies also sit at the center of an intensifying global competition over economic leadership, national security, standards-setting, and the values that will guide the next era of innovation. America must lead in these areas to secure economic growth and global influence.

The Chamber believes the United States must meet this moment with a clear, durable, and pro-innovation policy agenda. That means advancing risk-based, technology-neutral rules; avoiding fragmented and conflicting regulatory regimes; protecting privacy and intellectual property; supporting workforce preparedness; modernizing permitting and energy infrastructure; and resisting foreign regulatory models that would burden American businesses and diminish U.S. leadership. We are pleased to outline critical items for Congress to consider as it seeks to advance these objectives.

I. Data is Foundational to Technology and Consumer Privacy Must be Protected

Data is foundational to today's digital economy, and for artificial intelligence to be its most effective, we must have quality data sets. To assure we accomplish this in a way that effectively protects consumer privacy, we believe Congress must enact a single national privacy law that protects all Americans equally and provides certainty for businesses of all sizes.

Unfortunately, a patchwork of privacy and AI laws threatens to hold back U.S. technology leadership. We know, for example, that small businesses who use more digital tools, including AI, are growing in terms of revenue and employees, and according to the Chamber's *Empowering Small Business* report, 65% of small businesses are concerned a fragmented regulatory landscape will drive up litigation and compliance costs.[1] To get AI policy right, companies must have certainty about how the data used for AI systems is governed.

For this reason, the Chamber supports H.R. 8413, the "SECURE Data Act," which is based upon the Consensus Privacy Approach adopted with bipartisan support in more than 23 states.

[1] https://www.uschamber.com/assets/documents/Empowering-Small-Business-Report-2025.pdf

The SECURE Data Act would provide baseline limitations on how companies use data, give consumers the ability to delete and opt out of certain types of AI-driven decisions, and would provide heightened protections for sensitive data. Most importantly, the SECURE Data Act would establish a single national standard. We urge this Committee to quickly advance the SECURE Data Act.

II. Artificial Intelligence: A Risk-Based Framework to Support Innovation and Trust

AI is a transformational technology with the potential to expand opportunity, increase productivity, accelerate scientific discovery, improve services, and help businesses of all sizes compete in a more dynamic global marketplace. The Chamber supports a policy approach that enables responsible AI adoption while addressing significant risks. In 2023, the Chamber's Commission on AI Competitiveness, Inclusion, and Innovation developed a policy roadmap for AI regulation, workforce development, and global competitiveness.[2]

The right framework for AI should be risk-based, proportionate, and focused on intended use. Not every AI application presents the same level of risk, and policy should reflect that reality. A tool used for routine business analytics should not be regulated in the same way as those used for more consequential decisions like healthcare, housing, and employment. Oversight should focus on outcomes, material risks, and accountable deployment rather than prescriptive mandates that lock in today's assumptions and slow tomorrow's breakthroughs.

A sound Federal AI framework should include several core principles:

[2]https://www.uschamber.com/assets/documents/CTEC_AICommission2023_Report_v5.pdf

- **National consistency.** Businesses operating across state lines need clear rules of the road. A patchwork of conflicting state AI laws would create uncertainty, raise compliance costs, discourage investment, and make it harder for small businesses to adopt beneficial tools.

- **Recognize and Utilize Existing Laws.** Existing federal and state laws, such as those addressing consumer protection, privacy, and anti-discrimination, provide effective tools to address harms that involve AI and to hold bad actors accountable for harms caused by all types of technology. Policymakers should recognize and utilize those laws before proposing new regulations.

- **Risk-based governance.** When novel harms arise from the development and deployment of AI and there is no existing remedy in current law, policymakers should avoid one-size-fits-all legislative or regulatory approaches and instead distinguish between lower-risk applications and high-impact uses where more targeted safeguards may be appropriate. Last year Congress did just that when it enacted the TAKE IT DOWN Act to criminalize the distribution of deepfake non-consensual intimate images.

- **Promotion of Open Source A**I. Open source technologies have had tremendous value in spurring innovation. We commend Representative Evans for recognizing the value of promoting U.S. open source models in his Open-Source AI Leadership Act.

- **Public-private partnership.** Government, industry, academia, and civil society all have important roles in developing standards, best practices, and practical governance mechanisms.

- **Workforce readiness.** The United States must invest in education, training, and reskilling so workers and entrepreneurs can benefit from AI-driven growth.
- **International leadership.** The United States should lead in global AI governance and work with allies to promote democratic values, open markets, and innovation-friendly standards.

The Chamber supports Federal leadership to prevent regulatory fragmentation and provide clarity to entrepreneurs and businesses of all sizes. Congress should build on that work by advancing a balanced national framework that encourages responsible AI deployment, protects consumers, promotes competition, and sustains U.S. leadership.

The alternative is to allow other jurisdictions to define the rules for American innovators. Europe's highly prescriptive regulatory approach risks fragmenting global AI governance, deterring investment, and burdening businesses striving to innovate and compete. The United States should not import that model as the European Commission's own studies have recognized technology overregulation has contributed to economic stagnation.[3] Instead, we should lead with a framework that is practical and capable of adapting as technology evolves.

III. Robotics: Strengthening U.S. Competitiveness, Security, and Industrial Capacity

Robotics is increasingly tied to AI, advanced sensors, semiconductors, manufacturing systems, logistics, agriculture, health care, defense, and critical infrastructure. As robotic

[3] https://commission.europa.eu/topics/competitiveness/draghi-report_en

systems become more capable and connected, they will play a growing role in productivity, supply chain resilience, workplace safety, and national competitiveness.

The Chamber supports policies that help the United States lead in the development, deployment, and commercialization of robotics. That requires a comprehensive approach that strengthens domestic innovation, secures supply chains, supports advanced manufacturing, and ensures that regulatory frameworks keep pace with the technology without stifling its benefits.

Several priorities should guide congressional action:

- **Promote domestic innovation and deployment.** Robotics can help companies improve safety, expand production, and compete globally. Federal policy should encourage adoption across sectors rather than create unnecessary barriers.
- **Protect critical infrastructure and sensitive facilities.** As robotic systems become more connected, policymakers should address legitimate cybersecurity, data security, and supply chain risks, especially where foreign-controlled systems could create vulnerabilities.
- **Strengthen supply chains.** The robotics ecosystem depends on components, software, sensors, rare earth inputs, batteries, semiconductors, and advanced manufacturing capacity. The United States should reduce strategic dependencies and build more resilient supply chains.

The United States faces a coordinated global competition in robotics. Other nations are pairing government-directed industrial policy with aggressive efforts to dominate data,

manufacturing, component supply chains, and end markets. Congress should respond with a serious, bipartisan strategy that supports American companies, protects U.S. security, and ensures that robotics advances economic growth rather than dependence on foreign competitors. For this reason, we are encouraged by the approach taken in H.R. 7334, National Commission on Robotics Act that is before this Committee today.

IV. Quantum Computing: Preparing for the Next Strategic Technology Frontier

Quantum computing is an emerging technology with significant implications for cybersecurity, cryptologic security, materials science, logistics, drug discovery, energy systems, financial modeling, and national security. While many commercial applications are still developing, the policy choices made today will shape whether the United States leads in quantum research, commercialization, standards, and security. We applaud President Trump's recent executive order to accelerate government adoption of quantum.[4]

The Chamber believes quantum policy should be built around the same core principle that should guide AI and other emerging technologies: America must innovate faster, smarter, and with greater coordination than our competitors.

The Federal government should prioritize:

- **Sustained Federal research and development.** Quantum technology requires long-term investment in basic research, applied science, testbeds, and commercialization pathways.

[4] https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2026/06/ushering-in-the-next-frontier-of-quantum-innovation/

- **Public-private collaboration.** The Federal Government should work closely with companies, universities, national labs, and standards-setting bodies to accelerate practical deployment.
- **Cybersecurity preparedness.** Quantum computing may create new risks for existing encryption systems. Policymakers should support a practical transition to quantum-resistant security standards while avoiding unnecessary mandates that outpace readiness.
- **Talent development.** Quantum leadership will depend on a skilled workforce across physics, mathematics, engineering, computer science, cybersecurity, and manufacturing.
- **Commercialization and scale.** The United States must move from research leadership to market leadership by improving access to capital, infrastructure, procurement pathways, and cross-sector partnerships.

Quantum and AI are increasingly interconnected. AI can help advance quantum research, and quantum computing may eventually expand the capabilities of AI and advanced analytics. Similarly, advances in quantum science and AI will provide reciprocal advances in security in both areas. The stakes are not limited to any single industry. They extend to the Nation's economic strength, security, and global leadership for the next generation of technology.

V. Energy, Permitting, and Infrastructure Are Core Technology Issues

The Committee's jurisdiction places it at the center of a critical reality: leadership in emerging technologies will be determined by who can marshal the most abundant, reliable, and

affordable energy. AI, data centers, semiconductor manufacturing, robotics production, quantum research facilities, cloud computing, and advanced manufacturing all require significant power, modern infrastructure, and a regulatory environment that allows the United States to build at the speed the moment demands.

Permitting reform is one of the U.S. Chamber's top legislative priorities, and Congress must treat energy and permitting reform as foundational components of technology policy — not peripheral concerns. If America cannot build transmission, generation, manufacturing facilities, data centers, and related infrastructure in a timely manner, we will constrain our own innovation economy. Without decisive action, the U.S. will cede global leadership in emerging technologies and undermine American competitiveness.

Congress should advance policies that:

- Modernize permitting to be more efficient, transparent, predictable, and promote meaningful stakeholder engagement.
- Support investment in reliable and affordable energy.
- Enable infrastructure development needed for AI, robotics, quantum computing, and advanced manufacturing.
- Preserve certainty for long-term private investment.
- Ensure that environmental goals are pursued through practical, durable, and growth-oriented policy.

- Encourage the responsible siting, construction, and operation of data centers while avoiding unnecessary restrictions or moratoriums that only create obstacles to economic growth and global competitiveness.

A regulatory and permitting framework that matches America's technological ambitions must allow innovators to build, deploy, and scale here in the United States.

VI. The European Union's Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive: A Warning Against Extraterritorial Overreach

We also appreciate the opportunity to address the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive, often referred to as CS3D or CSDDD. While the Chamber supports responsible business conduct the EU's approach raises serious concerns for American businesses, transatlantic trade, and foundational principles of international law.

Last Thursday, Chairmen Guthrie, Jordan, and Hill sent a letter to the EU Ambassador to the United States opposing CS3D's extraterritorial overreach and the Chamber thanks the Chairmen for this important and timely action. We strongly echo the Chairmen's call for the EU to remove the Directive's extraterritorial provisions, and we are pleased to see Congress defend American businesses from duplicative, burdensome, and unjustified regulatory mandates imposed from abroad.[5]The Chamber has called for fundamental changes to CS3D and its companion legislation Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) which requires

[5] See June 22, 2026 letter from American Council for Capital Formation, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, International Franchise Association, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, and Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America. Joint-Trade-Association-Letter-to-the-House-Energy-Commerce-and-Senate-Foreign-Relations-Committees-June-2026.pdf

companies to report on Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions. Recent changes to CS3D, including the deletion of climate transition plan mandates and rejection of the EU-wide civil liability regime, represent progress toward a more balanced framework. However, major concerns remain, most concerningly the directive's extraterritorial reach.

CS3D challenges traditional principles of sovereignty in international law and would impose EU regulatory requirements on company activities with no territorial nexus to the EU. That approach creates global legal uncertainty, conflicts with U.S. law and governance principles, and burdens businesses operating across global supply chains. It also threatens to export a prescriptive European regulatory model in ways that could undermine American competitiveness and disrupt trade and investment.

The Chamber's concerns include:

- **Extraterritorial application.** The EU should limit the Directive's scope to companies incorporated or headquartered in the EU and to activities conducted within EU territory. The current framework exports EU regulations on conduct occurring entirely outside Europe.
- **Legal uncertainty.** Companies may face conflicting obligations across global jurisdictions, making compliance more costly and less predictable.
- **Civil liability exposure.** While the EU-wide civil liability regime was rejected in recent amendments, broad and ambiguous liability standards in individual Member States still encourage excessive and expensive litigation against U.S. companies rather than practical compliance.

- **Regulatory overlap.** American companies already face extensive sustainability, disclosure, corporate governance, supply chain, and sector-specific rules. Duplicative mandates increase costs without necessarily improving outcomes. For example, corporate disclosure in the U.S. has been guided for decades by the principle of materiality[6] which is often not recognized in EU regulations.

- **Impact on U.S. businesses and supply chains.** Companies, including firms that are not primarily based in Europe, may face significant burdens because of global operations, contractual relationships, or supply chain connections.

The Chamber urges Congress and the Administration to continue engaging with the EU constructively to address these concerns. Transatlantic cooperation is essential, but cooperation must be built on mutual respect, territorial jurisdiction, regulatory compatibility, and a commitment to growth. Sustainability objectives should not be pursued through rules that create conflicts of law, weaken competitiveness, or impose disproportionate burdens on companies outside the EU.

Congress has showed great interest in shielding U.S. businesses from the most concerning aspects of CS3D and CSRD. Rep. Fitzgerald's PROTECT Act, for example, seeks to address the extraterritorial threat of CS3D and CSRD. We appreciate the focus of the PROTECT Act and welcome some of the changes contained in the most recent version of this legislation - in particular removal of a private right of action against U.S. businesses. We also appreciate the updated provisions of the PROTECT Act to guard against legal action that could potentially be

6 U.S. Chamber report on materiality standard (2017) U.S.-Chamber-Essential-Information_Materiality-Report-W_FINAL.pdf

taken against U.S. businesses for complying with the bill. We look forward to working with Rep. Fitzgerald and all members of this Committee as the legislative process moves forward.

Recently, China has expanded its anti-extraterritoriality framework to prohibit or penalize compliance with foreign rules deemed to infringe its sovereignty, exposing Chinese entities, including foreign-invested subsidiaries, to sanctions and civil liability for adhering to regimes such as the CS3D. China has further restricted supply-chain investigations and data collection in terms broad enough to capture traceability, audits, and due-diligence activities required under CSDDD. As a result, U.S. companies may face liability within the EU without being able to gather the evidence needed to demonstrate compliance while the most serious risks remain unexamined; in practice, enforcement and litigation are likely to shift toward more transparent jurisdictions, such as the EU and United States, rather than the higher-risk environments the CS3D is intended to address.

Like CS3D, the EU Methane Emissions Regulation (EUMR) extends EU regulatory requirements beyond European borders — requiring importers of oil and gas, including U.S. LNG exporters, to report producer-level emissions data and meet methane intensity standards that remain undefined, with non-compliance penalties of up to 20% of an importer's total worldwide revenues. As written, the regulation would force exclusion of 43% of Europe's imported gas and 87% of crude imports, and 50% of refinery throughputs would vanish, causing gasoline prices to increase by 25%.[7] The EUMR similarly captures companies based on their commercial relationship with the EU market rather than any meaningful territorial nexus, creating

[7] https://iogpeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/EU-Methane-Emissions-Regulation-Study-1.pdf; MER Study Press Release FINAL

overlapping layers of compliance obligations that raise costs, introduce legal uncertainty, and have already begun stalling contract negotiations between U.S. exporters and European buyers. In fact, at the EU Energy Council Meeting last Friday, seventeen of the EU member states supported a statement to postpone implementation of the EUMR by three years, citing energy security concerns.[8]

Taken together, CS3D and the EUMR reflect a broader and accelerating pattern of EU extraterritorial overreach that places American companies at a structural competitive disadvantage. Congress and the Administration must treat these two directives not as isolated trade irritants, but as part of a coordinated regulatory trend that, left unaddressed, risks allowing Brussels rather than Washington to set the rules of global commerce. CS3D also provides a broader lesson for emerging technology policy. The United States should not allow foreign regulatory models to become the default global standard when those models are overly prescriptive, extraterritorial, or disconnected from innovation. Whether the issue is AI, robotics, quantum computing, digital markets, sustainability due diligence, or data governance, the United States must lead with policies that reflect our values: openness, competition, private-sector innovation, accountable governance, and the rule of law.

VII. Recommended Congressional Actions

To strengthen American leadership in AI, robotics, quantum computing, and emerging technology policy, the Chamber urges Congress to pursue the following priorities:

[8] https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-10728-2026-REV-1/en/pdf

1. **Pass the SECURE Data Act**. Congress must quickly pass the SECURE Data Act to provide all Americans real, tangible, and workable privacy protections and provide certainty for businesses.

2. **Establish a national AI framework.** Congress and the Administration should prevent a fragmented state-by-state approach and enact a risk-based framework that protects consumers while enabling innovation.

3. **Reject prescriptive regulations that freezes technology in place.** Emerging technologies evolve quickly. Rules should be flexible, outcomes-focused, and based on evidence.

4. **Support industry-led standards and public-private partnerships.** Voluntary standards, best practices, and technical guidance can often address risks more effectively than rigid mandates.

5. **Advance a national strategy for robotics.** Congress should support domestic deployment that ensures global competitiveness and worker safety as well as adopt the National Commission on Robotics Act.

6. **Accelerate quantum readiness.** Federal policy should support R&D, commercialization, quantum-safe cybersecurity, and the talent pipeline.

7. **Modernize permitting and energy infrastructure.** America's technology future depends on the ability to build the physical and digital infrastructure needed to power innovation.

8. **Strengthen workforce development.** AI, robotics, and quantum will require new skills across industries. Congress should support employer-led training, education partnerships, and pathways into technology-enabled careers.

9. **Promote U.S. leadership in global standards.** The United States should lead international discussions on emerging technology governance and ensure that rules reflect democratic values, open markets, and innovation.

10. **Push back against extraterritorial foreign regulation.** Congress and the Administration should oppose foreign laws, including problematic elements of CS3D, that impose burdens on U.S. companies outside appropriate jurisdictional limits.

VIII. Conclusion

The United States has the talent, companies, research institutions, capital markets, and entrepreneurial culture needed to lead the next era of technology. But leadership is not guaranteed. It will require Federal policy that encourages innovation, provides regulatory certainty, protects consumers, strengthens national security, and resists approaches that would burden American businesses or cede global rulemaking to others.

AI, robotics, and quantum computing are not isolated policy issues. They are central to America's economic and national security. They will shape productivity, industrial capacity, energy demand, small-business growth, workforce opportunity, and global competitiveness. At the same time, foreign regulatory efforts such as CS3D underscore the importance of defending U.S. companies from extraterritorial mandates that create legal uncertainty and weaken transatlantic commerce.

The Chamber stands ready to work with the Committee, Congress, the Administration, and stakeholders across the economy to advance a policy framework that allows the United States to innovate, compete, and lead.