

H.R. 2161

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), as amended by Public Law 104-17, is amended by striking "August 15, 1995," and inserting "October 1, 1995."

(b) CONSULTATION.—For purposes of any exercise of the authority provided in section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) prior to August 16, 1995, the written policy justification dated June 1, 1995, and submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 583(b)(1) of such Act, and the consultations associated with such policy justification, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 583(b)(1) of such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2161 temporarily extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, which otherwise will expire on August 15, 1995.

That act was previously extended by Public Law 104-17, which we passed in June. H.R. 2161 extends the Act until October 1, 1995, and further provides that the consultations with the Congress that took place in June prior to the President's last exercise of the authority provided by the Act will suffice for purposes of a further exercise of that authority prior to August 16.

In consultation with our Senate colleagues, we have decided to extend the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act only through October 1 because we hope to complete action by that date on legislation that will include a longer term extension of the authorities of the act, along with strengthened requirements for compliance with commitments that were voluntarily assumed.

I urge my colleagues to agree to the adoption of H.R. 2161.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the rest of the evening.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to begin debate on the rule for the Telco bill.

There will be a vote on the rule in about an hour. After that vote, which should be the last vote of the evening, we will do the general debate on Telco for about 90 minutes. We will then consider a Bliley amendment for 30 minutes, a Stupak amendment for 10 minutes, and a Cox amendment for 20 minutes, and all those votes will be rolled until tomorrow morning. So all Members should be alert for a vote in about an hour, and those Members who are interested in being involved in the general debate on Telco or those amendments mentioned should be prepared to continue working on the floor until we complete that work.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, what bill will be up in the morning at what time?

Mr. ARMEY. In the morning when we reconvene, we will reconvene on Labor-HHS, and hope to finish that bill tomorrow.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1555, COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 207

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1555) to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed ninety minutes equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the

Committee of the Whole. If that amendment is adopted, the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment printed in part 2 of the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 1555, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 652 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 1555 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendments to S. 652 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 207 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995, and allowing 90 minutes of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Commerce and Judiciary Committees. The rule waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule also makes in order as an original bill for

the purpose of amendment, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Commerce and provides that the amendment be considered as read. House Resolution 207 also waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI—prohibiting appropriation in an authorization bill—and section 302(f) of the Budget Act—against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

House Resolution 207 provides first for the consideration of the amendment printed in Part 1 of the Rules Committee report. This amendment, which will be offered by Commerce Committee Chairman BLILEY, is debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided between a proponent and an opponent, and provides that the amendment be considered as read. The manager's amendment shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the whole.

After general debate and the consideration of the manager's amendment, the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. House Resolution 207 makes in order only the amendments printed in part 2 of the Rules Committee report in the order specified, by the Members designated in the report, debatable for the time specified in the report to be equally divided between a proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The rule waives all points of order against amendments printed in the report, and provides that these amendments shall not be subject to division of the question in the House or Committee of the Whole nor subject to amendment unless otherwise specified in the report.

This rule allows the chair to postpone votes in the Committee of the Whole and reduce votes to 5 minutes, if those votes follow a 15-minute vote. Finally, this resolution provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as in the right of the minority.

Following final passage of H.R. 1555, the rule provides for the immediate consideration of S. 652 and waives all points of order against the bill. The rule allows for a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of S. 652 and insert H.R. 1555 as passed by the House and waives all points of order against that motion. Finally, it is in order for the House to insist on its amendments to S. 652 and request a conference with the Senate.

I would also ask for unanimous consent to add any extraneous materials for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1555 is a complex piece of legislation, and the final product that passes the House has been designed to ensure that the United States maintains the lead on the information superhighway as we move into the 21st century. The House has worked to cre-

ate a balanced bill which equalizes the diverse competitive forces in the telecommunications industry. The complexity and balance of this legislation requires a structured rule, because it is conceivable that a simply constructed amendment would attract enough votes, on the face of it, to upset the balance of the bill.

Let me take this opportunity to commend the diligent work of Chairman BLILEY, Chairman FIELDS, and Chairman HYDE, and also recognize ranking minority members JOHN DINGELL and JOHN CONYERS, for their service in guiding this fair balanced legislation to the House floor.

The overriding goal of telecommunication reform legislation must be to encourage the competition that will produce innovative technologies for every American household and provide benefits to the American consumer in the form of lower prices and enhanced services. The House Telecommunications bill will promote competition in the market for local telephone service by requiring local telephone companies to offer competitors access to parts of their networks, drive competition in the multichannel video market by empowering telephone companies to provide video programming, and maintain and encourage the competitiveness of over the air broadcast stations. The American people will be amazed by the wide array of technological changes that will soon be available in their homes.

The massive barriers to competition and the restrictions that were necessary less than a decade ago to protect segments of the U.S. economy have served their purpose. We have achieved great advances and lead the world in telecommunications services. However, productive societies strengthen and nourish the spirit of innovation and competition, and I believe that H.R. 1555 will provide customers with more choices in new products and result in tremendous benefits to all consumers.

In order to achieve further balance and deregulation in H.R. 1555, the rule will allow the House an opportunity to debate a manager's amendment to be offered by Commerce Committee Chairman BLILEY. This amendment represents a compromise that will accelerate the transition to a fully competitive telecommunications marketplace. This amendment is not a part of the base text, it will be debated thoroughly, and it will be judged by a vote on the floor of the House.

Following the consideration of the manager's amendment, the rule allows for the consideration of a number of divisive amendments that focus on cable television price controls, re-regulating cable broadcast ownership, and provisions for regulation of violence and gratuitous sexual images on local television that may be constrained by technology.

The Rules Committee has made seven amendments in order in part 2 of the

Rules report, including five minority amendments, a bipartisan amendment, and one majority amendment. A number of the amendments offered to the Rules Committee were duplicative, some were withdrawn and some were incorporated into the manager's amendment. In addition, some amendments have already been included in the Senate bill, and it is important to note that there will be room for negotiation in conference.

The rule makes in order an amendment—to be debated for 20 minutes—offered by Representatives COX and WYDEN which would ensure that online service providers who take steps to clean up the Internet are not subject to additional liability for being Good Samaritans. The rule also makes in order an amendment—to be debated for 10 minutes—offered by Representative STUPAK which involves local governments and charges for public rights of way.

The rule also allows for an amendment offered by the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, which would enhance the role of the Justice Department with regard to the Bell Companies applying for authorization to enter currently prohibited lines of business. The chairmen of the Commerce and Judiciary Committees have worked diligently to reconcile this issue, and it was decided that the Department of Justice should receive a consultative role. Nonetheless, the rule permits Members the opportunity to vote on this measure.

We have also been extremely responsive to the requests of the ranking minority member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, Mr. MARKEY, by allowing all three of the amendments he requested. Mr. MARKEY has a different, more regulatory view of the future of the telecommunications industry, and he has been afforded every opportunity to revise the bill by offering three rather controversial amendments. The first amendment—to be debated for 30 minutes—would amend the bill by changing the standard for unreasonable rates and imposing rate controls on the cable industry. While the goal of this legislation is to reduce regulations, the rule will reverse the deregulatory cable provisions in H.R. 1555.

The second amendment—to be considered for 30 minutes—would retain the current broadcast cable ownership rule and scale back the audience reach cap in H.R. 1555 from 50 to 35 percent. While I believe that this amendment would selectively weaken the broadcast deregulation provisions in the bill, this is an issue that concerns many Members of this House and deserves a full and open debate.

There will be a substantive debate over provisions for regulating certain violent and sexual images on television through technological constraints. While there is evidence that the increasing amount of violent and sexual content on television has an adverse

impact on our society and especially children, the House has two options to consider in this debate. Mr. MARKEY has been granted the opportunity to offer an amendment requiring the establishment of a television rating code and the manufacture of certain televisions, which many fear will require a government-controlled rating system. The House will also have the opportunity to vote for a substitute offered by Representative COBURN that utilizes a private industry approach that does not impose strict, Washington-based mandates which raise difficult first amendment questions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation will be remembered as the most

deregulatory legislation in history. The goal of this legislation is to create wide open competition between the various telecommunications industries, and this legislation in its final form will undoubtedly encourage a new era of opportunity for every company involved in the telecommunications industry and many companies heretofore unheard of.

Those nations that have achieved the most impressive growth in the past have not been those with rigid government controls, nor those that are the most affluent in natural resources. The most extraordinary development has come in those nations that have put their trust in the power and potential

of the marketplace. This bill states that government authority and mandates are not beneficial to economic development, and it will help assure this Nation's prosperity well into the 21st century.

The resolution that was favorably reported out of the Rules Committee is a fair rule that will allow for thorough consideration on a number of amendments. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of this extraordinarily important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of August 2, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	41	72
Modified Closed ³	49	47	14	24
Closed ⁴	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	57	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of August 2, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-188 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO		Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956		A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95)
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95)
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95)
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of August 2, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 233-104 (8/2/95)

Codes: O—open rule; MO—modified open rule; MC—modified closed rule; C—closed rule; A—adoption vote; D—defeated; PQ—previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

□ 2245

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

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this modified closed rule for the consideration of this landmark deregulatory telecommunications legislation for several reasons.

First, there is no legitimate need—there is no compelling reason—for us to consider H.R. 1555, during one of the busiest weeks we have experienced this year. There is absolutely no urgency at all attached to the passage of this bill before we adjourn.

Quite simply, we ought not to be debating this rule and this bill tonight. There are many more good reasons to put this legislation over until our return in September than there are for taking it up now.

Debating landmark legislation, which completely rewrites our existing communications laws, in the dead of night, squeezed carefully between major appropriations bills that should have first priority, is outrageous on its face.

We feel strongly that a bill with the enormous economic, political, and cultural consequences for the Nation as does H.R. 1555, should receive far more time for consideration than this bill will be allowed.

Second, there is not enough time allowed to properly consider the several very major amendments that have been made in order. For example, we shall have only 30 minutes to consider the Markey-Shays amendment to increase cable consumer protection in H.R. 1555, an amendment which seeks to guard consumers against unfair monopolistic pricing.

The sponsors of the amendment testified that H.R. 1555, as written, completely unravels the protections that cable consumers currently enjoy, and that their amendment is needed to ensure that competition exists before all regulation is eliminated. This is a very substantive amendment, dealing with an industry that affects the great majority of Americans. It certainly deserves more time for serious debate than we are giving it tonight.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most troubling part of the bill is its treatment of media ownership, and its promotion of mergers and concentration of power. The bill would remove all limits on the number of radio stations a single company could own, and would raise the ceiling on the number of television households a single broadcaster is allowed to serve.

It would also remove longstanding restrictions that have prevented tele-

vision broadcasters from owning radio stations, newspapers, and cable systems in the same market.

Thus Mr. MARKEY'S amendment limiting the number of television stations that one media company could reach to 35 percent of the Nation's households, and prohibiting a broadcaster from owning a cable system in a market where it owns a television station, is especially important—and, since it could lead to a single person or a single company's owning an enormous number of television stations or media outlets in the country, this is an issue too that deserves far more than the 30 minutes the rule allows for it to be discussed and debated.

As the New York Times editorialized today, the bill "would for the first time allow a single company to buy a community's newspaper, cable service, television station and, in rural areas, its telephone company. It threatens to hand over to one company control of the community's source of news and entertainment."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we also oppose the rule because it does not allow Members to address all the major questions that should be involved in this debate. This rule limits to 6, the number of amendments that may be offered.

We fully understand and respect the need to structure the rule for this enormously complex and technical bill; but we do believe that, in limiting the time devoted to this bill, the majority incorrectly prevented the consideration of significant amendments that address legitimate questions.

When the Rules Committee met late yesterday on this rule, we sought to make those amendments in order. I would add that we did not seek to make every one of the 30 to 40 amendments submitted in order—as I have already mentioned, we understand the need to structure this rule.

But the committee defeated, by a bipartisan vote of 5 to 6, our request to make in order the amendment submitted by Mr. MORAN that prohibits the FCC from undertaking the rulemaking that could preempt local governments from regulating the construction of cellular towers. The Members of the House should have the opportunity to vote on this amendment—and Mr. MORAN deserves to have the opportunity to offer it.

The amendment addresses the very important concerns of localities who believe this issue is properly within the jurisdiction of local zoning laws. It is endorsed by the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the American Planning Association. Many local jurisdictions have

contacted us this week in favor of this amendment, and we feel the committee made a mistake, Mr. Speaker, by not allowing it to be discussed on the floor.

We attempted unsuccessfully to make in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], eliminating the ban on joint marketing of long distance service and Bell operating company-supplied local exchange service. Mr. HALL deserves time to explain his amendment and let the Members decide for themselves whose interests are best served by his amendment.

The majority also denied making in order the Orton-Morella affordable access amendment, which adds affordability to the requirement for preserving access for elementary and secondary students to the information highway.

The amendment is strongly supported by education agencies and organizations, and we feel that the sponsors deserved the chance to present their arguments for the amendment to the House. We should not have acquiesced to the arguments of industry representatives that these affordable access requirements should not be debated because the implications are not known. That is why we have debates—so that both sides can explain their position. Unfortunately, in these cases, we were able to hear only one side.

So, Mr. Speaker, we believe our Members have legitimate amendments that should have been made in order by this rule, and we regret the decision to shut them out of this important debate.

With respect to the amendments that were made in order, Mr. Speaker, we are very disturbed that the commitment to ensure a vote on Mr. MARKEY'S V-chip amendment was not properly honored. While his amendment is in order, the Coburn substitute, which is much weaker, will be voted on first; if it is adopted, Mr. MARKEY is denied the right to have an up or down vote on his very important amendment.

Members should be allowed a clean vote on the Markey amendment, which is by far the stronger of the two. Whether or not parents are given the ability to block violent television shows so their young children cannot watch them is an important issue, and we should not allow the vote to be represented as something it is not. The rule is very unfair in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1555 is a very complex piece of legislation; very few Members understand the implications of this bill, and I would suggest that we might very well come to regret its consideration in this hurried and inadequate manner.

We all know that changes need to be made in our 60 year old communications law. But we should be concerned about the process under which this bill is being brought to the floor tonight. Not only has a manager's amendment been developed out of the public's eye, but it was done after the committee with jurisdiction overwhelmingly reported quite a different bill.

We should all be concerned about the process under which a bill with huge economic consequences and implications for consumers and business interests is being rushed through the House. The testimony of over 40 Members before the Rules Committee demonstrates the complexities involved in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the final version of this bill does balance the introduction of competitive markets, with measures designed to protect consumers. We have heard from all sides involved, and every industry has valid points to make. I do hope, however, that we do not lose sight of the consumer in this process, and of the need to protect the people from potential monopoly abuses.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose the rule—not only because it is restrictive, but because it does not go far enough in ensuring that enough time is given to this important debate, and because it does not protect the right of Members to offer amendments pertaining to all of the major issues of this very complicated piece of legislation.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] I really am surprised at his testimony here. As my colleague knows, first of all we have 8½ hours allocated for this piece of legislation. We extended that for another hour to take into consideration the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], our good friend, because he is a ranking Member, and he was entitled to his major amendment.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Of course he was.

Mr. SOLOMON. Now we expanded it for 1 hour. That meant we were spending 9½ hours on this bill. It puts us here until 2:30 in the morning today, and many of us will stay here while many of our colleagues leave, and we will finish that part of the bill.

Now, if we had made in order all of those amendments that the gentleman just read off, we would be 19 hours. I figured out the time, 19 hours.

Now the gentleman knows we are going to be here until 6 o'clock in the morning tomorrow night and into Friday, and my colleague and other Members have asked me from the gentleman's side of the aisle to tighten things down, let us take care of the major amendments. We negotiated with the majority, we negotiated with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], we negotiated with the gentle-

man's Democratic leadership. Everyone was happy, and all of a sudden we come on this floor here now and nobody is happy.

□ 2400

Let us stick to our points. If we make a deal upstairs in the Rules Committee, let us live by it.●

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] has 17½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will have a different view than my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEILENSEN]. I rise in support of this rule. It makes in order the key amendments that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and others have asked for.

Mr. Speaker, I also would have liked to have seen more debate on these amendments, but, on balanced, I think it is a fair rule and I urge my colleagues to support it.

If we are going to make technology work for our economy and for our country, and especially for our families, our laws have to keep pace with the changing times, and I believe the bill before us today will help bring this country into the 21st century. From the beginning, Mr. Speaker, telecommunication reform has been about one thing, it has been about competition.

We all know the more competition we have will lead to better products, better prices, better services and the better use of technology for everybody. Above all, competition helps create more jobs and better jobs for our economy. Studies show that this bill will help create 3.4 million additional jobs over the next 10 years and lay the groundwork for technology that will help to create millions more.

Let us be honest, Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill before us today. There are lots of improvements that can be made, and I want to suggest a couple of them to you tonight.

First, we have an important amendment on the V-chip. Studies tell us that by the time the average child finishes elementary school he or she will have seen 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence on the television. Most parents do all they can to keep their kids away from violent programming, but in this age of two-job parents and 200 channel televisions, parents need some help. Fortunately, we do have technology today that will help. The V-chip is a small computer chip that, for about 17 cents, can be inserted into a TV set and it allows the parents to block out violent programming.

This V-chip, Mr. Speaker, is based on some very simple principles: That parents raise children, not government, not advertisers, and not network executives, and parents should be the ones to choose what kinds of shows come into their homes.

Second, I believe we should do all we can to keep our airwaves from falling into the hands of the wealthy and the powerful. Current law limits the number of television stations, one per person or media company can reach, to 25 percent of the Nation's households. That rule was established to promote the free exchange of diverse views and ideas. The bill before us today, however, would literally allow one person, in any given area, to own two television stations, unlimited number of radio stations, the local newspaper and local cable systems. Instead of the 25 percent limit under this bill, Rupert Murdoch could literally own media outlets that reach to over half of America's households, Mr. Speaker. In other words, this bill allows Mr. Murdoch to control what 50 percent of American households read, hear, and see, and that is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] will offer an amendment to set that limit to 35 percent, and, frankly, I don't think this amendment goes far enough. I believe we need to address broader issues, such as who controls our networks, who controls our newspapers, and who controls our radios.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we would have liked to have seen a tougher amendment, but I urge my colleagues to support the Markey amendment on concentration, and, Mr. Speaker, this bill has been around a long time. It has been a long time in coming, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my colleague on the Rules Committee.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] and congratulate him for his fine work on an extremely complex rule that took a lot of work to get done, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] as well, and I am delighted there is support on both sides of the aisle, for it deserves it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule also, and I will use my time to indulge in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the honorable chairman of the Committee on Commerce, because two points have come up in discussion today regarding local government authority which I think can be clarified and need to be clarified.

Chairman BLILEY was Mayor BLILEY of Richmond, and this gentleman was mayor of a much smaller town, but they were both local governments and

there was a great concern among some of our local governments about some issues here, particularly two, as I have said. I want to address the issue of zoning.

Mr. Speaker, as to the cellular industry expanding into the next century, there will be a need for an estimated 100,000 new transmission poles to be constructed throughout the country, I am told. I want to make sure that nothing in H.R. 1555 preempts the ability of local officials to determine the placement and construction of these new towers. Land use has always been, and I believe should continue to be, in the domain of the authorities in the areas directly affected.

I must say I appreciate that communities cannot prohibit access to the new facilities, and I agree they should not be allowed to, but it is important that cities and counties be able to enforce their zoning and building codes. That is the first point.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify that the bill does not restrict the ability of local governments to derive revenues for the use of public rights-of-way so long as the fees are set in a nondiscriminatory way.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman and his colleagues and the chairman of the Committee on Rules for this rule. I wholeheartedly support it.

Let me say this, I was president of the Virginia Municipal League as well as being Mayor of Richmond, and I was on the board of directors of the National League of Cities. When legislation came to this body in a previous Congress for a taking of Mansassas Battlefield, I voted against it because the supervisors of Prince William County had made that decision. I have resisted attempts by people to get me involved in the Civil War preservation of Brandywine Station in Culpeper County for the same reasons.

Nothing is in this bill that prevents a locality, and I will do everything in conference to make sure this is absolutely clear, prevents a local subdivision from determining where a cellular pole should be located, but we do want to make sure that this technology is available across the country, that we do not allow a community to say we are not going to have any cellular pole in our locality. That is wrong. Nor are we going to say they can delay these people forever. But the location will be determined by the local governing body.

The second point you raise, about the charges for right-of-way, the councils, the supervisors and the mayor can make any charge they want provided they do not charge the cable company one fee and they charge a telephone

company a lower fee for the same right-of-way. They should not discriminate, and that is all we say. Charge what you will, but make it equitable between the parties. Do not discriminate in favor of one or the other.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that very clear explanation.

Mr. BLILEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the gentlewoman from Maryland has raised a point with me about access for schools to this new technology. Let me assure the gentlewoman that I know there is a provision on this in the Senate bill, and I will work with her and work with the other body to see that it is preserved and the intent of what she would have offered had she been able to is carried out in the final legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from a number of my local constituents, and I know the chairman is very strongly supportive of the rights of localities and strongly supportive of decentralized government. We have had some conversations about the process here, and I wonder if I may get a clarification.

Is my understanding correct that the gentleman is committed in the conference process to offer new language that will make it crystal clear that localities will have the authority to determine where these poles are placed in their community so long as they do not exclude the placement of poles altogether, do not unnecessarily delay the process for that purpose, do not favor one competitor over another and do not attempt to regulate on the basis of radio frequency emissions which is clearly a Federal issue? Is that an accurate statement of your intention?

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. BLILEY. That is indeed, and I will certainly work to that end.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Thank you and I look forward to working with the chairman.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if this bill really deserves a full and open debate, as the gentleman from Georgia has suggested, then why are we taking it up at midnight?

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that affects the telephone in every house and every workplace in this country. It is a bill that affects every television viewer in this country and a wide array of other telecommunications services, and when does this Congress consider it? At midnight, after a full day of debate on an appropriations bill.

Regardless of your view on this bill, and I think it has some merit, regardless of your view on the substance of

the bill, this sorry procedure ought to be voted down along with this rule. What an incredible testament to this new Republican leadership that they could take a bill of this vital importance to the people of America and not take it up until midnight.

You can roll the votes. That just means there will not be anybody here listening to the debate. You can roll them all night long, as you plan to do. The real question is whether you will roll the American consumer.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the rule. I think this is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my colleagues that if this were a software package that would be version 5 or 6. We have been working on this issue for the last 5 years in the Congress. We had a bill pass the House; we never went to conference with the Senate last year.

There is one amendment that has been made in order, a bipartisan amendment, the Stupak-Barton amendment, that deals directly with local access, local control of rights-of-way for the cities that is very bipartisan in nature, and I would urge support of that amendment if we can reach agreement on it, which we are still working on that.

So this is a good rule, I want to thank the Committee on Rules for making Stupak-Barton in order, and I would urge Members to vote for the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the ranking member of the committee.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2315

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for it. H.R. 1555 is a complex bill. It deals with a complex industry. It comprises a substantial portion of the American economy.

There are a lot of controversies in this legislation, and it should not be dealt with cavalierly. It is a matter of some regret to me we are proceeding late at night and that we have not had more time for this. But, nonetheless, the bill that would be put on the floor by the rule resolves many important questions, and it pulls out of a courtroom, where one judge, a couple of law clerks, a gaggle of Justice Department lawyers, and several hotel floors of AT&T lawyers, have been making the entirety of telecommunications policy for the United States since the breakup.

The breakup of AT&T was initiated by its president, Mr. Charley Brown, and it was done because he had gotten tired of having MCI sue him instead of

competing with him because of anti-trust violations by AT&T. The crafting of that agreement led to a situation where the entirety of the telecommunications policies of the United States were dealt with in a closed courtroom, where no other party could participate.

This legislation resolves that question. Now, does it do so perfectly? Probably not. But I will remind my colleagues that this bill will resolve a conflict between the very rich and the very wealthy, and that fairness under those circumstances is impossible to achieve.

I will discuss later how there is competition in the long distance services of the United States and how the rates of AT&T, MCI, and Sprint fly in perfect formation. They fly like the formation of the nuts and bolts in an aircraft, all tied together by invisible forces, which has led to a situation where they all make money and nobody gets into that because of the behavior of Judge Green and his law clerks and a gaggle of Justice Department lawyers and three floors of AT&T lawyers, who have been foreclosing the participation of any other person in or outside of the telecommunications industry.

The bill, is it perfect? No. But it is far better than the situation we have, and it is a good enough bill. I would urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The rule, is it what I would have written? Of course not. But it does get the House to the business of addressing an important national question, and that is the question of what will be our telecommunications policy, and will it be decided by the Congress, and will it be decided by the regulatory system, or will it be decided in a court of star chamber, in which no other citizen can participate.

I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995.

The last time Congress considered communications legislation, the year was 1934. Radio was still in its infancy and commercial television broadcasting was still years away.

In those six decades dizzying changes in technology and markets have made our Nation's current telecommunications statutes totally outdated.

Over the last decade as Congress has debated telecommunications reform legislation, the private sector hasn't waited—instead they have moved aggressively, for example implementing a completely new, alternative phone system—cellular service—and they are now on the verge of creating yet another form of wireless communication.

Because of these rapid innovations in the marketplace, it is impossible and counterproductive for Congress to control micro manage the Nation's telecommunications future.

Instead, H.R. 1555 seeks to break down restrictive barriers, repeal out-

dated regulations and provide a fair and level playing field for all competitors.

As the Commerce Committee worked on drafting this legislation, we were of the opinion that competition is better than regulation. In areas where regulations are necessary, such as the transition rules while opening the local phone loop, regulations must be fair, reasonable, flexible, and sunset as quickly as possible.

In earlier decades it was perhaps logical for the Federal Government to establish communications monopolies to serve the Nation. However, we've now reached a stage in communications in which regulation is not only inefficient, but is actually a hindrance to the innovation and expansion which benefits the consumer.

For example—for the first time our policy is to move toward competition in local phone service and in cable television. We will also witness greatly expanded competition in long distance and in radio and television broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to speak about the process that produced this important legislation.

H.R. 1555 is the result of many months of hard work by all members, both Democrat and Republican, of the Commerce Committee and innumerable hours by committee and personal staff.

This bill does not favor one company or one industry at the expense of another. Chairman BLILEY, subcommittee Chairman FIELDS and Ranking Member DINGELL worked hard to produce legislation providing a fair and level playing field that will allow all companies to compete in a myriad of communication services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, support the manager's amendment, and support final passage of H.R. 1555.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I will share with my colleagues two good reasons to vote against this rule: You know, 90 percent of America's parents have been asking us to give them greater control over what their children are seeing on television, the sex and the violence and the profanity. Enough is enough they say. They look to us to give them some relief.

More than 50 colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, cosponsored legislation to use the technology that exists today to empower parents to control what their children are viewing on television. Pennies is all it would cost to add it to every new television set.

We have worked on this for months, and now, at the last minute, we have an amendment that was put together by the broadcast industry, which really

is a sham, whose only objective is to kill the V-chip amendment. This rule makes it in order that if this amendment wins, and all it does is to encourage the broadcast industry to address this problem, if that amendment wins, we do not even get a vote on ours.

The second reason is a real sleeper in this bill, and that is with regard to the siting of these control towers. There are about 20,000 of them around the country now. There are going to be about 100,000. Our amendment said on private property, if you try to site a commercial tower, then the people that own that property have a right to go to their local zoning board.

Of course they have the right. Imagine if somebody tries to put a 150 foot tower on your property, and you object, and they tell you, "Well, the Congress gave us the authority to put it on. It is a Federal law. It supersedes local zoning authority." That is the last thing we want to be doing.

So I would urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that this bill has a great deal of merit and a lot of hard work has gone into it, and I think the rule, with a few exceptions, is a pretty good rule. But when I appeared before the Committee on Rules a couple of days ago, I specifically asked the chairman of the committee if we were going to get a freestanding up or down vote on this amendment.

I think there might have been a misunderstanding. I would not accuse the chairman of the committee of misleading anybody. But there definitely was a commitment, in my opinion, that we would have a straight, clear vote on the V chip amendment.

The problem is that we now have, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] said, a perfecting amendment which will gut our ability to have an up or down vote on whether or not parents in this country will be able to block out sexually explicit programs and violent programs that they do not want their kids to see.

This legislation that we are trying to get passed would be very, very helpful to parents who are working. There are going to be 2 to 3 hundred channels in most homes in the not too distant future. The only technology we have now will block out one or two or three programs, and parents are not going to take the time to go through and specifically block out program after program. But the technology we are talking about will allow them to block out whole categories of violence and sexually explicit programs. The amendment

that is going to be offered as a preferential amendment to mine would stop that and just create a study commission.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out, I had an amendment offered on the V chip that was not made in order. I am supporting the rule. I hope those Members who had their amendment made in order would have the courtesy to support the rule.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the reason I am not supporting the rule is simply because I was told we would have a straight up or down vote.

Let me just get to the crux of the problem. The American people, 90 percent of the families, as has been said, want the ability to protect their kids against violence and sexually explicit material. We have a way to do it, and we are not being given an up or down vote on that issue.

Now, we hope that the amendment that is going to supposedly perfect mine, which does not do anything, will be defeated. I urge my colleagues to defeat it so we can get a straight up or down vote on that, because I am confident that Republicans and Democrats alike, if given the chance, will give the American people what they want, and that is the ability to protect their kids against violence and sexually explicit programs. To do otherwise, I think is a sin.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1555. This vital legislation makes long-overdue changes to current communications laws by eliminating the legal barriers that prevent true competition.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 1555 will break down barriers to telecommunications for people with disabilities by requiring that carriers and manufacturers of telecommunications equipment make their network services and equipment accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. The time is past for all persons to have access to telecommunications services.

H.R. 1555 assigns to the FCC the regulatory functions of ensuring that the Bell companies have complied with all of the conditions that we have imposed on their entry into long distance. This bill requires the Bell companies to interconnect with their competitors and to provide to them the features, functions, and capabilities of the Bell companies' networks that the new entrants need to compete. It also contains other checks and balances to ensure that competition in local and long distance grows.

The Justice Department still has the role that was granted to it under the Sherman and Clayton Acts and other antitrust laws. Their role is to enforce the antitrust laws and ensure

that all companies comply with the requirements of the bill.

The Department of Justice enforces the antitrust laws of this country. It is a role that they have performed well. The Department of Justice is not and should not be a regulating agency: it is an enforcement agency.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open our telecommunications market to true competition. This legislation is long overdue. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1555.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN].

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition with the process which was used for this important legislation. This bill will impact the life of every American—whether they talk on the telephone, listen to the radio, watch television, or send a fax. Even more significantly, it will impact technologies that have not yet been imagined and will be developed in the next century.

So how does the House of Representatives deal with this bill? By debating it into the dark of night under a rule which allows for almost no amendments. This process is seriously flawed.

The primary goal of this bill is supposed to be to increase competition through deregulation. Unfortunately, the bill as amended by the manager's amendment, falls short of this goal. For example, the bill does not require that there be any real, substantial competition in the local telephone loop prior to Bell entry into the long-distance business.

Several amendments were proposed to the Rules Committee to improve the bill and ensure that local competition will develop. None were made in order.

One such amendment, to ensure that 10 percent of local residential and commercial customers have access to a viable competitor prior to Bell entry into long distance, was rejected. In my State of Pennsylvania, which has 5.3 million local access lines, this means that a Bell company could provide long-distance service to State residents once a competitor could provide service to just 530,000 access lines.

Now why is it so important to have local competition before allowing the local telephone monopoly into long distance? Without real competition in the local loop prior to entry into long distance, a company can control long-distance service provider access to their long-distance customers because all long-distance calls must traverse the local loop to reach telephone customers. In short, the Bell system can use its monopoly control over the local loop into monopoly control over the long-distance business. This bill does not prevent the Bells from extending their monopoly and denying the benefits of competition to our constituents. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and no on this bill in order to protect telephone consumers.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to be the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the rules governing debate of H.R. 1555 are bad enough—we have 90 minutes to debate the most substantial changes to our communications laws in over 60 years. What concerns me the most, however, are provisions in H.R. 1555 which would be the single biggest assault on American consumers and diversity of opinion that I've witnessed as long as I have lived.

H.R. 1555 completely repeals limits on mass media ownership, and the result will be a dangerous combination of media power. Under the bill, a single company can own a network station, a cable station, unlimited numbers of radio stations, and a daily newspaper, all in the same town.

We have heard that lifting ownership limits will promote competition. Personally, I can't think of a worse way to go about it. Once we lift the limits, a handful of network executives will dictate what programs the local affiliates in our districts should carry. If you have a complaint about losing local programming, don't bother changing the channel—the media group will own that station, too. If you want to write a letter to the newspaper, feel free, but know that the media group probably is the editorial board.

If any of my colleagues have kept up with the news recently, media companies are already lining up to buy each other out, all in anticipation of the broadcast ownership bonanza. You don't have to take my word for it, just look in today's New York Times and read about Walt Disney's buy-out of ABC, or the Westinghouse takeover bid for CBS. I will warn my colleagues: these companies are counting on us to remove ownership limits so they can squeeze out smaller competitors.

I don't think that many of my colleagues realize this, but the FCC is reviewing ownership limits and making changes right now to ensure competition and local diversity. Blowing the lid off all restrictions doesn't make sense; we should let the FCC continue to do its job.

Mr. Speaker, with unrealistic time limits, this rule continues the tradition of the Republican-led 104th Congress: careless legislating and minimal debate. The new leadership cares more about corporate giveaways than consumers, and that is why I will vote against this rule. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], a member of the committee.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2330

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that the folks who support the Markey amendment which was made in order, the gentlewoman from New York

was talking about the concentration of media, she has an opportunity to support the Markey amendment. But we cannot do that unless the rule passes. Then the Members, the V chip that they had their amendment made in order stand here in the well of the House and complain about the rule. When I had my amendment offered to the Committee on Rules, it was rejected. So instead, the bunch of ingrates standing here complaining about the rule who had had their amendment in order, and here I stand, I got stiffed by the Committee on Rules and I am supporting the rule. What is wrong with this picture?

I give up. I am here to support the rule and simply say that it is time that we break the chains of the modified final judgment and take once and for all the responsibility for telecommunications legislation back to the duly elected Representatives of the people and take it away from an unelected, unresponsive Federal court.

Let us give back, let us give us the opportunity to make those kinds of decisions for the consumer. This is the most far-reaching, procompetitive, deregulatory piece of telecommunications legislation in over 60 years.

This is a product that has not just come out of the woodwork. It is a product that has been worked on for at least 5 years. Members of our committee, members of the Committee on the Judiciary, Members who have been here a while have worked on this issue. I find it incredible that we would even consider not passing a rule that would get us one step closer to what we want in telecommunications in the modern marketplace.

We have an opportunity here to pass the most far-reaching job-creating bill that any of us can imagine, a 3.5 million jobs bill. In 10 years that will catch us up with technology and take an antiquated 1934 statute and bring it up to the 21st century.

I have a particular provision that I was proud to work on dealing with the foreign ownership restrictions. They are incredibly antiquated. They restrict the ability of American companies to raise capital and to compete in the worldwide market. This bill breaks those barriers. I am proud to support the rule and proud to support the bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in opposition to this rule. Once again, the Republican leadership has crafted a closed rule. Call it what they may, but where I come from there is nothing open about limiting both the time for debate and the amendments to be considered.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will affect the lives of nearly every American and is far too important to be subjected to a closed rule. H.R. 1555 would make it possible for one entity to own all the radio stations, newspapers, 2 TV

stations, and even the local cable and telephone companies in the same media market. So the same bill which seeks to end local telephone monopolies would allow a handful of media magnates to drive smaller competitors from the market and put an end to broadcast diversity. But an amendment to maintain current law regarding broadcast ownership was not made in order.

And what about the hypocrisy of the Republican leadership? For months they have been telling us that State and local governments are better equipped to make decisions affecting local residents, but this bill preempts local zoning authority with regard to the placement of antenna towers. Yet, an amendment to restore local authority was not ruled in order. I find it hard to believe that the Republican leadership is willing to rely on our State governments to solve this Nation's welfare crisis but does not trust local authorities to regulate the placement of cellular telephone antennas.

I would like to urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from Atlanta for yielding time to me.

Believe it or not, I know it is 11:34 p.m. But over the next couple of hours, because of the fact that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations wanted us today to proceed with consideration of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, we are going to embark on what I am convinced is one of the most exciting debates that we have possibly addressed in this Congress. It is a debate which is going to lead us towards the millennium and in fact lay the groundwork for dramatically improving the opportunity for consumers in this country to benefit in the area of telecommunications.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be done on a very, very fair, under a very, very fair and balanced rule. This rule will in fact allow for the consideration of a wide range of issues, contrary to some of the statements that have been made by those who are opposing the rule.

It will allow us to get into debates on the V chip issue, on broadcasting, on cable, on Internet, a wide range of items, including that very important item which was just addressed earlier, the issue of local control.

We also had a very healthy exchange between two former mayors, which is going to ensure that not only here but in the conference we will see the issue of local control addressed.

This is being done in a bipartisan way. I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

HYDE], and those on the other side of the aisle who have been involved in this issue. It is being addressed with the support of the leadership on both sides.

I believe that as we move toward the millennium, we are going with this legislation to greatly enhance the opportunity for the U.S. consumer.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], to the contrary, there is not going to be any debate tonight whatsoever. The reason is because once we vote on this rule, everybody in this room is going to go home except for five or six people, because there are not going to be any more votes until sometime tomorrow.

So the debate that takes place tonight will not be a debate. I would suggest all you Americans that are going to plan to participate, call home and tell them to start the home movies because you are going to be the only one to see yourself talking. There is not going to be anybody to talk to. There is not a single person who believes it is right to take up this bill at midnight and talk to ourselves for the next 3 or 4 hours.

General debate and debate on the amendments will take place in a total vacuum. It is not right. It is not necessary. Nobody on that side will stand up and defend this process, and nobody on this side will stand up and defend this process. It is an outrage. I am disappointed that the Democratic ranking member of the full committee, that the chairman of the full committee and chairman of the subcommittee have such a low regard for the jurisdictional area of this committee that they would go along with this process. I urge Members to vote no on this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], the chairman of the subcommittee which produced the bill.

(Mr. FIELDS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a good, balanced rule. This rule should be supported.

It gives us an opportunity to ask one question. That is: With our telecommunications policy, do we move into the 21st century or do we crawl back into the 1930s? Some of us have lived with that question for 2½ years, day in and day out. It is time to move forward. We know the issues of the debate. It is time to move forward on this important issue that affects a sixth of our Nation's economy.

I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], the leadership

on our side, the leadership on the other side for allowing us to move forward.

This is a complex issue. If we had our preferences, we would do this at an earlier time. We would have more time to debate this. We do not. It is important to move forward.

I also want to pay special recognition to some Members who, like me, have spent a great deal of time on this issue. My friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my friend in the back of the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], who has spent as much time and more on this particular issue. And we will have our differences during this debate. We do disagree on the V chip. We do not want to see the government get into content regulation. But we will debate that issue.

We do not want to see the government continue a policy of restricting growth when it is no longer necessary with direct broadcast satellite, the growth of cable, the spectrum flexibility, the ability of broadcasters to compress, and so forth. We will have that debate, a good debate on that particular issue.

Of course, we disagree on the government continuing to regulate cable. But those are debates that we have.

I want to recognize his leadership and others as we move forward on this legislation.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is not legislation. This is three card monte.

First we started with the appropriations bill on Labor-HHS, now we are going to slip in a telecommunications bill. But just when we get a focus on that, they will switch to the defense bill. This is an absolute degradation of the legislative process.

We also have the problem that we are now going to have the debate first and then the votes. I think they ought to try it other way around. Why do they not have the votes first and then the debate? They have obviously decided that the two are totally unrelated. They have totally degraded the legislative process. They have borrowed their sense of procedure from the red queen. Verdict first; debate afterwards.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], subcommittee ranking member.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. The gentleman from Texas has already pointed out that it affects one-sixth to one-seventh of the American economy. We should not be debating a bill that affects one-sixth to one-seventh of the American economy at midnight in the United States Congress. We should not be doing this.

We cannot have a good debate on cable. We cannot have a good debate on long distance. We cannot have a good debate on the V chip. We cannot have a good debate on privacy. We cannot have a good debate on the Internet. We cannot have a good debate on any of these issues which profoundly affect the satellite, the cable, the telephone, the computer, the software, the educational future of our country.

This bill will make most of the rest of the legislation which we are going to deal with on the floor of this body a footnote in history. This is the bill. We are taking it up at midnight. We are going to tell all the Members, after they vote on the rule, that they should go home, that there will not be any votes.

America is sound asleep. This is not the way to be treating one-sixth to one-seventh of the American economy. The Members should be here. Their staffs should be in their offices. The American people should be listening.

We are talking about issues that are so profound that if they are not heard we will have lost the great opportunity to have had the debate, to have had the educational experience which the Congress can provide to the country.

Now, some Members say, well, who cares, really, it is just a battle between AT&T on the one hand and the Bell companies on the other? Who really cares, is kind of the attitude that some Members have about it.

Well, my colleagues, this is more than how many gigabits one company might be able to provide or how many extra thousand cubic feet of fiber optic that one or another company might provide. This is about how we transmit the ideas in our society. Whether or not we give parents the right to be able to block out the violence and the explicit sexual content that comes through their television set goes to how our children's minds are formed. Whether or not consumers are going to have one cable company or two cable companies in their community 1½ years from now goes to the question of whether or not they are going to have a monopoly or a real choice in the marketplace.

Whether or not we are going to have a single company able to purchase the only newspaper in town, two television stations, every radio station and the cable system in every community in America is more profound than any other issue we are going to be debating on the floor this week, this month or this year.

This rule should be voted down. We should take up this bill in the light of day with every issue given the time it needs to be debated.

□ 2345

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, arguably, the most important thing about telecommunications reform is not in

this bill, and that is affordable access to the Internet for the Nation's schools. Myself and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] offered such an amendment in the Committee on the Judiciary. We were asked to withdraw it in the hopes that it would be worked on in this bill. The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and I went to the Committee on Rules for her amendment, and it is still not being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] what our posture would be, if I may, in a colloquy, with the Senate version of the language that does ensure Internet access for schools that is affordable.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, as I told the gentlewoman from Maryland earlier, it is my intention to work with her and anyone else to see that this provision, or as near as we can, is included in the final version when we come out of conference.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is time to vote on a rule for a very important bill. I would like to address a couple of points. First let me thank Chairman BLILEY and Chairman, FIELDS. We have worked on this for a long time. I would like to especially thank the ranking member [Mr. DINGELL] who has given us some sage advice and a great deal of help. I am a little bit surprised at the compliant that we are not debating for a long enough time. We started with a 6 hour rule and we wind up with nine and a half hours, and that apparently is not enough. I am surprised at my friend from Indiana who says he cannot vote for this rule because he made his amendment in order, he wanted a closed rule on his amendment. All he has to do to have an up or down vote on his amendment is to have a substitute. It seems to me, if you have enough votes, you can defeat the substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I am most startled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] who made it very clear to us that he could not support this rule unless he got all three amendments in order. And we believed the gentleman, and we thought they were substantive enough to debate, and we made all three in order, and now he is complaining because we are debating this at night.

Mr. Speaker, I was on this floor today on Labor-HHS and there were fewer people in this Chamber during this day on Labor-HHS appropriations than there are here tonight. You know as well as I that typically there are fewer people in this Chamber during the day than at night. These are specious arguments. The rule is a balanced rule. I urge you to support it.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment that the rule on this bill does not include an amendment that I introduced to provide affordable access to advanced telecommunication technologies for schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities.

In title I, section 246(b)(5) of this bill, the committee expresses its intent that students in our public schools should have access to advanced telecommunications technologies as one of the fundamental principles of universal service. This is an important and historic commitment. However, the bill does not address the issue of affordability of such access, nor does it include provisions addressing libraries and rural health care facilities. This was the amendment I introduced with Congressmen ORTON and NEY and Congresswoman LOFGREN. The bill, I understand, refers to "reasonable" rates. Reasonable rates by what standards? "Affordable" would have ensured that all schools, nationwide, would have access to the information superhighway.

I want to clarify that my amendment would not have imposed a financial burden on telecom providers. In the bill, universal service is being redefined by the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] based on recommendations by this joint board. In my amendment, schools and libraries would pay "affordable" rates as defined by a joint Federal-State universal service board.

Most schools simply cannot afford advanced telecommunications services. At present, less than 3 percent of classrooms in the United States have access to the Internet. This will not change unless we make access for schools affordable.

The Senate has wisely added provisions to ensure access at a discount price for schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities. I am pleased the Commerce Committee chairman has stated his agreement to working with me to include this provision in conference. In a Nation rich in information, we can no longer rely on the skills of the industrial age. All of our students must be guaranteed access to a high quality of education regardless of where they live or how much money they make. We must ensure that the emerging telecommunications revolution does not leave our critical public institutions behind.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 255, nays 156, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 616]

YEAS—255

Allard
Archer
Arney
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Biley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Clinger
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly

Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Matsui
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney

NAYS—156

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Borski

Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Cardin

Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skeem
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Toricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff

Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gunderson
Hancock
Harman
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson

Hoekstra
Holden
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Levin
Lipinski
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moran
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey

Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quillen
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Thomas
Thornton
Torres
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews
Bateman
Callahan
Chrysler
Dicks
Hall (OH)
Martinez
McDade

Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Reynolds
Rose
Sabo
Shuster
Studds

□ 0005
Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCLAIMER OF STATEMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO ME

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, twice in debate on the previous rule it was asserted that this bill is going to be debated tonight because that was my preference. That is absolutely baloney. For the last month, at the request of the majority, I have been trying to assist the majority to see to it that they finish all their appropriations bills before we recess for August. It has been my position from the beginning that telecommunications should not even be on the floor until the Labor-HEW bill is finished and until the defense appropriation bill is finished. If after that time there is time for telcom, in my view that is a decision that is made above my pay grade by the leadership, but I personally believe it is a disgrace that any of these bills, especially a bill