

Hamre's assurances to the contrary, the form that I have been reading from today—the DD250—provides no guarantee that DOD gets what it pays for. All the form does is tell DOD what is supposed to be on the loading dock or stocked in some warehouse. It does not mean that it is really there.

The DD250 is not an internal control device.

The DD250 will not tell us whether the item received was indeed ordered.

The DD250 will not tell you whether the price paid was the price agreed to in the contract.

The DD250 will not tell you whether your accounts contain enough money to cover the payment.

The DD250 will not warn you if you are about to make an underpayment, overpayment, or erroneous payment.

To protect and control public money, then, the Defense Department must match disbursements with obligations before payments are made. That is the way it must be done.

These DD250 forms are no substitute for nitty-gritty accounting work.

If Mr. Hamre wants to do effective damage control and silence his critics, then he needs to go back to the drawing board. He needs to find a device that addresses the source of the criticism. These forms—the DD250's—miss the mark, and miss it completely. The DD250's do not protect and control the people's money.

Mr. Hamre is the DOD comptroller, and he ought to know all these things.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and yield back any time I may have.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1283, TELEVISION CONTENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to address the issue of television violence, which we debated earlier this week in the context of this telecommunications bill. I opposed the Lieberman-Conrad amendment on this subject, but I strongly supported the Simon-Dole sense of the Senate amendment. I want to take this occasion to briefly sketch out my thinking on this subject.

I completely agree with my colleagues about the terrible effects of television violence on our children. The average American child witnesses 8,000 murders and 100,000 other acts of violence on television by the time he or she finishes elementary school. That is simply unacceptable. The American Medical Association, the National Commission on Children and other in-

terested groups and individuals have spoken persuasively about the effect of this incessant violence on our children.

I believe that something must be done about this terrible problem, but I also believe that it should be up to parents and the industry itself to accomplish that end. This is an area where I do not believe Congress should be mandating a solution. Especially in the context of this deregulatory bill, we should not be creating federal commissions to promulgate highly prescriptive new rules in areas we should stay out of.

I was also concerned about some of the vague language in the Conrad-Lieberman amendment. It refers, for instance, to "the level of violence or objectionable content." We might—might—be able to come to agreement on a definition of "violence," but I do not see how we could reach a consensus on the meaning of "objectionable content." Everyone would have a different view.

As consumers and parents, we must all do a better job of turning the dial when programming to which we object comes across our television set. If that were to happen in large numbers, the market would dictate a dramatic improvement in television programming.

I supported the Simon-Dole sense of the Senate amendment, which calls on the industry to police itself but does not establish an unprecedented set of onerous government rules. I think this represented a more sensible approach to this problem.

AMENDMENT NO. 1325

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator WARNER's amendment requiring Bell operating companies to fully disclose their protocols and technical requirements for connection with their facilities. This is a complex, technical issue, but it is a critical safeguard as the Bell companies move into manufacturing.

Section 222 of the bill before us applies the same competitive check list to Bell entry into manufacturing as it does to entry into long distance services. I have been concerned, however, by the fact that the legislation carves out a major exception for manufacturing research and design activities. This exception would allow Bell companies to commence these activities almost immediately.

Research and design is one of the most expensive phases of the manufacturing process, and it often holds the key to the end success of the product. But under S. 652's provisions, Bell companies would be able to engage in such activities before they face competition. This could open the door to cross-subsidization, unfair use of privileged information about RBOC network interfaces and other monopoly abuses that could decrease competition in the already competitive telecommunications manufacturing industry.

I have argued that the simplest solution to this problem was to delete the bill's exception for research and design

activities. But this solution proved unacceptable to the bill's managers, so instead I supported Senator WARNER's efforts to add important safeguards.

Senator WARNER's amendment would ensure that the public network remain open and accessible to independent manufacturers. By requiring disclosure of technical specifications and planned changes in those specifications, the amendment would prevent Bell companies' manufacturing subsidiaries from gaining exclusive or early access to the kind of information that is the lifeblood of telecommunications manufacturing.

Independent manufacturers do not fear competition from Bell companies, so long as that competition is fair. Senator WARNER's amendment makes a great deal of progress in the effort to ensure fairness, and I hope we can build on this progress to make further improvements as this bill moves to conference.

I thank Senator WARNER for his leadership on this important issue, and I also thank Senators HOLLINGS and PRESSLER for agreeing to accept this modest amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today we have had an historic opportunity to vote on a sweeping revision of the 1934 Communications Act, an act which is now, over 60 years after its original passage, woefully out of date. We tried last Congress to revisit this legislation but we were unable to bring the matter to the floor. I am glad that we have had a chance to consider this legislation on the floor this year. I hoped to be able to vote for it. We owe it to the people of this country to modernize the laws which govern telecommunications services and to do so in a way that promotes competition among the companies attempting to provide those services, and thus provide American families with more and better services at lower prices.

This legislation serves the first purpose—that of modernizing the law to reflect the many changes in technology since 1934.

However, there is a real question as to whether the end result will be more competition. On the contrary, I believe that the result of this bill may be more concentration of power in the market. I do not believe American families will benefit from this concentration.

I would like to believe what I have heard on the floor over the last week: that true competition will ensue from this bill, and the result of that competition will be a new world of innovative products at affordable prices. Nevertheless, I fear that the flaws in this bill will likely defeat those hopes. Accordingly, while I would like to be able to vote for this bill, I cannot.

I am a longtime student of technology and of telecommunications. I know what benefits they can bring. I have promoted State and Federal support for technology in the classroom and I have sponsored legislation to provide that support. I am proud to have

been an early and eager supporter of the Snowe-Rockefeller-Exon-Kerry language in this bill which will, for the first time, make access to telecommunications services by schools, libraries, and rural health care providers affordable. I am especially proud that the Senate approved this aspect of the bill.

But there are a series of amendments to this bill which I had hoped would pass and which would have made this bill what I had hoped it could be and what I think the American consumer deserves.

First, and foremost, I was disappointed that the efforts of my colleagues from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN and Senator THURMOND of South Carolina, to bring the Department of Justice into the process, were defeated. I fear that this bill—without the amendment to give the Department of Justice a more active role—may lead to abuses and more concentration in the long distance market. There are serious issues competition issues raised by the entry of the Bells into long distance, yet we have given the Nation's expert competition agency, the Department of Justice, a toothless role. The Department of Justice has long and deep experience with this market and with these competitors. It is the best positioned entity to evaluate the many issues which are going to arise as new entrants seek access to the local exchange networks controlled by these companies. In my view, only the Department of Justice can assure that what is billed as competition does not become concentration to the detriment of the American consumer.

I also have concerns about the potential for concentration in the cable market which this bill presents and the potential for greatly increased cable rates for consumers in rural areas where competition is unlikely to exist in any meaningful way. The marketplace will very likely bring lower prices and greater choice to consumers in urban and affluent areas. But in many parts of the country, and in much of my State of New Mexico, the marketplace will do little. We have seen in airline deregulation how rural consumers are treated. I hope that that does not happen in the cable marketplace as well. If it does, and we shall see in the next few years, Congress should revisit this issue to provide the protections which I would have liked to see this bill today.

Other amendments, such as the ones offered by the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. KERREY], to put a consumer representative on the universal service board and to restrict cross subsidization by public utility of services, were defeated. Other amendments designed to keep some reasonable limits on broadcast ownership were also defeated.

Taken as a whole, this bill, while up-to-date, seems to be to anticonsumer and anticompetitive. I foresee an increasing concentration in the tele-

communications industry with increasing prices for consumers with little increase in choice or innovation for those living in rural America. I hope that I am wrong. I hope that this bill can be improved in the conference. If it is, I will be happy to vote for it when it returns to the floor. In its present form, however, I must vote no.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote for S. 652, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995, because a myriad of technological innovations over the past few years have made the current regulatory system obsolete.

New rules are needed to acknowledge and encourage competitive innovative technological developments which will enliven the marketplace and offer the consumer greater choice and new technologies. However, these regulatory changes should be done in a way that maintains adequate protections of the public interest.

There are several issues that concern me regarding S. 652.

My first concern is with the lack of a Department of Justice role in determining when the Baby Bells should be allowed into the long distance market. I believe a specific Department of Justice role is needed to ensure that existing monopoly powers are not used to take advantage of the new markets being entered.

It's reasonable that such broad and unprecedented telecommunications deregulation should include reasonable oversight of potentially anticompetitive behavior in an industry where a few giants could control large segments of the various markets.

Without a specific Department of Justice role, there is a greater risk that the monopolistic and concentrated businesses will increase and we will not achieve the competition that this bill promises. If this happens, American consumers will be the losers.

I supported the Thurmond-Dorgan compromise amendment which would have provided the Attorney General a simultaneous role with the FCC in approving a request by a Bell company to provide long distance service providing that action would not substantially lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly. Unfortunately, that amendment was not adopted.

I hope, therefore, that the House will move to adopt a Department of Justice role so that this issue can be revisited in conference.

My second concern regards the cable rate deregulation provisions of the bill. In 1992 Congress passed a comprehensive cable act in response to a strong public outcry about skyrocketing cable rates. This bill undoes much of the good that bill accomplished in slowing down cable rate increases and in many cases reducing cable rates for Americans. This bill deregulates all but the basic tier of cable television and in so doing runs the very real risk of resulting in increased cable rates for Americans which is contrary to what Con-

gress attempted to do just 3 years ago in the 1992 Cable Act.

I am also concerned that the bill allows for the preemption of local rules and regulations relating to the management of local rights-of-way. I supported the Feinstein amendment to remove the provision in S. 652 which would preempt local control of the public rights-of-way. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated. A weaker alternative was accepted which modified but did not eliminate language in the bill allowing for the preemption of local regulations. The Feinstein amendment would have eliminated the preemption capability of the FCC altogether.

I believe it is important that we in Congress pay proper recognition to the rights of local government and I am disappointed this bill does not adequately do that.

The telecommunications bill before the Senate today will have a huge impact on our economy and on the lives of every single American. I believe the telecommunications reform is both necessary and important. But equally important in that process are the necessary checks and balances to protect consumers and discourage monopolies. While I will vote for this bill because I recognize that telecommunications reform is long overdue and must move forward, I am not convinced this bill contains adequate checks and balances. I hope the House will be able to add those back into the bill and I reserve judgment on whether I will support a final conference report.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995.

Over the last week I have heard many of my colleagues address this legislation. One statement is common to their remarks. This legislation will touch, indeed will impact, a significant portion of our economy. It will be felt in one way or another in each of our lives.

Of the many advances in our society of the past century, telecommunications is among the most pervasive. Our movement into this information age has yielded tremendous changes in our lives. The ability to communicate around the globe instantaneously has helped us become part of a global marketplace. It is an advance from which there can be no retreat.

I believe that we all benefit when competition is enhanced. Retaining a competitive edge has been quite difficult as we have forced technology of today to fit the restrictions of yesterday's regulations. The potential for continued improvement in these industries is tremendous. This bill should usher in new products, better prices, and more choices in the services which consumers demand in Montana and across the country.

Mr. President, the development in the personal computer, and even the

hand-held calculator before it, is a tangible example of what I expect in telecommunications. In the past 30 years, these technologies have become commonplace. In fact I can't imagine life without them.

The development of telecommunications technology has been no less dramatic. And with this legislation, we advance the ball. While this bill fails to satisfy my entire wish list, I believe it leaves us better than before. But we still have work to do and as legislation moves through the House and into conference, I am confident we can improve this bill.

In recent days we have voted on changes designed to improve the measure. The amendment offered by Senator CONRAD will encourage television manufacturers to include computer technology allowing parents to prevent objectionable material from entering their home. I supported that measure and I believe it is important in this bill.

An amendment offered by Senator EXON protects against harassment, obscenity, and indecency to minors via telecommunications devices. Together, these two amendments will go a long way toward protecting our youth from harmful material. There has been some public comment on this topic recently and I believe these amendments are what Montanans want in this kind of legislation.

Finally, I want to go on the record in stating my belief that passage of this measure does not finish our work in this area. Granted, this legislation has been a long time coming. But we now have a serious responsibility to conduct congressional oversight over this legislation. As we work to construct the information superhighway, we must make certain that the system works.

I don't want a system which is a restrictive entry highway. And I don't want a toll road where nobody can afford the fare. And I want to make certain that in Montana, my constituents have access to the benefits of this technology. I will be watching to see that this effort succeeds and I stand ready to step in if intervention is needed.

But Mr. President, this bill has strong support. I have heard from broadcasters, small business owners, and those in the telecommunications industry in Montana. And all these groups want this legislation to pass. I share their desire to help the best telecommunications system in the world leap forward into the next century and I will cast my vote in favor of this measure.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to state my reasons for opposing the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995.

Yesterday the Senate adopted amendment No. 1362 by a vote of 84-16. The amendment purports to prohibit computer transmission of obscenity

and indecency. I voted "no" out of concern that we were taking this action improvidently and without adequate consideration for its significant constitutional and practical implications.

In 1973, the Supreme Court in *Miller versus California*, and in several subsequent decisions, held that the Constitution does not protect obscenity, which the Court defined as material that appeals to "prurient interests" or is "patently offensive." The government accordingly has the authority to regulate obscenity, and properly so. But we must do so with care.

The amendment attempts to apply existing laws against obscene and harassing telephone calls to computer transmissions. Regrettably, the language of the amendment is too broad, raising serious questions of constitutionality under the first amendment. For example, the amendment could reasonably be interpreted to prohibit an individual from sending an annoying e-mail message. The penalty for such a transgression: a fine of up to \$100,000 or up to 2 years in prison—or both. And, as was noted by Senator LEAHY and others during the debate yesterday, the amendment likely makes unlawful on computers materials that are perfectly lawful in books or letters. I suspect the courts will take a dim view of this provision when it is challenged, which it surely will be.

Similarly problematic is the failure of the amendment to recognize the difference between telephones and the unique characteristics of computers. In order to view the kinds of lewd and lascivious material complained of by the proponents of the amendment, an individual must take numerous affirmative steps to gain access to it via the on-line services where it can be found. I grant that this is not terribly difficult for one who is computer literate, but the fact remains that in order to look at this material on the computer, you have to actively seek it out. It does not just pop up on the screen when you turn it on. One who looks for and then views such material on his or her computer is in a very different position than a victim of obscene telephone calls. Yet the amendment fails to recognize this distinction.

I am also troubled by the Senate's action on another amendment to this bill. This afternoon, by a vote of 67-31, the Senate tabled the Lieberman amendment to retain cable television rate regulation. Senator LIEBERMAN knows the subject of cable rate regulation as well as anyone, having fought cable rate increases in Connecticut in the 1980's when he was State attorney general. He predicts that, without the reasonable rate restrictions in his amendment, cable TV rates will surely rise as a result of this bill. I am afraid he is right. Cable rates rose sharply after Congress lifted rate regulations in 1984, and they are likely to do again if we pass this legislation. This is why I supported the Lieberman amendment,

and why I believe it was a mistake for the Senate to defeat it.

For this and for the other reasons I have given, I will vote against the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995.

THE DOLE AMENDMENT ON CABLE VOLUME DISCOUNTS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we are faced here with a very unfortunate situation. Senator DOLE has offered an amendment to address a significant public policy matter raised by S. 652 as reported by the Commerce Committee, and that amendment has become entangled in a dispute that goes to the way the Senate deals with those who do business in areas affected by legislation upon which the Senate acts.

I must say that I am distressed by the appearances of what has occurred regarding the interactions of two cable programming providers with the chairman of the Commerce Committee. While I have not been involved at all in—or even knowledgeable about—these interactions, and believe according to what I have been told that there may be more inadvertence and clumsiness in evidence here than anything else, it is unfortunate for all involved that some evidently see this as a case where inappropriate pressure has been brought to bear in such an interaction.

Regardless, and without in any way acting as judge and jury and attributing blame, I will say unequivocally that I do not believe that the proper way for elected officials and business executives to interact is for elected officials to threaten businesspeople with injurious legislation if they do not comport their business activities with the policy desires of those elected officials, nor for businesspeople to threaten elected officials with business actions deemed undesirable by the officials if those officials fail to take legislative actions favored by the businesspeople. Further, the way I have always understood the concept of honor, a deal's a deal, and starting with the assumption that honorable elected officials should make only deals that are in the public's interest, both those officials and businesspeople who enter into agreements ought to honor those agreements.

Having said these things, when the day is over here, what really counts in my judgment is the public policy that the Senate makes, and the effect it has on our Nation and its people. I think it is important that we keep our eye on the ball here, and by that I mean I think we should cast our votes on this amendment based on the public policy impact of the policies those votes will determine. It is on that basis, rather than with reference to the regrettable dispute that has emerged concerning what has preceded the offering of and voting on this amendment, that I cast my vote on the amendment.

Many of the decisions with which this body must grapple are not simple, where two courses, one black and the other white, present themselves and all

we have to do is choose the easily discernible right course. Many decisions we make have multiple and varying implications, and we are forced into the position of playing Solomon to mediate disputed interests and needs.

Such is the case here, Mr. President. On the one hand none of us to my knowledge wants to act in a way that will deprive persons in rural areas or other areas served by small cable systems of programming that those who live in areas served by large cable systems can enjoy. On the other hand, we should approach extremely seriously any decision that could result in the government imposing controls on the free marketplace, especially a decision that leads to price controls. There have been situations in our history that have warranted such actions, but they are the exception, not the rule.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the circumstances of the cable industry warrant imposing what amount to price controls on those who provide programming. Yes, I do believe that those programming companies should deal responsibly with all cable operators who wish to purchase their products. But no, I do not believe that in this industry the Government should prohibit practices of volume discounting or other methods of pricing that are employed in virtually every industry in our Nation, whether it be selling shoes or cabbages or long distance phone service.

So, Mr. President, before I had heard anything about the dispute concerning the agreement that did or did not exist between Time-Warner and Viacom and the chairman of the Commerce Committee, I had concluded that I should vote for the Dole amendment. Now that the dispute has surfaced, I continue to believe that the correct public policy is reflected in the Dole amendment, and I will vote for that amendment for that reason.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate votes today on a very important piece of legislation, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995. There is no question in my mind that telecommunications reform legislation is needed. The communications laws in this country are without a doubt antiquated and the Congress must take action and pass telecommunications legislation.

I am sad to say, however, that I cannot support the legislation the Senate is voting on today. This bill, in my judgment, could be more accurately described as the "telecommunications concentration act" rather than the "telecommunications competition act." Unfortunately, this legislation, in its present form, is going to lead to greater concentration in the telecommunications and media industries—which is antithetical to competi-

tion. Robust competition is the driving force of our free market economy. Competition offers consumers lower

prices and wide ranging services. True marketplace competition also eliminates the need for regulation. If our goals are to ensure that consumers receive advanced telecommunications and media services at competitive prices and to free the industry from government regulation, competition is our means to that end. But it must be true and fair competition.

This is where this legislation misses the mark. There are two key areas of this legislation that lead me to the conclusion that existing competition in telecommunications is in jeopardy: First, the conditions under which regional Bell operating companies [RBOC's] may offer long distance services; and second, the liberalization of broadcast ownership rules.

This legislation, mistakenly in my judgment, deregulates both the television and radio broadcast industries at the risk of promoting greater concentration at the expense of competition. The bill raises the national audience cap from 25 to 35 percent and eliminates the 12 station limit on TV broadcast ownership. It also eliminates ownership rules on radio ownership. Liberalization of these limits runs absolutely contrary to the goal of promoting competition. I am convinced that if these changes are enacted, the media industry in this country will be controlled by a handful of conglomerates in future. The long-held principles of localism and diversity will suffer.

I offered an amendment, unsuccessfully, to strike the provisions liberalizing the ownership limits in the bill. Under my amendment, the FCC would have been instructed to review and modify its broadcast ownership rules to "ensure that broadcasters are able to compete fairly with other media providers" while ensuring that diversity and localism are protected. The amendment would have maintained the current limits while directing the FCC to review and modify the ownership rules on a case-by-case basis.

At the heart of this issue is the relationship between the networks and the local affiliate stations. Raising the national ownership limits would represent a drastic shift in power from the local affiliate stations to the national networks. The provisions in the bill; including the Dole amendment, threaten local media control—both in terms of programming and in terms of news content—in favor of national control. The change will remove the ability of local stations to make local programming and news decisions—such as preempting network programming in favor of local news, public interest, and local sports programming.

The change would also mean that station managers will not be able to stop network programs he or she believes is inappropriate for the local market. When the networks buy up the affiliates, the networks will be able to dictate the terms of the affiliate/network relationship. The networks will

leverage their power over affiliate preemption of network programming, conduct of news divisions, and the moral tone of network entertainment. The change proposed in broadcast ownership rules under S. 652 will turn locally owned stations into extensions of large multimedia companies and will result in the nationalization of television programming and the demise of localism and local program decisions.

The bill's changes to broadcast ownership rules will lead to greater concentration of the media—a concentration towards the national networks. The fact is that the present limits help preserve competition. Fox television would not be the fourth network today if it were not for the existing limits on ownership. The current limits are what made it possible for Fox Broadcasting to develop so quickly because there were affiliates available in media markets that were not owned by the established networks with whom Fox had to compete with to build a market for itself.

Proponents of removing the ownership limits have a single purpose—to reduce the number of people participating in broadcasting ownership. The current limits permit small companies to own stations in large markets. Because the existing limits ensure that concentration is limited and entrepreneurial efforts in broadcasting are possible. Elimination of ownership limits will make it more difficult for minority participation in broadcast ownership—something the FCC has been trying to promote for years is more minority ownership. This bill would send a blow to that effort.

Will the local television landscape be better off if the local television stations are controlled by the national networks in New York and Hollywood instead of by stations in Bismarck or Wichita? Will there be less violence on TV if there is more national control? I do not think so. In fact, I expect that these problems will get worse.

This bill will rob local stations of the opportunity to say no to network programming that local station managers think is inappropriate for their local communities—where they themselves live. If the national networks are permitted to own a substantial portion of the local stations in the country, then all programming decisions will be made in Hollywood and New York, without regard for the concerns of local communities. Make no mistake about it. The bill's provisions represent nothing short of a power grab on the part of the national networks under the guise of deregulation. The proposed changes to the ownership rules would concentrate power in the hands of the networks and would be anticompetitive.

Another unsuccessful amendment I offered with the senior Senator from South Carolina relates to what is perhaps the most contentious battle in the development of this legislation: the conditions under which the RBOC's

would be permitted to offer long distance services. One of the major reasons why I cannot support this bill is because it does not provide for an adequate role for the Department of Justice to ensure that competition in the long distance market is protected when an RBOC that controls the local loop is permitted to enter what is already a competitive market.

Under the bill in its present form, an RBOC need only apply to the FCC to enter long distance services. The FCC would utilize a public interest standard and determine that the RBOC has completed the competitive checklist. The bill provides only for a consulting role by the Justice Department.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the debate over this legislation has been turned upside down. The fact is that the fundamental policy goal confronting the Congress as we develop telecommunications reform legislation is how do we employ competition in markets which are currently controlled by regulated monopolies, such as the local exchange. The fact is that the long distance market is a truly competitive market. We risk damaging that competitive market if the RBOC's are permitted to enter the long distance market prematurely. Our goal should be to promote the same level of competition in the local exchange that currently exists in long distance. Unfortunately, this bill is weak on incentives that would promote local competition and it also threatens to damage the competitive long distance market.

It was the Justice Department that investigated and sued to breakup the Bell system monopoly—which resulted in making the long distance and manufacturing markets competitive. If the local exchange networks are going to be vertically reintegrated with long distance service, there is a danger that entry by RBOC's could impede competition and unravel the progress made over the past decade in promoting competition since the breakup of the Bell system. DOJ has a unique role to assess whether the conditions for meaningful competition are present.

The experience of airline deregulation shows that the protection and promotion of competition is not accorded enough weight when DOJ has only an advisory role. In the case of airlines, mergers that were approved by the Department of Transportation over the objection of DOJ, the result was monopolization of certain hubs and higher ticket prices for consumers.

A DOJ role would avoid expensive AT&T-type antitrust suits in the future by making sure that competition is safeguarded in the first instance. RBOC enter that occurs without assurances that it will not impede completion will invites complex litigation, which will consume resources better spent on competing. Having DOJ apply a marketplace test as a condition to entry will help avoid wasted litigation.

Since the breakup of the Bell system, long distance rates have dropped 66 percent and the long distance competitors have constructed four nationwide fiber optic networks—the backbone of the information superhighway.

It cannot be assumed that a series of specified steps will result automatically and inevitably in the development of local exchange competition. Potential barriers to competition are sometimes subtle and overcoming these barriers is a very complex task. Congress cannot hope to successfully specify in advance a set of conditions that will provide answers to all issues before meaningful competition is a reality. The only way to ensure true competition is to look at actual marketplace facts and DOJ must provide this role.

A series of specified steps—for example, the competitive check list in Section 255—is not by itself sufficient to bring real competition to local markets. The RBOC's must have a positive incentive to cooperate with the development of competition.

Monopolists have proven themselves adept at erecting new barriers faster than old ones can be identified and dismantled. Complete elimination of barriers to competition will occur only if the monopolists have positive incentives to cooperate with the introduction of meaningful competition. The RBOC's will have such incentives when the check list is supplemented by a process that ensures application of real competitive analysis to actual marketplace facts.

I still hope that these areas can be perfected in the conference committee. Unless these two areas are addressed, this legislation will do more to harm competition than to promote it. That would not be in the public interest and I hope that the Congress will not make that mistake.

Although there are serious problems with this legislation, I do believe that some provisions in this bill I strongly support. This bill contains some very important provisions that would preserve universal service and ensure that rural areas will have access to advanced telecommunications services. I have worked long and hard with many of my colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that universal service will be preserved as competition is introduced into local exchange service. The provisions in the Senate bill with respect to universal service are vitally important to rural areas and it is my hope that if these provisions will be retained in the conference committee.

In conclusion Mr. President, I would ultimately like to vote for this legislation. Unfortunately, I cannot in its present form. As I said earlier, this legislation will not adequately promote competition. Rather, it will have the opposite affect: concentration. I urge the managers of the bill and all those Senators who have spoken with such passion about promoting competition

to work to improve this measure so that we can truly call it the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act.

RESTRICTING CABLE-TELCO IN-REGION BUY-OUTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to note an important amendment that has been made to the telecommunications bill.

As introduced, the telecommunications bill modified our outdated law that bans cable companies and telephone companies from offering the service of the other. With digital and other new technologies being developed, the demarcations between the businesses of telephone and cable service is blurring.

It is about time for Congress to update the law to catch up with the new convergence in video, computer, and telephone technologies.

But by repealing the telco-cable cross-ownership ban altogether, the telecommunications bill, as reported, failed to impose any limits on the ability of telephone companies to buy out cable companies—their most likely competitor—in the telephone companies' local service areas. Allowing such mergers would destroy the best hope for developing competition in both local telephone service and cable television markets.

Without the protection of an antibuyout provision, consumers would be deprived of the lower cable and telephone prices that would result from two-wire competition.

Because of these concerns, the distinguished chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, Senator THURMOND, and I sent a letter to our colleagues a few weeks ago detailing the reasons why standard antitrust scrutiny would not be enough to preserve the potential competition between telephone and cable companies.

The leadership package of amendments adopted last Friday took seriously the concerns that we expressed, and provided some antibuyout restrictions to prevent telephone companies from merely substituting one video service monopoly for another.

The amendment restricting in-region buyouts improves this bill and promises to benefit consumers by promoting greater competition in the delivery of video services, increasing the diversity of video programming, and advancing the national communications infrastructure.

In particular, the amendment eliminates ambiguity and makes clear that the antitrust enforcement authorities will maintain their authority to challenge anticompetitive buyouts under the antitrust laws.

Even when the FCC has decided that from its perspective that the telco/cable buyout is acceptable, or when the buyout comes within the rural exception, standard antitrust scrutiny may still be applied.

The amendment maintains the specialization and expertise of the anti-trust authorities—the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, as well as State antitrust authorities—in determining whether a buyout would violate the antitrust laws and harm consumers.

This amendment is necessary to help promote the competition we want to develop between cable and phone companies, with the hope that prices for both services will be lowered for consumers, while their options and choices increase.

CHOICE CHIP

Mr. CONRAD. I am very pleased my amendment was accepted by such a wide margin on the Senate floor. The choice chip could be a very important tool for parents to help protect their children from the violence that is all-too available on television. I am hopeful that the Senate-House conferees will see the value in this approach and retain my amendment. However, I deeply regret that I will have to vote against S. 652, even though it contains an amendment I sponsored.

I have deep concerns about the approach this bill takes, in the name of competition, by removing protections that currently safeguard against media concentration. Diversity of opinions and voices is at the very heart of our democracy. I believe this bill creates the potential to stifle many of those voices in our media by greatly consolidating broadcast ownership in this country.

My colleague, Senator DORGAN, offered an amendment earlier this week that would have prevented a single television owner from concentrating ownership above the current, reasonable limit of 25 percent of the national audience. This bill raises that limit, and initially the Senate agreed that was a dangerous precedent. Then politics took over and the Dorgan amendment was defeated.

Today, an amendment by Senator SIMON which would have restricted radio station ownership to a very reasonable limit of 50 AM and 50 FM stations was tabled. The bill, as it stands, eliminates virtually all ownership restrictions. That simply does not safeguard the diversity of voices that democracy requires.

I am also concerned that cable television rates for consumers will rise under this bill. An amendment by Senator LIEBERMAN to keep rates in check before real competition is in place was also tabled today. I believe it is a mistake to pass a bill that includes the word "competition" in the title but does not safeguard consumers in the absence of competition.

Finally, I have concerns about rebuilding the telephone monopoly that the Department of Justice and the Federal courts rightly ended. Now, the Department of Justice, the very agency which protects Americans from anti-trust practices, will not have a role beyond consultation in preventing a po-

tential monopoly from being reestablished. I supported what I believed was a very reasonable amendment from Senator DORGAN and THURMOND to apply a time-honored antitrust standard to any application to enter long distance. That amendment was defeated.

I hope that the final report from the Senate-House conference is a bill that truly promotes competition, while also safeguarding the interests of the consumers before competition arrives. I do not believe this bill meets that goal, and I regret that I cannot support it.

AMENDMENT NO. 1421

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I seek to clarify a part of the Leahy-Breaux amendment (No. 1421) on intraLATA toll dialing parity that was adopted yesterday. As the amendment states, the joint marketing provision in subparagraph (iii) of the amendment applies only in those States that have implemented intraLATA toll dialing parity during the relevant period and to telecommunications carriers in those States offering intraLATA services using "1+" dialing parity. The prohibition on joint marketing however, was not intended to apply to telecommunications carriers offering intraLATA services that do not make use of "1+" dialing parity. That is my understanding of the Breaux-Leahy amendment. Is this consistent with your understanding?

Mr. BREAUX. Yes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1367

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise to make a comment relative to the amendment I successfully offered earlier today to the provision of the bill addressing cable-telephone company mergers and alliances. I understand that some concern has been expressed that the effect of the amendment may be broader than intended. I do not intend that this amendment have broad effect or undo the carefully crafted buyout limitations agreed to previously. I look forward to working with the managers and conferees as we move forward to make any language changes necessary to ensure that the amendment has only the narrow effects intended.

FEES IN LIEU OF FRANCHISE FEES

Mr. PRESSLER. In part, section 203 of the bill adds a new subsection to the 1934 Communications Act that would permit the collection of fees from providers of video programming in lieu of franchise fees. It is my understanding that this requirement does not permit local or State governments to impose such fees on direct-to-home satellite services. Is this correct?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Yes, the intent of the subsection to which you refer, which authorizes fees in lieu of franchise fees, does not apply to the direct-to-home satellite industry. However, nothing in section 203 is intended to affect whether direct-to-home satellite services are otherwise subject to other taxes or fees under current law.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 652, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act. This bill is far from perfect, but on balance I believe it will be a plus for American consumers and the American economy.

We now find ourselves in a highly competitive, global economy, and telecommunications is an increasingly important part of it. In order to keep up in this booming sector, it is imperative that the United States replace a regulatory structure crafted in the 1930s with one suitable for the 21st century. This bill represents an important step in that direction.

The communications industry is a \$1 trillion segment of our economy, and it is among the fastest growing sectors. This boom is not widely understood, but it has tremendous implications for consumers and business.

This trend is being driven by a variety of factors, foremost among them technology. Old copper phone wires can only carry a handful of conversations at once. But one fiber optic cable can carry 32,000 conversations at once. New services can be sent to the home or office over fiber optic cable at virtually zero marginal costs to the producer.

An incredible array of companies has a stake in the emerging communications marketplace—both obvious and surprising players. Consumers can only benefit from the stepped up competition if we break down the walls that now separate cable companies, local phone companies, long distance firms, electric utilities, satellite firms, radio and television broadcasters, cellular companies, computer companies, and Hollywood studios.

With passage of this bill, we hope that companies in all these areas will eventually invade each others' territory, providing consumers with a multiplicity of new choices and creating jobs along the way. Some reports estimate that true competition in all sectors of the telecommunications industry could create 3.6 million jobs by 2003.

We cannot even imagine much of what will eventually be available to consumers in this area. Among the possibilities are movies on demand, interactive home shopping, home banking, interactive entertainment and the ability to take classes and talk with the teacher from home.

The break-up of the old AT&T monopoly in 1984 is the best case study in the benefits of competition in communications. We all remember the time when there was no choice in long distance—no price competition, no incentive to improve quality, no innovative new services in long distance.

But since the break-up of AT&T, 30 million Americans switch long distance carriers a year, and long distance rates have fallen 60 percent. Five hundred companies now offer long distance service.

There is now a wide consensus about the need to further unleash these technological and market forces for the

benefit of consumers. It is imperative that we update Federal communications policy to allow this to happen. We are still operating under the Communications Act of 1934. That should speak for itself.

And since 1984, much of the communications industry has been regulated by one man—Judge Harold Greene, who oversaw the AT&T break-up and who continues to oversee the consent decree that governs the behavior of the Bell operating companies. He has done an admirable job, but it is time for Congress to reenter the game.

That is what this bill represents. As I mentioned before, I supported a number of important amendments that did not pass. I believe the Justice Department should have a formal role in deciding whether Bell Companies should be allowed to offer long distance. The Antitrust Division at Justice has the expertise to assess a market and to prevent monopoly abuse.

I also supported my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, in his effort to strengthen the cable rate regulations in this bill. The leadership package of amendments we passed last week included some additional protections for cable consumers. They represent a considerable improvement over the cable provisions in the bill as reported out of committee. Like Senator LIEBERMAN, however, I wish we could have gone further.

I hope that the remaining problems with this bill can be corrected as the House considers its version and the two chambers meet in conference. Furthermore, if problems develop on cable rates or other matters down the road, Congress can revisit the issue and make improvements at that time.

I commend Senators PRESSLER and HOLLINGS on all of their hard work on this bill, which I think will provide a shot in the arm for our economy.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the United States and, indeed, the world have embarked upon a new technological revolution. Like previous revolutions sparked by technological innovation, this one has the potential to change dramatically our daily lives. It will certainly transform the way we as humans communicate with each other.

What we are witnessing is the development of a fully interactive nationwide communications network. It has the potential to bring our Nation and our world enormous good; without appropriate ground rules to assure fair competition, however, this revolution could create giant monopolies. The communications policy framework we create in this legislation will determine whether many voices and views flourish, or few voices dominate our society.

The impact of this new age communications revolution on the way we send and receive information, and the way we will view ourselves and the world, is profound. Even more staggering is its potential impact on our economy. We could be seeing the largest

market opportunity in history. Some forecasters, including the WEFA Group in Burlington, MA, predict a January 1996 opening of the telecommunications market to full competition would create 3.4 million new jobs, increase GDP by \$298 billion, save consumers nearly \$550 billion in lower communications rates and increase the average household's annual disposable income by \$850 over the next 10 years. As the Communications Workers of America have underscored, delaying free and fair competition means fewer new high-wage, high-skill jobs.

New technologies and industries seem to be emerging and merging almost daily. They range from such sectors as entertainment and education to broadcasting, advertising, home shopping and publishing. One key player in this revolution is the Internet—the global computer cooperative with a current subscriber base of approximately 20 million and a 10 to 15 percent monthly growth rate. One billion people are expected to have access to the net by the end of the decade. While some may consider the net to be the revolution, it is only one of many players in the new communications network game.

We see examples of this new era almost daily, such as someone driving a car while talking on a cellphone. The pace of change is so rapid that words like "cellphone" and "Internet" and "telemessaging" are not in my office computer's spellcheck system. In the weeks and months ahead, more and more Americans will gain access to video dialtone, choosing their television programs through their telephone service. Likewise, cable franchises will enter the local telephone service market. Residents of Springfield, MA, will be able to watch their State legislators in Boston debate an education bill and instantaneously communicate with their legislators about how to vote on an amendment. We will hear more talk about the players in this new game: content providers, transporters, and technology enablers.

As we consider this brave new age of communications, it is clear the current law, the 1934 Communications Act, is a wholly adequate foundation upon which to build a communications system for the 21st century. Moreover, although the courts on occasion properly have intervened to halt monopoly abuse—most notably a little over a decade ago in the telephone industry—we should no longer leave the fundamentals of telecommunications policy to the courts.

S. 652, the telecommunications bill reported by the Commerce Committee on March 23, 1995, by a vote of 17-2 and which I am confident will be passed momentarily by the Senate, is not perfect. In some respects, I would have preferred S. 1822, the bill crafted so ably by Senator HOLLINGS and reported by the committee last year. However, the legislation before the Senate now is

preferable to the status quo. It will establish fair and balanced ground rules for competition in the communications sector as we enter the next century. It will foster competition, assuring a needed balance among existing competitors and new entrants in this rapidly evolving field.

This legislation provides us with a national policy framework to promote the private sector's deployment of new and advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition. Free and fair competition and maintaining universal service are the twin pillars of this new framework.

The bill assures that no competitor, no business and no technology may use its existing market strength to gain a head start on the competition. The legislation requires that a company or group of companies satisfy certain competitive tests before being able to offer a new service or enter a new market. Entry into new services and new areas is contingent upon a demonstration that competition exists in the market in which the business currently competes. But once competition has been achieved, most Federal and State regulation is replaced by consumer demand to regulate the market.

These fundamental features of S. 652 are designed to create a level playing field where every player will be able to compete on the basis of price, quality, and service, rather than on the basis of monopoly control of the market.

The bill also maintains universal service as a cornerstone of our Nation's communications system. With many new entrants in the communications market, S. 652 assures every player pays his fair share to continue universal service throughout our Nation. As the committee report states:

The requirement to contribute to universal service is based on the long history of the public interest, convenience and necessity that is inherent in the privilege granted by the government to use public rights of way or spectrum to provide telecommunications services.

The present system, where certain parts of the country indirectly subsidize low-cost service in other areas, will be phased-out.

I am also pleased the legislation includes two amendments which I sponsored in committee and one I sponsored on the floor. The two amendments adopted in committee seek to restore a level playing field in two areas: broadcast rates for public, educational and governmental entities—known as PEG access groups; and competition in the pay phone markets. I am disappointed that efforts to refine the payphone amendment were unsuccessful, but I hope that further progress can be made on the subject in conference.

As I noted earlier in my statement, there are several provisions in the bill that continue to trouble me. On the floor, I offered and the Senate passed an amendment to ensure low income and rural areas are not bypassed as

communications companies implement new technologies and services.

As the bill moves to conference, I will continue to do what I can to make further improvements and defend against efforts to weaken its provisions protecting consumer interests and assuring free and fair competition.

Through this legislation and this debate, we have a unique opportunity to craft a telecommunications policy framework for the next century. Today, Mr. President, each of us is in a sense a pioneer heading out on the new information highway. Each of us is not only a witness to, but a participant in, one of the most amazing technological revolutions in history. We, as legislators, bear a special responsibility to assure that competition in this new era is fair and that every American in this and future generations may enjoy the fruits of this competition. This is truly one of the greatest challenges we face as we enter the 21st century.

RADIO SPECTRUM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I share the concerns that have been expressed by others regarding the availability of radio spectrum for law enforcement purposes. I have been contacted by law enforcement organizations across the country, including those in my State of Utah, expressing these concerns.

A critical element in the effort to battle crime and to respond to emergencies of all types is the existence of reliable and secure radio communications facilities, which in turn depends on adequate spectrum availability. Yet, current allocations may well be inadequate to meet present needs. Many metropolitan police departments are unable to add new channels to alleviate congestion.

Moreover, spectrum space is also needed to bring new technologies online. Just last week, we passed a counterterrorism bill, which included important provisions to increase information sharing between law enforcement. Yet these provisions will be for naught if spectrum space is not available for the deployment of these technologies.

I appreciate the commitment expressed by the managers of this bill to address this issue. I know that the Senator from South Dakota, the Distinguished Chairman of the Commerce Committee, shares my concerns. As a former member of the Judiciary Committee, he understands the needs of law enforcement. I understand that he is committed to attempting to resolve these concerns as this legislation moves forward. I look forward to working with him and the Senator from South Carolina on this vital issue as the legislation moves through conference.

Mr. BIDEN. I am very concerned that Federal, State, and local law enforcement have adequate spectrum availability, and would like to work with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the managers of this bill to en-

sure that this vital issue is addressed in the conference on this legislation.

The reason this is so important is twofold. First, in this era where Federal, State, and local law enforcement often work together we need to maintain spectrum space so that these, and other public service agencies, can communicate with ease and with the most advanced technology available. If we develop better technology to allow the police to talk to each other without the bad guys listening in, we must have the spectrum available to use this technology.

Second, we must work to ensure sufficient spectrum space for the myriad technological advances being made in the area of secured communications. I have heard several of the law enforcement leaders in my home State of Delaware raise these key points. So, I believe this is a practical problem that we face in Delaware and around the Nation.

We do a disservice to law enforcement and to the American people if we do not provide these public servants with the many benefits of our rapidly advancing telecommunications industry. I look forward to working with my friend from Utah on this important effort.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my friend and colleague from Delaware for his support on this issue. As the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, his strong support of law enforcement is wellknown, and I look forward to working with him in this.

Mr. BIDEN. I want to acknowledge and thank my colleagues for their efforts on this issue. In particular, Senator HATCH and the managers of this important legislation, Senator PRESSLER and Senator HOLLINGS not only for their support of this effort, but also their support of law enforcement.

Mr. PRESSLER. I do share my colleagues' concerns, and appreciate the interest of the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee in this issue. I look forward to working with them on it.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I, too, understand these concerns and look forward to addressing them.

CABLE ISSUES

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to engage my colleague from South Carolina in a colloquy on several cable issues. First, it is my understanding that neither section 204(a) of the bill nor the relevant provisions in the Dole-Daschle-Hollings amendment is intended to prevent the FCC and cable operators from entering into "social contracts" or other similar arrangements to settle rate complaints, under which the operator agrees to offer a low priced basic tier to offset an increase in the rate for cable programming services.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator from South Dakota is correct.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Senator. Second, it is my understanding that the reference to comparable video pro-

gramming, added by the Dole-Daschle-Hollings amendment to new section 623(j)(1)(D) of the Communications Act, has the same meaning as it does elsewhere in section 632(j)(1) of the Communications Act and the FCC's regulations defining comparable.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. PRESSLER. Finally, I call the Senator's attention to the managers' amendment to S. 652. As amended by the managers' amendment, new section 613(b)(2)(B) of the Communications Act clarifies that a Bell operating company providing cable service as a cable operator utilizing its own telephone exchange facilities is not required to establish a video platform. However, a Bell operating company that provides cable service as a cable operator, whether through its own telephone exchange facilities or otherwise, would be subject to the PEG and commercial leased access requirements of the Communications Act—sections 611 and 612—applicable to all cable operators.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator accurately states the intent of the bill as amended by the managers' amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

POLE ATTACHMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have reviewed the provisions of S. 652, as reported, that seek to amend section 224 of the Pole Attachment Act of 1978. As a result of that review, I am deeply concerned that these provisions would have a significantly adverse impact on electric utility ratepayers throughout the Nation. I am particularly concerned that these provisions would require electric ratepayers to shoulder the burden of subsidizing not only cable operators but also telephone companies and telecommunications providers. The amount of money foregone by the bill as reported is not trivial. It amounts to tens of millions of dollars annually, if not hundreds of millions of dollars. Put simply, it is not fair to ask consumers of electricity to subsidize cable operators and telephone companies. In this connection, it is important to point out that this subsidy does not even necessarily go the customers of these companies.

From a consumer protection standpoint, I believe the legislation should be amended to ensure that all entities that attach to poles are required to pay a fair and proportionate rate that provides for recovery of the cost of installing and maintaining the entire pole, including the common space. I ask the chairman of the Committee, Senator PRESSLER, and the ranking minority member, Senator HOLLINGS, whether they have any concerns on this matter and what their plans are to remedy the situation.

Mr. PRESSLER. I agree with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], that this is a real concern that needs to be addressed. I believe that many of these concerns are being addressed in the Manager's amendment, but to the

extent that they are not fully addressed I will work with you to address them.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I concur in the comments of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] and the comments of the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. PRESSLER.

SUBMITTED AMENDMENT NO. 1320

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I filed an amendment No. 1320, that addresses the part of the bill which amends existing law regarding pole attachments. Under the bill, all utilities are required to open up their poles, ducts, conduits or rights-of-way to other telecommunications carriers on a cost basis. Of course, there are exceptions to this. I filed an amendment which would have removed that obligation for nondominant telecommunications carriers. In other words, no nondominant telecommunications carrier would have to provide access on a cost basis. Instead, they would offer access on a free-market basis.

The reason this amendment was filed is straightforward. I can understand requiring the incumbent monopoly to provide access on a cost basis, since the captured rate payers funded the construction. But, I cannot understand requiring other, competitive providers to provide access on a cost basis—particularly if their business is largely in providing access to those very same conduits on a market basis.

There are competitive telecommunications businesses that have laid lines and built a long distance service through hard work and purely private capital. There are telecommunications businesses that have focused on laying conduit or lines for purposes of leasing or selling that capacity. The obvious problem would arise if these businesses that focus on selling capacity lose any chance of profit because they must provide access on a cost basis. I do not think the bill should apply to them, but I am not sure that it does not.

I am sure that the intent of this section was not to burden competitive carriers that are in the business of providing capacity. I ask the managers if they agree with me that this was not the intent of the section?

Mr. PRESSLER. That is right.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BROWN. The amendment I filed would have exempted nondominant carriers from application. At this time, we will not offer the amendment.

The difficulty in this area is that it is unclear whether the bill actually causes an inequitable result and thus whether anything needs to be done. We will take a second look at drafting a solution to this potential problem between passage in the Senate and the conference with the House.

At this time, I ask the managers of the bill if they will support our effort to solve this potential problem in conference?

Mr. PRESSLER. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that there may

be a unwanted inequitable result from this section, and I will work to solve this potential problem in conference.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I, too, believe there may be a potential problem and will work to solve this problem in conference with the House.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the managers for their help on this important issue and commend them for their work on the bill. I yield the floor.

SINGLE LATA STATES

Mr. PRESSLER. This amendment refers to "single-LATA states." I understand this to cover only states where the LATA and the state are the same—where the state constitutes the entire LATA.

Mr. ROTH. That is my understanding as well. The amendment would not exempt those states, like Delaware, that are part of a LATA that includes part of another state.

Mr. PRESSLER. I agree with that interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this debate on S. 652 has clearly demonstrated the potential of emerging telecommunications technologies. It is truly exciting to contemplate what this legislation could mean for Americans society.

A particularly intriguing new development in the telecommunications field is the creation of Personal Communications Services (PCS). These devices will revolutionize the way Americans talk, work and play.

While this new technology opens new vistas for personal communications services, its emergence also highlights the potential downside of entering untested areas. Specifically, concerns have been raised about the potential side-effects of some new PCS technology on other devices such as hearing aids.

Recently, the government completed an auction that netted \$7 billion for the right to provide advanced digital portable telephone service. It is my understanding that some of the companies that obtained these PCS licenses have considered utilizing a technology known as GSM—Global System for Mobile Communications. I am informed that people who wear hearing aids cannot operate GSM PCS devices, and some even report physical discomfort and pain if they are near other people using GSM technology.

It should not be our intent to cause problems for the hearing impaired in promoting the Personal Communications Services market. It is my view that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should carefully consider the impact new technologies have on existing ones, especially as they relate to public safety and potential signal interference problems. An FCC review is in keeping with the intent of S. 652, which includes criteria for accessibility and usability by people with disabilities for all providers and manufacturers of telecommunications services and equipment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would be glad to yield to the honorable ranking member of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Senator for yielding and support his suggestion that the FCC investigate technologies that may cause problems for significant segments of our population before they are introduced into the United States market. Such review is prudent for consumers, and it will help all companies by answering questions of safety interference before money is spent deploying this technology here in the United States.

Four million Americans wear hearing aids, and the Senator from South Dakota has raised an important issue. GSM has been introduced in other countries, and problems have been reported. It is reasonable that these problems be investigated before the growth of this technology effectively shuts out a large sector of our population.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senator for his remarks, and would also like to commend his role in bringing telecommunications reform to the floor. His leadership and patience throughout this three-year exercise that has spanned two Congresses is well known and widely appreciated.

Mr. President, the public record indicates that if companies are allowed to introduce GSM in its present form, serious consequences could face individuals wearing hearing aids. I would urge the FCC to investigate the safety, interference and economic issues raised by this technology. I also would urge the appropriate congressional committees to consider scheduling hearings on this issue.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, S. 652 contains what appears to be two checklists—the first is in section 251(b)—and it deals with such issues as interconnection, access, unbundling, resale, number portability and local dialing parity. Section 255, which deals with the removal of the long distance restriction imposed upon the Bell operating companies by the modification of final judgment, has the second checklist in section 255(b)(2). Section 251(b) deals with the very same issues as section 255(b)(2) does, but its requirements are stated in a broader and less specific manner. Is a Bell operating company required to have "fully implemented" both the section 251 and the section 255 checklist before the Communications Commission can authorize a Bell operating company to provide interLATA service pursuant to section 251(c)?

Mr. PRESSLER. No.

Mr. PACKWOOD. When Section 255 makes reference to section 251, is that reference intended to incorporate the minimum standards of section 251?

Mr. PRESSLER. No.

Mr. CRAIG. What is the intended relationship between the section 251(b) "minimum standards" and the section 255(b)(2) "competitive checklist" given that both the "minimum standards" and the "competitive checklist" address many of the same issues?

Mr. PRESSLER. The competitive checklist is found in section 255(b)(2) and is intended to be a current reflection of those things that a telecommunications carrier would need from a Bell operating company in order to provide a service such as telephone exchange service or exchange access service in competition with the Bell operating company. This competitive checklist could best be described as a snapshot of what is required for these competitive services now and in the reasonably foreseeable future. In other words, these provisions open up the local loop from a technological standpoint as section 254 opens the local loop from a legal barrier to entry standpoint. Section 251's "minimum standards" permit regulatory flexibility and are not limited to a "snapshot" of today's technology or requirements.

NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, may I direct a question to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota regarding a minor technical matter in the Committee amendment?

Specifically, I believe a clarification is in order regarding the Senate's intent in changing the heading on page 101 at lines 15 and 16 to read "(2) Non-Discrimination Standards . . ." It is my understanding that this amendment is necessary to express clearly the Senate's intent that the non-discrimination provisions in this paragraph shall apply to transactions of Bell operating companies with all parties, not just other local exchange carriers as incorrectly suggested in the Committee Report.

Such nondiscriminatory treatment in procurement, standards-setting, and equipment certification is particularly important to the telecommunications equipment supplier community. Independent suppliers must have the same opportunity to sell to the Bell operating companies as any of their affiliates. This is good for the consumer, good for the suppliers, and good for the telephone companies.

Mr. PRESSLER. The understanding of my colleague from North Carolina is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I thank my good friend from South Dakota for making this clarification in the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1256

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I understand there is some concern among those in the transportation industry over an amendment agreed to earlier regarding the use of auctions for the allocation of radio spectrum frequencies. Specifically, the amendment would extend the FCC's authority to use auctions for the allocation of radio spectrum frequencies for commercial use. That amendment, which I supported, also includes a provision to exclude so-called "public safety radio services" from competitive bidding requirements.

I see the sponsor of the amendment on the floor. Will the Senior Senator from Alaska enter a very short col-

loquy to help me put to rest the concerns over this amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. Certainly.

Mr. PRESSLER. For purposes of public safety radio services, there are many circumstances when the transportation industry must rely on radio telecommunications to address safety concerns. For example, the railroad industry uses radio spectrum for voice and data communications that are essential to public safety. Freight and passenger railroads rely upon radio communications to transmit authority for train movements, to broadcast emergency warnings, and to seek emergency response in the event of accidents. Indeed, radio communications can often be critical to addressing the safety concerns of many modes of transportation. Does the Senator from Alaska agree with my views?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. The transportation industry's reliance on radio communications can be critical to public safety. The amendment is not intended to impose economic burdens on the transportation industry or other industries when meeting public safety obligations.

For example, public safety radio services also include private, internal non-commercial use radio services used to provide reliable and secure communications in the management and operation of utility and pipeline services, like the Trans-Alaska pipeline and other oil, gas, mining, and resource development activities in my state under federal, state, and local statutes, regulations and standards relating to public health, safety or security.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Senator. Now, I will yield to the Senior Senator from Oregon, who I understand would also like to comment on this important subject.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I thank the Chairman. I wanted to stress that the availability of radio frequencies is critical to technological advancements which enhance transportation safety. For example, the Department of Transportation is currently working with the Union Pacific Railroad and the Burlington Northern Railroad on an important test program to demonstrate the benefits of a new technology using radio spectrum called Positive Train Control. In fact, a 1994 Federal Railroad Administration report to Congress specifically emphasized the importance of radio technology in the development of positive train control.

This is just one example of how the radio spectrum can be important to the development of new transportation safety technologies. Since the availability of radio frequencies will be critical to these efforts in the future, I strongly agree with my colleagues the term "public safety radio services" includes safety-related communications of railroads and other modes of transportation.

Mr. PRESSLER. I concur with the Senator and thank him for his comments.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am concerned that the language in S. 652 is unclear concerning the requirements that the regional Bell operating companies [RBOC's] must fulfill before they are permitted to provide interLATA, or long distance service. The entry provisions of section 255(b)(1) require that the RBOC must reach an interconnection agreement and must fully implement the checklist under section 255(b)(2). The language is unclear, however, whether the RBOC actually must simply reach an agreement to provide interconnection or whether it must also actually provide such interconnection to a carrier. I would simply clarify that, as one of the principal authors of this legislation, it is my understanding that the legislation requires the RBOC not only to reach an agreement but it must also actually provide such interconnection to a carrier fulfilling the checklist under section 255.

I understand that the legislation does not require that the RBOC's comply with both the minimum standards under section 251(b) and the section 255 checklist before being authorized to provide interLATA service. I would clarify one additional point, however, concerning the charges of providing interconnection under section 255. While there is no explicit reference to the charges that the RBOC's may assess for interconnection under section 255, it is my interpretation of the language in section 255 that the RBOC's must provide interconnection under section 255 at charges that are consistent with section 251(d)(6). Indeed, while the reference to section 251 in section 255(b)(1) is not intended to refer to the minimum standards under section 251, it is intended to include reference to subsection (d)(6) in section 251 concerning the charges for each unbundled element under section 255. I appreciate the opportunity to share this interpretation with colleagues.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995. Mr. President, I had hoped that, following the adoption of several proconsumer amendments on the floor, that I would be able to support this legislation.

I favor increased competition and deregulation of telecommunications markets because true competition benefits consumers by providing them with more choices, lower prices, and improved service. However, Mr. President, S. 652, as it was reported by the Commerce Committee, did not contain adequate assurances that the deregulation of telecommunications markets will result in true competition. And unfortunately, Mr. President, virtually all of the amendments offered on the floor to ensure that this bill would benefit users of telecommunications services were rejected by the Senate.

Mr. President, I am disappointed about that turn of events because I think there was ample opportunity to

make this bill a good bill for consumers, local communities, State governments, and private businesses alike. I regret that the Senate took what should have been an opportunity to better serve consumers, and turned it into an obstacle to greater true competition in telecommunications.

The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, and the Senator from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, was among the most critical amendments offered to improve this bill. That amendment would have included in the legislation a strong decisionmaking role for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in the approval of the regional Bell operating companies [RBOC's] entry into long distance telecommunications markets. It was an attempt to rectify the inadequate long distance entry provisions contained in the bill.

Mr. President, while the bill did attempt to provide protections for consumers, such as the competitive checklist and the public interest test, there was still a distinct need for review by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The competitive checklist in S. 652 only ensures that certain technical and legal barriers to competition in the areas served by the Bell monopoly have been eliminated prior to the RBOC entry. This checklist does not require that competition actually exist in local markets dominated by the RBOC's before they are able to use their substantial market power to enter long distance markets.

The power of the local monopoly is without equal in telecommunications markets. The advantages provided to them over those with lesser market power, fewer resources, and limited opportunities to control entry by their competitors are without bounds. We must keep in mind that competition in both local and long distance markets cannot exist when one player has substantially greater market power than his/her rivals.

S. 652 also prohibits the Federal Communications Commission, the agency required to enforce the competitive checklist, from expanding on the criteria contained in the checklist. If Congress has overlooked crucial criteria with respect to barriers to entry, FCC would be unable to consider it. At the same time the bill limits FCC's role, it provides absolutely no role for the Department of Justice which is the agency responsible for the competition that exists today in long distance markets. Senators DORGAN and THURMOND worked hard to rectify that inadequacy by offering an amendment giving the Department the authority to approve individual RBOC applications to enter long distance markets. Mr. President, that crucial amendment failed.

The absence of a sound antitrust review of RBOC applications to offer long distance service means there is little assurance that the benefits consumers have realized in a competitive long dis-

tance markets will not evaporate if this bill becomes law.

And Mr. President, if the absence of a DOJ role did not provide adequate reason to oppose this bill, the rejection of a substantial number of basic proconsumer amendments only added to my opposition.

Mr. President, this bill repealed much of the cable rate regulation established in the 1992 Cable Act, a law enacted in response to consumer outcries about skyrocketing cable rates. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] offered an amendment which would have merely provided an accurate yardstick to measure whether a cable company's cable rates were out of line and should be subject to regulation. That amendment was tabled.

An amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] would have provided some assurance that channels currently included as part of a consumers' basic tier cable service, which remain under Government regulation, would not be moved into more costly upper tier packages, which will be deregulated under this bill. S. 652, in its current form actually provides an incentive to move channels offered as part of a basic package into the unregulated upper tier packages for which cable companies can now charge higher rates. Senator Boxer's amendment was tabled.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] offered several very good amendments on this bill. One very simple amendment would have merely required that a consumer representative sit on Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, the board which will study existing universal service support mechanisms and make recommendations about how to preserve and advance universal telecommunications service. It seems entirely appropriate that rural consumers be guaranteed representation on this board. Senator Kerrey's amendment was tabled.

The package of leadership amendments that was approved earlier this week by the Senate eliminated virtually all restrictions on the number of radio stations one entity might own raised a number of concerns about undue market concentration in broadcasting. While I voted for that package of amendments because it contained a prohibition on cable/telephone company cross ownership, I remained concerned about the radio ownership provisions in the package. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] attempted to increase the number of stations one entity might own by 150 percent from current law rather than lifting the restrictions entirely. His effort was designed to ensure that this bill did not actually result in less competition in radio broadcasting. His amendment was rejected.

Mr. President, the list of defeated proconsumer amendments goes on. I was astonished by the rejection of some of these amendments which were

intended to benefit consumers and protect them from potentially anti-competitive practices of some within the telecommunications industry. I have wondered if my colleagues have forgotten that the reason we are attempting to encourage greater competition through deregulation is to benefit consumers, not the competitors themselves. This bill might be very good for telecommunications business interests, but it is not good for consumers.

In addition, Mr. President, I am very disturbed by the passage of an amendment yesterday, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] which I believe contains an unconstitutional provision. I spoke at great length yesterday about my specific concerns with that amendment.

Mr. President, it is with disappointment that I must oppose S. 652. However, the outcome of the floor action on this bill, leaves me very little choice.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY LANGUAGE ON OWNERSHIP CAP/ATTRIBUTION

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, In raising the ownership cap to 35 percent of the Nation's TV households immediately, with a biennial regulatory reform review, it is our intent to permit broadcast companies to achieve greater operational efficiencies through expanded group ownership of television stations. There is a danger, however, that future changes to the FCC's attribution rules—for example, prospectively or retroactively restricting the availability of the single majority shareholder exemption or attributing nonvoting stock—could cause some ownership interests not now covered by the cap to fall within the scope of this regulation. Such a result could seriously undermine the goal that we are seeking to advance through adoption of this legislation. Accordingly, the committee expects the FCC to avoid the adoption of more onerous or restrictive attribution policies that would reduce the national station ownership potential of individual companies below the level that would be permitted under a 35-percent cap utilizing the attribution rules that are currently in effect.

PROMOTING THE USE OF TELECOMMUTING

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to speak more fully about my amendment on telecommuting, which passed the Senate yesterday by voice vote. My amendment directs the Secretary of Transportation to research successful telecommuting programs and to inform the general public as to the types of telecommuting programs that are succeeding and the benefits and costs of such programs. This amendment is appropriate in the context of the pending bill, which accelerate the deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies.

As my colleagues are aware, telecommuting is the practice of allowing people to work either at home or in nearby centers located closer to their home during their normal working

hours, substituting telecommunications services, either partially or fully, for transportation to the traditional workplace. I believe that it is in the national interest to encourage the use of telecommuting because it can enable flexible family-friendly employment, reduce air pollution, and conserve energy. Further, as a Senator from a State which has major urban areas like Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, I recognize there is a real need to improve the quality of life in and around America's cities.

According to a July, 1994, Office of Technology Assessment report, between 2 to 8 million American workers already telecommute at least part time. A 1994 survey by the conference board found, however, that in 155 businesses nationwide, only 1 percent of employees telecommute, although 72 percent of the businesses had such an option.

According to the Office of Technology Assessment, the most significant barriers to telecommuting are business and worker acceptance and costs. This legislation responds to the need to broaden public awareness of the benefits and costs of telecommuting, and to identify and highlight successful programs that can be duplicated.

I believe telecommuting is profamily. I have seen several news articles which featured working mothers and other parents who endorse telecommuting as benefiting child care and flexibility generally. One General Services Administration employee who now telecommutes was interviewed for a June 11, 1995, Washington Post article remarked, "I just wish they had this much sooner, when my kids were little."

Telecommuting should also appeal to computer-literate younger Americans, such as those described as Generation X, for whom a balance between work and lifestyle is very important. This new generation of American workers is the most adept at utilizing computers and should welcome the opportunity to spend less time commuting and more time pursuing other interests.

It is also important to note that some physically impaired individuals are able to obtain jobs thanks to their ability to telecommute. An April 23, 1995, Boston Globe article detailed a pilot project in Massachusetts, where physically impaired individuals such as the legally blind and quadriplegics do transcription work for doctors and hospitals. One woman who suffered crippling injuries in an automobile accident noted that she never thought she'd work again, but that this new telecommuting program "is like a gift sent from heaven."

Telecommuting should be of interest because of its potential implications for transportation, particularly the mitigation of traffic congestion. The Energy Department issued a report in June, 1994, in which it stated that telecommuting and its benefits will be

concentrated in the largest, most congested urban areas, with 90 percent of the benefits accruing to the 75 largest American cities. Thus, the greatest benefits will occur where they are most needed. Reflecting the direct effects of telecommuting on transportation, the Department of Transportation has reported that in 1992, telecommuting saved 2 million Americans an estimated 3.7 billion vehicle miles, 178 million gallons of gasoline, and 77 hours of commuting time each. The Department also estimated that telecommuting would lead to reductions of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides on the order of 100,000 tons in the year 2002 and 1 million tons of carbon monoxide. Rural areas should also benefit from a broader use of telecommuting because more employment opportunities would be available through the information superhighway.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It directs the Secretary of Transportation to identify successful telecommuting programs used by Government agencies and companies and publicize information about such programs in order to broaden public awareness of the benefits of telecommuting. The Secretary would carry out this directive in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, so that work force and environmental concerns will be taken into account. The Secretary of Transportation would also be required to report to Congress on his findings, conclusions, and recommendations with respect to telecommuting within 1 year of enactment. Using such information, Congress may consider whether additional legislation to promote telecommuting is warranted or desirable.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the Washington Post and Boston Globe articles I have mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1995]

FEDERAL WORKERS TEST DRIVE

TELECOMMUTING

(By Todd Shields)

In a federal office in Waldorf, Julie Jones occupies workstation 13. Chrissie Edelen sits right beside her, in mirror-image No. 14.

Their cubicles are bereft of humanizing touches, bare of the snapshots or photocopied cartoons that might proclaim that a person is in the bureaucrat's seat.

They'll go all day without walking down the hall to a meeting.

They'll not be visited by a boss, and no colleague will drop in for a chat.

Office grumps? Strange ascetics?

Certainly not. They are happy telecommuters, using their cubicles in Southern Maryland once a week, on the blessed day when they don't devote two or three hours to the simple act of getting to and from work. And that, they certainly love.

"The morale is excellent," said Edelen, a graphic artist. "I feel more relaxed. You're not fighting traffic. . . . You just feel better."

Edelen and Jones, a paralegal, are early beneficiaries of a pilot program that may spare tens of thousands of federal workers enervating commutes while boosting productivity and cutting air pollution.

The women are among 56 workers who spend one or two days a week at the InTeleWorkNet Center, a 14-station office suite replete with computers, faxes, printers and other equipment. The center, set up with money from the General Services Administration, is one of five on the fringes of the Washington area, where federal commuters face particularly grueling trips.

Proponents see the centers as forerunners of scores of similar stations that would dot the area, in essence bringing many workplaces within a short drive or even a bicycle ride of workers' homes. The GSA, which is using the Washington area as its prototype, expects to expand the program nationwide, fostering "telework" centers for 60,000 federal employees by 1998.

The federal pilot, funded by a \$6 million appropriation through late 1996, is one of several initiatives to bring telecommuting—working at a distance from the usual office—to government workers in the Washington area.

Fairfax, Arlington and Montgomery county governments all have begun small pilot programs for their staffs to work from home. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, a regional planning agency, envisions four work centers in Virginia and one in the District for private and public workers. And this year, Maryland is to launch a three-year pilot program for state employees, who would work at home.

The programs are initial steps toward a transformation already well begun in the private sector. Estimates of the number of telecommuters in the United States begin at 5 million, yet the federal government, with its 2.8 million employees, has only 3,000 workers enrolled in telecommuting programs. By comparison, one regional telephone company alone, Bell Atlantic Corp., has 2,000 telecommuting employees. Public or private, the programs' impetus is the same. Planners and executives look around and see the same things workers by the legion experience—bad air, traffic jams and stress-filled schedules that commonly have workers leaving home before dawn and placing their children in the care of others in eerily empty suburbs.

"You wonder: My God? Isn't there a better way to do this?" said Warren Master, head of the GSA pilot project.

Master speaks with the zeal of the converted, sketching aloud plans for work centers that play host to both government and private employees and that attract the broader public with copying shops, Internet access and services such as Veterans Affairs counselors or Internal Revenue Service advisers.

For the time being, though, the benefits go primarily to people such as Jones, the paralegal. A resident of Clinton, in southern Prince George's County, she usually commutes more than an hour to Defense Mapping Agency offices in Merrifield or Bethesda. On Wednesdays, she travels a few miles south against traffic to reach the Waldorf center in 15 minutes or less.

The hours saved leave more time with her husband and 22-month-old son. But Jones was surprised to find an added plus: She can accomplish far more at the Waldorf center, where she has all the equipment she needs without the countless distractions of big-office life, she said.

"It makes things easier," Jones said. "It's just the same as if I'm working at my desk in Merrifield or Bethesda, except I don't have as many interruptions."

Jones and Edelen, who works for the Federal Highway Administration, said they save large, complex tasks for their telecommuting days. Being able to work without interruption is a relief. "It's off my brain," Jones said, "and I'm on to something else."

The Waldorf workers have experienced what telecommuting consultants and advocates long have contended: that teleworkers are more productive. Studies document increases of 15 percent to 25 percent, said Master, of the GSA.

But telecommuting still can be a tough sell, said Jennifer Thomas, program director at the GSA's telecommuting center in Fredericksburg, VA., which opened its second branch last month.

"Some kind of grumpy middle manager will say, 'How do I know this person's not goofing off?'" Thomas said. Her center advises the managers to judge by results. So far, she said, the center has received only positive feedback from workers and their managers.

Despite the good reviews and the affected workers' adulation—virtually all Waldorf teleworkers surveyed by the University of Baltimore's Schaefer Center for Public Policy thought the arrangement improved morale and their quality of life—the centers' future is by no means assured.

"Once the funding runs out on these pilots, they, of course, have to be self-sufficient," Master said. When subsidies drop away, the charge to agencies that rent the computer workstations will increase. Master said agencies still could save money if they reduce the number of desks in central offices, to take account of telecommuters.

One person who hopes the centers will succeed is Ruth Ann Campbell, a GSA budget analyst who for 28 years has endured commutes of as far as 42 miles from her home in La Plata. Now she revels in the opportunity to drive just 10 miles north of the Waldorf center.

"My family and friends think I'm much nicer," she said during a break in the work center's small video-conferencing room. "I'm not only happier on Wednesdays, I'm happier because I'm looking forward to next Wednesday. . . ."

"I just wish they had this much sooner, when my kids were little."

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 23, 1995]

QUADRIPLIGICS GET HELP IN WORK-AT-HOME PROGRAM

(By Andrew Blake)

When Mary M. Palermo suffered crippling back injuries after an automobile accident in Revere in the summer of 1992, she thought she would never be able to work again—certainly not as a waitress or in an office.

In some respects she was right. She says she can't commute to work because of back pain. But under a program just gearing up at Melrose-Wakefield Hospital, Palermo will "tele-commute" as she and several others work for doctors at the hospital via computer, without leaving their homes.

"For me this is like a gift sent from heaven," said Palermo, 42, of Revere.

"I started getting assignments for transcriptions on April 4 and the best part is I can work at home at my own pace," she added.

One doctor at the hospital has been using the new service since February. Several more physicians employed by the hospital or affiliated with it are expected to start using the service within a week or two.

Doctors dictate their patient medical notes, progress notes or surgical notes into a Dictaphone. The notes are then heard by a transcriptionist at his or her home, typed

into a home computer and sent back to the hospital or doctor.

The program, which allows physically impaired people including the blind, to do transcription work for doctors and hospitals, originated at Boston University's Helping Hands project, best known for its work in training monkeys to help quadriplegics. It is funded in large part by a \$50,000 grant from the State Department of Employment and Training.

M.J. Willard, executive director of Helping Hands, affiliated with Boston University's Medical School, described this pilot project "as diversification of the original program."

The idea came about, she said, after talks with the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission, the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind and Gov. Weld's Telecommuting Initiative. A variation on the program is working in California, she said.

"Over the summer, working with people referred by state agencies and scored for compatibility with home transcription work, a dozen trainees learned medical terminology, learned how to use computers and communication modems and software programs for writing and communication by computer.

"Not surprisingly, we discovered the very reasons that we set up the program were causing problems for the students—commuting," she explained.

The classes at BU were scaled back to once a week and then the students could learn by communicating with their computers. While BU provided the class space and administrative help, Willard said IBM donated computers and modems, the Dictaphone company donated some Dictaphones and deeply discounted others, Willard explained. And the state paid the salary for the instructor.

"We had contacted 82 hospitals and transcription companies to gauge their interest. Thirteen expressed interest but Melrose-Wakefield Hospital expressed deep commitment in making this happen, so we went with them," said Willard.

At the hospital, Jackie Valente, director of medical management, said the Helping Hands project could not have come at a better time. An increasing number of physicians need faster and more efficient transcription services.

"We see this expanding to 50 or so physicians with about one transcriptionist for every three doctors," said Valente.

Right now, she added, Dr. Khaleet Beeb is working with a transcriptionist to establish formats and to work out kinks in the system. For the moment, the transcriptionist first sends the transcribed reports to a proof-reader working at home in Quincy, who checks for correct medical terminology and then sends it to Beeb at the hospital.

Three more transcriptionists she said, including Palermo, are about to start possibly as early as this week. One is in Dorchester and the other lives in Watertown.

One of the physicians about to use the program is Dr. Joseph L. Pennacchio, a Revere native who is president of the medical staff at Melrose-Wakefield Hospital.

"This sounds like a good program. I can definitely see advantages. With this service we can better document our notes, communicate faster for the benefit of patients and get more detailed information to us more efficiently," said Pennacchio.

The system currently used by doctors to have their notes transcribed relies heavily on commercial transcription services and free-lance transcriptionists who stop by the hospital or doctor's office to pick up tapes. The person then listens to the tapes, transcribes the information on a typewriter and then carries the material back to the hospital. That can take days or weeks, according to Valente.

Under the telecommuting system she expects the turnaround time to be greatly reduced.

"People can work at their homes at midnight or 3 a.m. if they feel like it or they can tend to their children and start work any time they like. The more they work, the more they earn," she added.

The homebound computer transcriptionists will be paid 7 cents a line. They can work as much as or little as they like, and much will depend on how extensive a doctor's notes are on any given assignment, she explained.

Palermo, originally from Watertown, N.Y., and with a degree in English, came to the North Weekly region about 19 years ago on assignment from the Social Security Administration to the Lynn office.

Later she worked as a waitress at Durgin Park in Boston, "where I was entertaining people for 12 hours a day. So I decided to be a stand-up comic, where I only had to be funny for 5 minutes."

"When the accident happened I was in the process of thinking about a work change. I never imagined I'd be working at home with a computer," she said.

RESTRICTION ON IN-REGION MERGERS OF TELEPHONE AND CABLE COMPANIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to commend the leadership and the managers of the telecommunications bill, S. 652, for the amendment which was made to ensure that potential competition between telephone companies and cable companies will be maintained for the benefit of consumers. Until this amendment was made, I had serious concerns about S. 652 removing the current prohibition on mergers between local telephone exchange carriers and cable companies in their service regions, subject only to standard antitrust scrutiny. I was prepared to offer an amendment to the original language in the bill because it lessened the likelihood of vigorous competition developing between telephone and cable companies, with each offering the services of the other.

As the chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee, I am particularly pleased that the amendment adopted to restrict telephone-cable mergers contains a savings clause which makes absolutely clear that the antitrust laws are maintained and will be applied by the antitrust enforcement agencies. Thus, even if the FCC grants a waiver as permitted in the amendment or a merger comes within the rural exception, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission still have the authority and the obligation under the law to consider whether any telephone-cable merger, acquisition, or joint venture violates the antitrust laws.

Mr. President, antitrust analysis by the antitrust authorities is critical to promote competition between the two wires—cable and telephone—that already run to the home, and avoid a single monopoly provider of both cable and telephone services, which would result in higher cable and telephone prices for consumers.

I am pleased that an agreement was reached in this area and that this amendment is now part of the bill.

RURAL HEALTH PROVIDERS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to talk about how the Snow-Rockefeller provision in the bill before us today will assure rural residents that when it comes to their health care they will have the same advantages as urban residents.

A shortage of family doctors, pediatricians, nurse practitioners, and other primary care providers has been a chronic problem in rural areas. Access to a medical specialist has been practically nonexistent unless a rural citizen was willing and able to travel, sometimes a very long distance, to be treated.

Telemedicine is a telecommunications technology that can address both these problems, and at the same time, save money for both patients and health care facilities. Patients save because they can be treated in their own hometown rather than being referred to an out-of-town specialist. This saves them transportation and overnight accommodation costs.

Patient cost-sharing payments will also be less if a patient can be treated locally rather than transported to a referral or specialty center. The costs of a local, rural hospital are generally lower than a teaching or specialty hospital. In those cases when a patient must be transferred for specialty care, the availability of telemedicine consultations can speed up when a patient can be transferred safely back home.

Mr. President, a major difficulty in recruiting doctors and other health care providers to rural areas is the professional isolation, the heavy workload, and little or no back-up medical support. Telemedicine can provide life-saving back-up support for medical emergencies which eases the minds of patients and their families and the doctor taking care of the patient. Telecommunication hookups can reduce the sense of professional isolation and provide for continuing education opportunities. And, over the long run telemedicine can increase training opportunities for health care professionals at rural sites, increasing the chances a doctor or nurse will return to practice in a rural community.

Mr. President, in West Virginia and all across the country, rural hospitals are finding it increasingly difficult to retain patients in the community because specialty physicians have a hard time diagnosing a patient's condition over the phone based only on a verbal description of the problem by the rural physician. Now with telemedicine, many of those rural hospitals can safely and effectively care for their patients instead of referring them elsewhere.

For example in West Virginia, a medical student and a primary care doctor consulted with the chief of neurology at West Virginia University about an elderly Medicare patient. The chief neurologist was able to diagnose the patient's medical condition through

telemedicine technology. This saved the patient a 138-mile trip over mountainous terrain to West Virginia University Hospital. The patient instead was able to be treated at the rural hospital and ended up saving the Medicare Program \$2,500.

And, of course, when minutes, even seconds, count, having the instant availability of emergency consultations can literally mean the difference between life and death. Just last week in West Virginia, an emergency medical resident staffing a rural hospital emergency room had to treat a patient with a broken neck. The medical resident had never treated a broken neck before, but because the rural hospital had telemedicine capabilities, Dr. John Prescott, the chief of emergency medicine at West Virginia University was able to immediately consult with the doctor on the appropriate treatment protocol. The patient was stabilized and later transferred to a referral hospital.

Our amendment will help bring down a significant financial barrier to the development of telecommunications technology in rural areas: the costs of transmission. While the basic start-up costs for acquiring telemedicine technologies are coming down, transmission costs remain unaffordable. A small, rural hospital in West Virginia reported that the estimated charge for a T1 line to allow them to hook up with a larger hospital for administrative and quality assurance support was an unaffordable \$4,300 a month.

The West Virginia University which started a pilot telemedicine project 5 years ago, recently solicited bids for carrier services; three companies bid for the service. The winning bid's monthly charges ranged from \$475 a month to \$2,200 a month. The highest monthly charge of \$2,200 was for a telecommunications hookup with a small rural health center in Greenbrier County, WV with the closest teaching hospital in the area.

The cost of transmission must be lowered if telemedicine is to become economically feasible for many rural communities. Right now the West Virginia telemedicine project is funded by Federal grant dollars. This is true for hundreds of telemedicine projects all across the country. Congress with enthusiastic bipartisan support has encouraged the development of telemedicine technologies all across the country. The Government has provided seed money for telemedicine, but unless we make sure that telecommunication transmission costs are affordable over the long run, many rural health care providers won't be able to continue with these very important projects.

Tommy Mullins, a hospital administrator for a small rural hospital in West Virginia, recently told my staff that "the \$2,000 per month service charge for the T1 is more than I spend for educational programs for my entire staff of 150 employees. If we did not

have the grant money to pay for the monthly charge we could not maintain the hookup."

Mr. President, our amendment is carefully targeted to health care facilities that are providing health care services in rural areas. We have also specifically included academic health centers, teaching hospitals, and medical schools in our amendment. These institutions have been essential partners with rural health providers in planning and creating rural health telemedicine networks and have been leaders in initiating rural health networks. Rural health care providers are generally so overloaded with patient care demands that it is difficult for them to spend the time planning and coming up with the resources to implement a telemedicine program.

In addition, academic health centers bring health professions training programs and continuing education programs to the rural health network which reduce professional isolation for the rural health care providers. Finally, it promotes an increased understanding and sensitivity on the part of the academic health center to many aspects of rural health care.

Mr. President, I am extremely pleased and relieved that the amendment I sponsored with the Senator from Maine, Senator SNOWE, was not stricken from the telecommunications bill. I believe that our provision will have a tremendous positive effect on rural health care. We are already seeing amazing results in terms of quality of care and in improving access to primary and specialty care in rural areas as a result of telemedicine. This amendment will make sure that the important progress we have made in rural health care will continue and expand.

LIMITING ACCESS BY CHILDREN TO INAPPROPRIATE MATERIALS ON THE INTERNET

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, as you know, the Internet is a remarkable development that has transformed the way people communicate. On the Internet, you can converse on-line with family, friends, and associates across the globe, search untold numbers of data bases on every imaginable subject, and share ideas with millions with the push of a button. The Internet is an enormous highway with few rules. Its simplicity is part of its appeal. But its lack of rules is also a source of considerable concern, because of the widespread availability of materials on the Internet that are entirely inappropriate for children.

Certainly one option is to impose stricter legal penalties for putting offensive materials on the net, and the provisions in the bill accomplish this. I am concerned about these provisions, however, because they challenge first amendment rights and undermine one of the freest, most spontaneous communications media ever devised.

Another approach is to pursue a technological solution. Parents can block

cable TV channels they deem inappropriate for children. We need similar controls for the Internet and other electronic communications media.

Some Internet providers are offering schools a service that denies access to unsuitable Internet sites. One software vendor is now offering a service which identifies and, if a parent desires, filters out inappropriate materials on the Internet. These are encouraging steps, and I hope industry will continue to develop and market such services. These services must be purchased, however, and will not come cheap for all Internet users. Hence a more ubiquitous fix is needed.

Another option, addressed in this amendment, is to include a "tag" or "marker" in the filename of Internet text or graphics of a mature nature. For example, if an Internet user is preparing to post a file that is of a mature nature, he or she can include a tag such as "adult" or "mature" in the file name. Similarly, he or she can put this tag in an address—essentially this would mark all files under that address as inappropriate for children. It is then a simple matter for programmers who develop the software that connects users to the Internet to include an optional parental block to filter out all such files. Teachers could use the filter as well.

This amendment simply encourages the Internet community to self-regulate its behavior by adding tags to files that are inappropriate for children. It does not mandate such tags, Mr. President. The amendment encourages vendors of software that links users to the Internet to include a parental block to filter out the tagged files. Finally, it requires the Department of Commerce to promote the program and GAO to study whether the voluntary tags are effective after one year. This amendment does not conflict in any way with the indecency provisions in the bill.

I should note that one industry initiative, announced Monday, involves putting a "stamp of approval" on materials judged appropriate for children, where parents can then choose to let their children see only those approved materials. Since the vast majority of material on the Internet is entirely appropriate for children, it is unclear how this idea can be implemented practically. It is nonetheless a useful initiative and complements the approach of this amendment.

This amendment offers only a partial fix, but in concert with appropriate legal penalties and other technical approaches, it will help address a very serious problem.

BELLCORE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the interested parties to the Bellcore issue raised during the debate on the manager's amendment have come to an agreement on a statement of goals that outline a mutually agreeable solution to the issue. The parties intend to ne-

gotiate legislative language to be included in the final bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of goals be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GOALS FOR AMENDMENT ON STANDARDS-MAKING AND CERTIFICATION

In addition to the provisions in S. 652 regarding Bellcore manufacturing, the parties agree to negotiate an amendment for adoption in the final act that will:

Ensure that entities engaged in industry-wide telecommunications equipment standards-making use open and non-discriminatory procedures.

Ensure that any entity that is an affiliate of more than one Bell operating company will engage in open, fair, and non-discriminatory establishment of generic network requirements intended to be a significant reference point for more than one Bell operating company in their product specifications, standards-making, and product certification for hardware, software, and related products when such company undertakes an activity for more than one company.

Ensure that Bellcore, if no longer an affiliate of any Bell operating company, will not be considered a Bell operating company, or a successor or assign of a Bell operating company.

Ensure that the Bell operating companies have choices in awarding contracts for the purpose of establishing product and service standards and requirements.

Ensure that vendors selling telecommunications equipment to Bell operating companies have opportunities to have their equipment certified under circumstances that are open, fair, and non-discriminatory.

Ensure that proprietary information submitted in the standards-making and certification processes is not released for any purpose other than that authorized by the owner of such information.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is my desire that the parties conclude these negotiations in a timely manner. I will support the product of the negotiations and urge that the Senate accept that product in the final version of this bill. Finally, I would like to thank the Senator from North Carolina for helping to bring the parties back to the negotiating table.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I concur with the Senator's statement. It is in everyone's best interest to seek a negotiated settlement. I thank the Senator for his work in getting the parties to agree to the statement of goals. It is an important first step. I understand that the statement of goals is acceptable to all Senators that have expressed an interest in this issue, including Senators HELMS, BRADLEY, DORGAN, EXON, and KERRY. I also understand that the statement of goals is acceptable to the managers of the bill, and that the managers are amendable to including the negotiated legislative language in the final bill.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I shall stop speaking the minute either the Majority Leader or Minority Leader walk in the door. I wanted to take this time to make my concluding remarks.

I think this bill will result in lower telephone rates, lower cable rates, and

more services to the American people. I think this is a very exciting era, and this bill an historic opportunity. I hope the House acts quickly, and I hope we have a conference as soon as is practicable. I hope a Conference Report can be adopted by both the House and the Senate, and I hope the President will sign the bill.

The intention of this bill is to get everybody else into everybody else's business. It is to promote competition and to deregulate. It has been a struggle because almost everybody in the industry says they are for deregulation. Yes, they say they are for deregulation, but they usually mean deregulation of the other guy.

This is a balanced, bipartisan bill. I think it is truly the first major bipartisan bill we have moved through the Senate this year. We have had our differences, but I believe that this bill will cause an explosion of new jobs. I believe that it will cause a new era, similar to what has occurred in the computer industry.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299, AS MODIFIED

AMENDMENT NO. 1422

AMENDMENT NO. 1423

AMENDMENT NO. 1313

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining Breaux amendment be modified with the modification I send to the desk, that the modified amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that it be in order for me to send to the desk two technical amendments and a modification of amendment No. 1313, that they be considered and agreed to, en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the amendments (Nos. 1299, as modified; 1422; 1423; 1313) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

On page 123, line 10, add the following new sentence: "This section shall take effect for each vessel upon a determination by the United States Coast Guard that such vessel has the equipment required to implement the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System installed and operating in good working condition."

AMENDMENT NO. 1422

In section 623 of the Communications Act of 1934 (as added by section 204 of the bill on page 70), strike "and does not, directly or through an affiliate, own or control a daily newspaper or a tier 1 local exchange carrier." and insert "and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed \$250,000,000."

AMENDMENT NO. 1423

In section 262 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 308 of the bill—

(1) strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

"(e) GUIDELINES.—Within 18 months after the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995, the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board

shall develop guidelines for accessibility of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment in conjunction with the Commission on the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The Board shall review and update the guidelines periodically.

(2) strike subsection (g) and insert the following:

“(g) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall, not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995, prescribe regulations to implement this section. The regulations shall be consistent with the guidelines developed by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board in accordance with subsection (e).

AMENDMENT NO. 1313

On page 116, between lines 2 and 3 insert the following:

(D) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Commission, for interstate services, and the States, for intrastate services, from considering the profitability of telecommunications carriers when using alternative forms of regulation other than rate of return regulation (including price regulation and incentive regulation) to ensure that regulated rates are just and reasonable.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Democratic leader would like to speak at this time. As I understand, after he speaks, I will have just a few minutes to speak on my amendment. Then we vote on the Dole amendment and then final passage.

I hope during the two votes I can determine what we will do the balance of the day and the balance of the week, so my colleagues will have some information before 6 o'clock. We are attempting to take up two bills and we are meeting objections from different sides for different reasons on each. We may be able to work that out during the vote.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, citizens in my State of South Dakota often ask me, what does this legislation mean to the State of South Dakota? What does it mean to people living in small cities?

I say a great deal.

First it will mean that a small city will be able to be on the same basis as a big city in terms of getting information. We have CitiBank's credit card operation located in Sioux Falls. We have the Spiegel Catalog telephone mail order facility in Rapid City.

Recently, a team from Georgetown University came to Sioux Falls to start a joint research project on telemedicine. Georgetown is planning to work with a Sioux Falls hospital to establish this telemedicine project.

Recently, I was talking to some of the major universities in this country

about partnering with small South Dakota colleges. Modern telecommunications will make such partnerships not only possible, but productive.

I have recently approached one of the largest companies in the United States about doing a project jointly with small companies, using modern telecommunications.

The city of Aberdeen, SD, has a new upgrade digital switch. They are now able to use this capability for telemedicine, to have an interaction with some of the big hospitals as operations are being performed. As a result of the upgrade, a major motel chain, Super 8, was able to locate its nationwide reservation system in the city.

Someone living in a small city or a small town has the same information available as someone in a great city. You do not have to be in downtown New York, downtown Minneapolis, or in downtown Los Angeles to get information, use it and respond to it.

The executive director of the Northeast Council of Governments in my State has sent me a well-prepared report on what new telecommunications will mean in that region of smaller cities in rural areas. She reports that upgrading telecommunications technology has already attracted national companies to Aberdeen, where they have created hundreds of new jobs in the last year.

Other communities are clamoring for upgrades to their communications technology. They know this will help improve the quality of life in their communities.

Faye Kann's report also describes the potential for telemedicine and long-distance learning with an improved telecommunications infrastructure in northeast South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the RECORD.

TELECOMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY IN
NORTHEAST SOUTH DAKOTA
(By Faye Kann)

Competition in the telecommunications arena could benefit rural areas such as northeast South Dakota. The SD Public Utilities Commission worked very hard to help Aberdeen and the region upgrade the telecommunications capabilities in order to effectively compete for business retention and creation. With the availability of competition, the upgrade of technology equipment could have occurred earlier.

In 1994-5, approximately 400 jobs have been newly created or retained in Aberdeen due to the upgrade of telecommunications technology and the ability for rapid data transmission. Four separate national and local entities saw the opportunity to utilize upgraded telecommunications equipment but needed the assistance of the state PUC in order to obtain the equipment upgrades. Companies such as Super 8 reservation systems, Howard Johnson's Reservation system, Aman Collection Company, and Student Loan Finance Corporation are among companies that added employees due to the technology upgrades. Without the telecommunications upgrade, one of these companies would have located in another state instead of South Dakota.

Those upgrades include the installation of SwitchNet 56, ISDN lines, and Signal 7 tech-

nology. That more up-to-date technology has enabled those companies to locate and maintain their companies in Aberdeen and keep jobs in northeast South Dakota. The increased payrolls and job opportunities have added to the number of jobs available to a broad spectrum of age groups employed in telecommunication agencies. The general nature of telecommunications jobs allow for flexible work schedules to accommodate workers from all age groups to interact both professionally and to maintain their excellent quality of life in South Dakota.

Other communities in northeast South Dakota such as Britton, Eureka, and Gettysburg are actively seeking job growth due to upgrades in telecommunications equipment throughout the region. Manufacturers in Britton such as Horton Industries and Sheldahl, Inc. with approximately 400 employees are currently using telecommunications equipment to communicate with their suppliers, markets, potential contracts and corporate headquarters. Use of the telecommunications equipment allows for quick, effective two-way interaction in the design stage before production.

Another component of the telecommunications industry focuses on long distance learning. The statewide Rural Development Telecommunications Network (RDTN) allows higher education to offer classes for students across the state. Schools in communities such as Groton, Frederick, and Webster in northeast South Dakota utilize cost efficiencies and class offerings that are available with telecommunications through the North Central Area Interconnect (NCAI) system. Continuing education for communities and school district staff allow for future development and curriculum enhancement.

Northern State University is moving ahead with expanding the connections on campus. The campus infrastructure would allow all video/audio conferences, meetings and instructional programs to be shown in the individual classrooms. Many classrooms, one existing microcomputer lab, and a new multi-media based Instructional Classroom will be connected to the LAN network. This classroom will be equipped with appropriate printers, scanners, and display equipment as well as a fully interactive video-conferencing component.

In addition, telemedicine is being used in the experimental stage in the region. The impact of the next phase of the regional telecommunications upgrade will place the high resolution telecommunications equipment in outlying clinic for patient diagnosis and effective utilization of physician's assistants and nurse practitioners. Those types of clinics are in communities where doctors are unwilling or unable to locate. The aging population as shown in the demographics of South Dakota rate health care as one of the top concerns.

Another community which is a good example of the need for state-of-the-art technology for a point of presence and fiber optics is Huron. Several major employers have considered Huron for economic development expansion but because of the lack of access and equipment, jobs and economic opportunity were denied in the northeast region of South Dakota. When checking with telecommunications companies who provide the necessary equipment, the cost to benefit ratio is not attractive in the rural areas and therefore equipment has not been installed and access is denied.

Education, government, and business are supporting the creation of CityNet in Aberdeen. The local cable company is upgrading its system with the installation of a large fiber-optic cable network. In addition to the cable company's normal services, this fiber-

optic infrastructure will be used to connect various entities (K-12 education, higher education, all levels of governments, health care, and individual homes and businesses). The uses for the network are virtually limitless and offer a means for connections not only within the community but to the world as this network connects with other networks.

Competition coupled with universal service is a must for rural states to have access for all citizens. If major telecommunications networks such as Internet access are denied in the rural areas, state-of-the-art technology will be deployed only in the mass markets with dense population where the providers are able to obtain cost-benefit ratios which are attractive to the provider. It is imperative that Congress understand this issue. Aberdeen hosts an annual telecommunications conference and was the first demonstration nationwide with an interactive two-way audio/video link over the public switched network with the US Senate Recording Studio in 1994. We invite interested parties to northeast South Dakota to view our projects and partake in demonstrations of the effect of utilization of the technology.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Laska Schoenfelder, public utilities commissioner of the State of South Dakota. Commissioner Schoenfelder has many years experience working to support South Dakota consumers and to help provide them better telecommunications services. She enthusiastically endorses S. 652.

Commissioner Schoenfelder writes, "This bill will allow Americans greater access to communication services at an affordable price which can only be achieved through a competitive market. The bill also preserves universal service, which is vital to rural states."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION, STATE CAPITOL
BUILDING,

Pierre, SD, June 9, 1995.

Memo to: Senator LARRY PRESSLER.

From: Laska Schoenfelder, SD Public Utilities Commissioner.

Re SD 652.

Residential and business consumers of communication services will be the real winners if Senator Pressler's bill, the Communication Act of 1995 (SB 652), passes.

While South Dakota has promoted telecommunications competition at the state level this bill will be a boon for economic development in all states. This bill takes a step forward in recognizing the essential role of the State in promoting fair competition.

This bill will allow Americans greater access to communication services at an affordable price which can only be achieved through a competitive market. The bill also preserves Universal Service which is vital to rural states.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, competition and deregulation will bring great benefits to South Dakota and other States with small cities.

For example, the bill is designed to rapidly accelerate private sector development of advanced telecommunications and information technologies

and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition.

A recent series of television commercials have shown people sending faxes from the beach, having meetings via computer with people in a foreign country, using their computer to search for theater tickets and a host of other services that soon will be available. My bill would make those services available even sooner by removing restrictive regulations.

A person living in Brandon could work at a job in Minneapolis or Chicago, students in Lemmon would be able to take classes from teachers in Omaha, and doctors in Freeman could consult with specialists at the Mayo Clinic. Telecommunications can bring new economic growth, education, health care and other opportunities to South Dakota.

Competition in the information and communications industries means more choices for people in South Dakota. It will also mean lower costs and a greater array of services and technologies. For instance, competing for customers will compel companies to offer more advanced services like caller ID or local connections to on-line services such as Prodigy and America On-Line.

It hasn't been that long since Ma Bell was everyone's source for local phone service, long distance service and phone equipment. Now there are over 400 long distance companies and people can buy phone equipment at any department or discount store. Under my bill, eventually people would be able to choose from more than one local phone service or cable television operator.

This new competition also should lead to economic development opportunities in South Dakota. People will be able to locate businesses in towns like Groton and Humboldt and serve customers in Hong Kong or New York City. We are entering an exciting, historic era. I want to spur growth and bring new opportunities to South Dakota and everywhere in America.

Mr. President, we are reaching the close of this debate and a vote on final passage of S. 652. I am confident we are about to approve telecommunications reform by a wide margin.

This reform is not a partisan issue. This is the first major bipartisan legislation of the 104th Congress. I want to thank my comanager, the Senator from South Carolina, for his leadership. Today's vote will bring to fruition a project he has been working on for many, many years. I want to thank the majority leader and the minority leader for their indispensable efforts for passage of this bill.

The bill we are about to pass will break up monopolies. It will tear down competitive barriers. It will open up communications networks.

Mr. President, every American household and every business large and small, uses the services we are about to make more competitive. The bill we

are about to pass will give the American people unprecedented freedom to choose.

After this bill is signed and implemented, Americans will be free to choose from competing local phone companies. This is unprecedented. It will lower prices. It is pro-consumer.

S. 652 will give Americans freedom to choose among more long-distance companies. This will cut prices. This is pro-consumer.

This bill will usher in a new era of robust competition in cable TV. It will, in effect, break up all the cable TV monopolies. This will give consumers more freedom to choose. It will cut prices. It will expand services. This, too, is pro-consumer.

S. 652 will let electric utility firms get into the phone or cable business if they wish. It will give broadcasters new flexibility to use new digital technology to offer multichannel programming with the same allocated spectrum that formerly could carry only one channel. This, Mr. President, dramatically gives consumers more freedom to choose.

No earlier legislation concerning cable prices—neither the deregulation of 1984 nor the reregulation of 1992—included these powerful procompetitive reforms.

This reform bill is historic. It is strongly bipartisan. It deserves the President's support.

Some who still oppose our reform bill are trying to get the President's ear. They say this bill will lead to more concentration in the communications business. I say that is a myth.

Concentration is what we have had under the old, 1930s-era system of government-created monopolies. Breaking up the monopolies and lifting burdensome regulation will give room for more entrepreneurs to compete.

Just consider other segments of the information industry, segments which did not strain under regulation and the monopoly model:

Fax machines aren't regulated or organized into a government-sanctioned monopoly. Just look at how prices have dropped, quality has improved, and sales have soared.

So it is, too, with cellular phones and pagers.

The computer market now gives consumers 200 times more value, in terms of lower price and greater power, than it offered just a decade ago.

Freedom for consumers and entrepreneurs did not lead to concentration in the computer business. No, quite the contrary. There have been winners and losers, large and small. Hundreds of start-up firms have flourished, including Gateway 2000 in my State of South Dakota. Meanwhile the biggest computer firm of all has seen a huge loss in market share and has been forced into significant restructuring. Free market capitalism breeds a kind of creative destruction of big businesses. This is good for continuing innovation and renewal in business. It is clearly pro-consumer.

Mark my word, in the years after this bill comes into force, it will have helped bring about the rise of exciting new firms which do not exist today. It will have helped usher in industry segments which have no lobbyists in the reception room today—industry segments which do not even exist at this time.

This bill will accelerate the digital revolution. Through digitization, the very same data can travel through space from satellites, over the atmospheric spectrum, through coaxial cable, fiber-optic threads or copper wire. The same digitized data can be stored on computer disks or drives, displayed on computer screens, or played on audio or video disk players. The trends of technology are erasing old distinctions between cable TV, telephone service, broadcasting, audio and video recording, and interactive personal computers.

But in many instances, the only thing standing in the way of consumers and businesses enjoying cheaper and more flexible telecommunications services is our outdated law. This reform bill will allow the cable, telephone, computer, broadcasting, and other telecommunications industries more easily to converge and transform themselves.

The information industry already constitutes one-seventh of the U.S. economy. Worldwide, the information marketplace is projected to exceed \$3 trillion by the close of the decade.

Digital convergence, more communicating power, and wide-open competition is what consumers want. It is what American businesses need to stay competitive with the rest of the world. It will come soon if the President signs this reform legislation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding and congratulate him for the outstanding job he has done, as well as the Senator from South Carolina, for their teamwork, efforts, and partnership that produced a historic bill.

No question about it, this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we may have passed so far this year. Others may have different views. But it is near the top of the list.

The Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, is in a meeting, so I will make my little statement on my amendment, and then we will vote on that. After that vote, he will make a very brief statement and then we will vote on final passage. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1341

Mr. DOLE. The vote will occur in a minute on the so-called Dole amendment.

It was explained earlier, but I want to make myself perfectly clear, this amendment is about allowing private interests—not big Government—to work out their own problems.

I thought that is why we were considering this bill in the first place. The telecommunications industry is cur-

rently one of the most regulated industries in the United States. Unfortunately, the provisions in question regulate prices.

The point is that business should be allowed to negotiate. As I have pointed out, the provision I have proposed to delete would prohibit such negotiation, and amounts to rate regulation. It is that simple—no more, no less.

The language is there. We had negotiations and worked on their differences. I do not know about all the discussion of the Senator from Nebraska. I am not involved with all that.

The provision I proposed was supposed to stop some players from taking advantage of small operators. There is no question it would do that, but it would also hurt those in fair deals. It solves the problems and creates a new one.

The bill's provision also does not treat all programmers evenly, and only applies to those affiliated with cable TV companies, meaning nonaffiliated programmers not under these pricing restrictions. That means they would have an unfair competitive advantage.

Not only does the bill regulate the price of programming, but it is anti-competitive. That is not what this bill is about. I printed in the RECORD earlier letters from Turner Broadcasting, representing the Discovery Channel, the Black Entertainment Network, and also—I do not have the letter with me now—all the small cable companies, the National Cable Television Cooperative, and they are all in support of the bill.

I have heard the comments of the Senator from Nebraska. He is entitled to his own interests, but I assure him, my interest in this amendment is consistent with the intent of this bill—getting Government off the backs of business and benefiting consumers.

I hope the amendment I am offering will pass. I think it will have bipartisan support.

I yield back my time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Following the vote, the Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, will be recognized, and then we will have final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the Dole amendment?

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I would use this opportunity to commend both the ranking member of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, and the chairman of the committee, for the good work they have done.

This has not been an easy process, I say to all of our colleagues. We have worked on this for not just a couple of days on the floor, but we have been working on this legislation for several years.

In the last Congress, all Members of the committee spent 2 years on this

communications bill, and then again the better part of this year, working on trying to bring this product to the floor.

There has been a great deal of compromise. There has been a great deal of trying to balance the very competing interests in order to get a 1995 communications bill.

I think it is important that all of our colleagues realize that this country has been run by the 1934 Communications Act. That is hard to believe that we have been operating under an act that is 60 years old. Does anybody think that the communications technology of 1995 is anywhere similar to the communications technology of 1934? The answer is, of course, no.

The reason everybody has been in court is because Congress was unable to get an agreement that wrote a modern 20th century bill to govern all the decisions about who does what.

This legislation makes some fundamental points. That is that we are going to create more competition. Competition is good for society. It is good for consumers. It is good for the development of new technology. This legislation is a fragile compromise. Almost everyone in the industry would like to have more. Some would like to have guarantees with regard to what they can do and what they cannot do.

We were trying to really create a bill that was fair to all of our American industries and fair to the American consumer. I think that while this bill is certainly not perfect—nothing we ever do is—certainly, it represents a major milestone in the communications legislation that has been brought before the Congress over all of these last 60 years since the first passage of the 1934 Communications Act.

I congratulate all the members of the Commerce Committee for their input, their suggestions. We have had a lot of cooperation on the floor. A lot of very difficult things have been worked out. I think that is good.

With regard to the Dole amendment, I happen to agree with it. I think the amendment by Senator DOLE really will encourage more competition and will encourage small cable companies to be able to form cooperatives like they are doing in order to be able to get discounts because they purchase cable services in volume just like the larger cable companies will be able to get volume discounts because they buy large amounts of products from the various producers. I think the Dole amendment really does try to promote additional competition. I think in that sense—it does allow cooperatives to be formed—there is nothing wrong with that.

There was a lot made about who does this benefit and what-have-you, I think it benefits the consumer. I think the Dole amendment is a good consumer amendment. It encourages small cooperatives and cable companies to be able to deliver services at a better rate. There is nothing wrong with that. It allows large sellers of cable services to

get volume discounts. The ultimate benefit of all of this is the American consumer.

I think the ultimate benefit of the entire package we have before the Congress is the American consumer and those who bring about the technology for the 21st century. If there is one thing the United States of America excels in—there are so many things, but one thing is the entertainment industry, the telecommunications industry. We can be proud of that. Other countries would love to have what we have in this country. This bill ultimately will make all of that a lot better and we will all benefit from that product.

So I support an affirmative vote on the Dole amendment and certainly support the passage of the telecommunications act that is now pending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. He has been at the forefront every step of the way in this bill and we could not have done it without his bipartisan effort. His staffers, Thomas Moore, who has now gone on to an appointment, and Mark Ashby, have been in the night meetings, night after night.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana from the bottom of my heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the Dole amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the Dole amendment, No. 1341. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MACK (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Abraham	Faircloth	McConnell
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatfield	Reid
Bryson	Hefflin	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Simpson
Coats	Jeffords	Smith
Cochran	Kassebaum	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kennedy	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerry	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dodd	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	McCain	

NAYS—39

Akaka	Bingaman	Bradley
Biden	Boxer	Bumpers

Byrd	Gramm	Mikulski
Cohen	Harkin	Moynihan
Conrad	Hollings	Murray
Daschle	Inouye	Nunn
Dorgan	Johnston	Pell
Exon	Kerrey	Pryor
Feingold	Kohl	Robb
Ford	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Glenn	Leahy	Sarbanes
Gorton	Levin	Simon
Graham	Lieberman	Wellstone

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mack

NOT VOTING—1

Hatch

So, the amendment (No. 1341) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, telecommunications reform legislation was a focus of the last Congress. Unfortunately, election-year politics prevented then-Chairman HOLLINGS from bringing the bill to the floor for a vote.

This year, with changes and modifications that are inevitable given the political change in the make-up of the Congress, a new telecommunications was brought to the Senate floor.

This is complex and potentially far-reaching legislation. It will affect an economic sector that constitutes 20 percent of our economy and whose services reach virtually every American.

I want to commend the ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS, whose patience and efforts have done a great deal to bring this measure to its present state. Senator HOLLINGS' work in the last Congress, and in this, has been focused on developing a bill that will enhance true competition in the telecommunications field without shortchanging American consumers.

From the beginning, our nation has understood the significance of communications and transportation. It is not an accident that the words of the Constitution require the Congress "To establish Post Offices and post Roads." The Founders could not have known that one day the roads would be fiber networks and the post offices would be e-mail. Yet that is where we have arrived.

When Congress first confronted the need to legislate for an entirely new technology, it produced the Communications Act of 1934. The regulated monopoly that was legislated into existence by that law was the best outcome then possible. And the old Bell system gave Americans the cheapest, most efficient universal telephone service in the world.

In fact, consumer resistance to the breakup of the Bell phone system was widespread in the early 1980's. Americans feared that the courts were breaking up something that worked well and might replace it with something that didn't.

We know today that those fears were unfounded. Competition in phone service has been a boon to American consumers. Long-distance rates are the lowest in the world. Equipment is cheaper and better-made. Competition has spurred innovation and improved customer service.

At the same time, it's important to remember and learn from our experience. The concept of universal service was at the heart of the old 1934 Communications Act. It is a New Deal era concept that is as valid today as it has proven to be over the decades.

When the reach of a technology is limited by cost, innovation and progress remain slow. But as soon as a technology is within reach of a broader sector of the population, an explosion of invention, development and innovation takes place. We have seen that happen in computers, in personal communications services, in wireless cable transmissions and countless other applications. Twenty years ago, calculators were sophisticated and relatively costly devices. Today they're offered as advertising promotions.

While legislation focuses on competition and deregulation, the bill before us also contains essential rural safeguards. It would create a Federal-State joint board to oversee the continuing issue of rural service and to monitor and help evolve a definition of Universal Service that makes sense for the present day and for the kinds of services that will be coming on-line. It does not demand unrealistic competition in towns of 50 households.

Our own history teaches us that it is good economics for the private sector as well as the public sector to make universal service a reality for all Americans, no matter how small their community. I believe this is still the case, and I believe it is particularly important to preserve the viability of rural communities in this respect.

The legislation before us recognizes the need to redefine universal service in terms of developing technology and products. The joint Federal-State board created by the bill is essential to making certain this function is fulfilled.

The bill before us also recognizes the important role that must be played by State Public Utilities Commissions. PUCs are the best entities to judge whether a given market within their State can or cannot support competition. That's not a judgment we should make from Washington.

Nor is it something we can or should leave to the unbridled, unsupervised judgment of the private sector. Those who have taken the risks and made the investments to extend cable or phone service to smaller rural communities should not now be placed at risk of being overwhelmed by larger, better-financed companies.

As Congressman ED MARKEY has said, that's not competition, it's "communications cannibalism." State PUC's will be able to judge where communities can sustain competition and

where they cannot. We should preserve the viability of the Universal Service Fund, for that reason as well.

The purpose of the bill before us is to create the competitive, free market environment that will most efficiently bring the Information Superhighway into existence for all Americans. I don't believe anyone disagrees with that key to achieving that goal is competition. The Senate's task is to ensure that the competitive elements in the bill do the job.

The best outcome is one that brings on line the new products and services that Americans want at a cost they're willing and able to pay. Not only will consumers benefit, but the process of creating new services and products will be a substantial engine of job creation.

The present economic recovery has been a period of exceptionally strong job creation. Under the Clinton administration, 6 million new jobs have been created, more in the first 2¼ years of this administration than in the preceding 8 years of the Reagan-Bush administration.

Democrats believe the key to longlasting economic growth and expansion is the creation of more jobs and higher income for working families. When Americans are working and earning good wages, our economy prospers and we can invest for the future well being of our children. The passage of the bill before us will help continue this pattern of job creation as our information-based economy creates significant employment opportunities. That will mean more families can send their kids to college, buy a home, and save for their own future. That is the best economic program and the best social program any nation can have.

This technology also means new opportunities for innovative economic development. I am in the process of working with a tribal college now on ways to market native American and agricultural products through the Internet. The technology that is helping do this is breaking down the geographic and technical barriers that have retarded our movement to a more information-based economy.

There is little doubt that our urban areas can and will sustain an enormous expansion of telecommunications services in the years ahead. We must make certain that our rural areas are not left behind as services expand and new products come on line. In the long run, universal service at high standards nationwide is in the best interests of the entire country.

In addition, we must not neglect the role of the public sector in the new telecommunications world. Schools, public libraries, state universities, all should have the ability to share in and disperse the benefits of the telecommunications revolution.

Senators ROCKEFELLER and SNOWE offered an amendment in committee to make certain that the public sector's ability to connect with the Internet and other information services is en-

hanced. That's important, not only to prevent stratification into information-rich and information-poor populations and regions, but to assure that all our children have the tools with which to enter the 21st century work force.

While the bill before us is far from perfect, it has been significantly improved over the course of the past 6 days. Senator HOLLINGS and I introduced an amendment that strengthens the bad actor test in the cable provisions.

It also places reasonable limitations on the ability of cable and telephone companies to eliminate each other as potential competitors through buyouts and mergers, except in rural areas where competition may not be viable.

Finally, our amendment, which was adopted, allows small telephone companies to jointly market local exchange service with long distance service providers that carry less than 5 percent of our nation's long distance business. This will allow consumers to realize the benefits of competition in the local telephone exchange, while preserving the competitive balance between the Bell companies and major long distance carriers.

I believe the provisions in our amendment strike a better balance between consumer protections and market deregulation. These safeguards are designed to protect consumers by expanding services and keeping them affordable.

This bill is a reasonable and balanced one, and it deserves the Senate's support.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, gentlemen start your engines, because we are about to pass telecommunications reform that will be the roadmap to our Nation's future.

When we started floor consideration of S. 652 more than 1 week ago, I noted that this was just the beginning. A beginning of a new era of leadership for the telecommunications industry and for America. While some see America's power dwindling, I see it growing. I see our renaissance, and its called the information age. America's years of leadership in telecommunications, whether it was inventing the telegraph or the microchip, gives us the right to lay claim to this future. We have earned it. We must now reach out and take it.

RECOGNIZING SENATOR PRESSLER'S HARD WORK

And one person who deserves a good deal of credit for making this new era a reality is Senator PRESSLER. As all Members know, telecommunications reform is a tough, complex, and often contentious issue. Congress has struggled with it for more than a decade, with no success. And along comes Senator PRESSLER. He tackled this issue and has moved it through the Senate in record time. His tenacity proves that the Senate is capable of delivering on the toughest issues.

Not only did he have to fight competing interests, but also the White House.

Senator PRESSLER has won, the Senate has won, and America has won.

The bill also could not have been possible without Senator HOLLINGS. Both Senators PRESSLER and HOLLINGS have done an outstanding job at bringing the competing interests together, or as close together as possible.

THE REAL JOBS STIMULUS PACKAGE

No doubt about it, telecommunications reform is the real jobs stimulus package. Except this one relies on the private sector to create those jobs. And it will.

Thousands of jobs will be necessary to build new communications networks. And that's just the beginning. Studies indicate that millions of more jobs will be created because information will become more accessible, jobs that will make America more efficient, more productive, and ultimately more powerful.

While some may argue that it is not the perfect bill, its message is right—competition, not government, is the best regulator. Competition, not regulation, has the best record for creating new jobs, spurring new innovation, and creating new wealth. It's that simple.

Competition and deregulation are also the only ways to accommodate the explosion of new technology.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, removing the telecommunications industry's shackles is not about politics as usual. It is not about Republicans versus Democrats. It is about providing all Americans, rich or poor, urban or rural, a better future. I believe that a procompetition, deregulatory telecommunications bill can help make that future a reality.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 652, as amended, be printed in the RECORD immediately following the final vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRESSLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the passage of S. 652, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator HOLLINGS added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question occurs on passage of S. 652, as amended.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, just let me indicate to my colleagues, as I said earlier before many were here, we hope to determine the balance of the schedule this evening and tomorrow before 6

o'clock this evening, and so we will try to let everybody know by then what the schedule will be. Hopefully, it will not be too heavy. It depends on how this bill comes out.

I will let Senators know in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Abraham	Feinstein	Lott
Akaka	Ford	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Bradley	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatfield	Pell
Burns	Heflin	Pressler
Campbell	Helms	Robb
Chafee	Hollings	Rockefeller
Coats	Hutchison	Roth
Cochran	Inhofe	Santorum
Cohen	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Jeffords	Shelby
Craig	Johnston	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Smith
Daschle	Kempthorne	Snowe
DeWine	Kennedy	Specter
Dodd	Kerry	Stevens
Dole	Kohl	Thomas
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Exon	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Faircloth	Levin	Warner

NAYS—18

Bingaman	Feingold	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Packwood
Bumpers	Kerrey	Pryor
Byrd	Leahy	Reid
Conrad	Lieberman	Simon
Dorgan	McCain	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Hatch

So the bill (S. 652), as amended, was passed.

(The text of S. 652, as passed, will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I thank everybody involved. I thank the majority leader and minority leader. I have already thanked the staff. I am feeling like this Chamber was almost a funeral parlor this afternoon, we had so many good words said about everybody.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate, as I did earlier, that this is a

tremendous vote—81 to 18. It is a very significant piece of legislation that has passed this Chamber, largely through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER].

It is not a perfect bill. I understand that almost everybody finds something wrong with it, which probably means it is not that bad; it is probably a very good bill. I think it is a very important piece of legislation. I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation.

I do not think we took too much time. On a bill of this magnitude, it takes a little longer on the Senate side, and it probably should, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] said earlier today.

I thank the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his cooperation throughout the debate.

Mr. President, I have had a discussion with the Senator from South Dakota, [Mr. DASCHLE], the Democratic leader, and I outlined to him what I would like to do. First, I will ask unanimous consent that we go to S. 440—I will not ask it now—and I understand there will be an objection. Then I will move to the consideration of S. 440, and I understand the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY], and others will at that point discuss the motion to proceed.

If that would be the case, there would be no votes tonight and no votes tomorrow. Then we would try to work out something to accommodate our colleagues on Monday.

So I do not want to make the request until the Senator from South Dakota indicates it is all right to do so.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will yield. Let me just speak very briefly, because I know there are other Members that need to conduct business. I share the sentiment expressed by the distinguished majority leader about the bill just passed. It may not be everything we all want, but it represents a real achievement.

I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and certainly the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, for all of the effort he has put forth in the last seven days to accomplish what we have now. A number of people had a lot to do with bringing us to this point. It represents a balance between providing new opportunities and communications to provide the flexibility and the freedom to go out and do what we must to build the information superhighway. But it also represents a desire on the part of many to protect consumers as we conduct that construction.

So I hope very much that we can move this legislation through the remaining parts of the legislative process here and accommodate all Senators as we attempt to pass this very significant piece of legislation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. I failed to announce no more votes this evening, and no votes

tomorrow. For Monday, I will make that announcement before I leave here tonight, so Members will know what the schedule will be on Monday. I need to discuss that with the Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO SHEILA P. BURKE FOR HER SERVICE AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 134, submitted by myself and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 134) expressing the Senate's gratitude to Sheila P. Burke for her service as Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements on the resolution be placed in the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the resolution (S. Res. 134) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 134

Whereas Sheila P. Burke faithfully served the Senate of the United States as Secretary of the Senate from January 4, 1995 to June 8, 1995, and discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of that office with unflinching devotion and a high degree of efficiency; and

Whereas since May 26, 1977 Sheila P. Burke has ably and faithfully upheld the high standards and traditions of the staff of the Senate of the United States for a period that includes 10 Congresses, and she continues to demonstrate outstanding dedication to duty as an employee of the Senate; and

Whereas through her exceptional service and professional integrity as an officer and employee of the Senate of the United States, Sheila P. Burke has gained the esteem, confidence and trust of her associates and the Members of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the notable contributions of Sheila P. Burke to the Senate and to her country and expresses to her its appreciation and gratitude for her long, faithful and continuing service.

SEC.2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Sheila P. Burke.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of S. 440, the highway bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I object.