

Gejdenson	Martinez	Rush
Gibbons	Mascara	Sabo
Gilman	McCarthy	Salmon
Gordon	McDermott	Sanders
Green	McHale	Sawyer
Gutierrez	McKinney	Schroeder
Hall (OH)	Meehan	Schumer
Hall (TX)	Meek	Scott
Hamilton	Menendez	Sensenbrenner
Hancock	Meyers	Serrano
Harman	Mfume	Sisisky
Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)	Skaggs
Hilleary	Mink	Slaughter
Hilliard	Moakley	Spratt
Hinchey	Mollohan	Stark
Holden	Montgomery	Stenholm
Horn	Murtha	Stokes
Hoyer	Myers	Studds
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Stump
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Taylor (MS)
(TX)	Oberstar	Tejeda
Jacobs	Obey	Thompson
Jefferson	Olver	Thornberry
Johnson (SD)	Ortiz	Thornton
Johnson, E. B.	Orton	Thurman
Johnston	Owens	Tiahrt
Kanjorski	Pallone	Torkildsen
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Kennedy (MA)	Payne (VA)	Towns
Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi	Trafigant
Kennelly	Peterson (FL)	Velazquez
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Klecza	Petri	Visclosky
Klink	Pickett	Volkmer
Klug	Pomeroy	Ward
LaFalce	Poshard	Waters
Lantos	Quillen	Watt (NC)
Lazio	Rahall	Waxman
Levin	Ramstad	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Woolsey
Lofgren	Reed	Wynn
Lowey	Rivers	Yates
Luther	Roberts	Zimmer
Maloney	Roemer	
Markey	Roybal-Allard	

NOT VOTING—22

Bryant (TX)	Geren	Roukema
Chapman	Hansen	Smith (WA)
DeLay	Hayes	Stockman
Dickey	Largent	Williams
Fields (TX)	Leach	Wilson
Filner	McIntosh	Wyden
Flake	Oxley	
Gephardt	Rose	

□ 2021

Mr. ROBERTS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ZELIFF, BROWBACK, and SCARBOROUGH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEFAULTED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. appropriation has just passed this House after 4 very arduous months. The concern that I have had all along relates to the financial condition of the District.

As I have seen what has happened to this city, I have not been able to keep from analyzing the situation of the District to the situation that the United States of America could find itself. The District, Mr. Speaker, courted default as it was running out of money. It did not know what to do or could not do what had to be done, and so a financial authority was appointed, and that authority was necessary in order for the District to be able to borrow.

As one contemplates the problems facing this body with a debt limit, one wonders what would happen if the United States of America got close to default.

I can say this to you, Mr. Speaker, there would not be any higher authority to take over the United States of America. We are the ultimate authority, and so I would hope that we all try to figure out how to make sure that we do not get any closer to the threat of default.

I wanted to talk about the threat of default for a moment. The District, for example, has heard in the last couple of days from the bond ratings that they still do not believe that the District will rise again, and they are considering lowering the District's bond rating yet again. What trembles and shakes that has sent through the District of Columbia. In effect, Moody's did the same thing to the United States of America this very week when it threatened to downgrade our credit, the best credit in the world for over 200 years.

I want, therefore, to ask this body to consider not default but what the threat of default can do to interest rates, to confidence, how it can ripple through our country and through the world.

□ 2030

I want, therefore, to ask this body to consider not default, but what the threat of default can do to interest rates, to confidence, and how it can ripple through our country and the world.

I recognize the United States of America and the District of Columbia are different. Yet the fact is that there have been only a few large jurisdictions that have ever been threatened with default, and, for all of those, the results have been catastrophic.

So I would ask this body in the next few weeks to try to consider what is at stake. History will remember us for how we handle the first threat of de-

fault in the history of the United States. The threat of default is as bad in a very real sense as default itself. Who can forget what led to the budget agreement under which we now operate? What led to that agreement, of course, was a crash on Wall Street that came one day, absolutely unexpected, that came one day without warning. It is the possibility that the credit of the United States could be affected without warning that I hope this body will take into account in deciding what to do with the debt limit.

I am asking this body to respect the long record of the United States and to pass a clean debt limit bill. We must not allow the shutdown experience to be born again in the debt limit bill. The only way to respond to the experience we have had in the last couple of months with the shutdown experience is to make sure we do not repeat bad history. If we are ever to repeat that history, we certainly should not repeat it with the full faith and credit of the United States.

I know what it is to lose your credit. I am from the District of Columbia, which today does not have credit. I ask my country then to look at its Capital City and to make sure that its credit in no way resembles that of its fallen city. I appreciate that there is a great difference. I hope that difference will continue to be great, and I hope that we will return to this body, not to have 4 days of haggling about what to do about the debt limit or what to attach to the debt limit, but that we will march forward together in a bipartisan way and pass, finally, one clean debt limit bill.

BUDGET MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHRYSLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, in light of Ms. NORTON's just-delivered remarks, I would like to say as someone coming from the last State to be admitted to the Union, the State of Hawaii, that I recognize only too fully what the implications are when you find yourself without representation, when you find yourself having to look to the good will of others.

In this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to pay some final attention before we leave the building, before we leave the floor, and pay some particular attention to the proposition, is this actually what we should be doing?

I do not mean tonight, Mr. Speaker. I think that the majority party, the Republican Party, and the House, have the opportunity to reconsider in the next day or two whether we want to go home, whether we need to go home bearing the burden of not having resolved the question of the debt limit.

Now, we have had arguments made, we can show headlines and present

charts indicating that there was ostensibly a breakdown in the budget negotiations. The budget negotiations, I submit, Mr. Speaker, are separate and apart from those negotiations that might occur or should be occurring with respect to the extension of the debt limit.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they should be connected.

I have listened with care. I have listened with intensity today to the arguments being made. As you know, earlier today, in the absence of immediate legislative business, there was quite an extensive discussion of some hours' length on the floor by various Members with respect to the question of debt limitation, balancing of the budget, and the implications for tax credits or tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I finished a special order just the other day, if you will, paraphrasing the title of an editorial to which I was referring in the Washington Post, the title being "Who won the budget battle?" I finished by saying the real question, Mr. Speaker, was who might lose in the budget battle? That is what really counts.

We do not want anybody to lose in that budget battle, because we are talking about not only the future, which has been brought up many times by speakers on both sides of the aisle, children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, who will pay, but, rather, what will be lost in terms of what has been referred to over and over again as the full faith and credit of the United States with respect to paying its debts.

Mr. Speaker, I submit there are two separate issues here that you and I, either individually, as Members of this body, or as representatives of positions in both caucuses can have, of fruitful discussion on this floor and in the context of the House of Representatives, institutionally speaking, as to what the best course of action is or should be with respect either to the budget or the debt limit.

But to argue or make the debt limit extension part of that discussion at the present time I think advances no one's agenda, Mr. Speaker. Not mine. I do not come down to the floor to try and make a political game, rhetorically or otherwise, over arguing this issue. It is much too important, bigger than you or I.

So I would hope that there would be consideration in the Republican Conference in the hours and immediate days to come, or, if we do leave without resolving the issue, that there would be a consideration that at least as far as the debt limit is concerned, that for now we set that aside as not being relevant to resolving the very real differences that may be between us politically or otherwise in terms of policy, and that we put the health and welfare literally of the Nation ahead of or at the top of all our priority lists, of all political parties concerned; that we separate that out, and that we have a

full and fair discussion, not about the credit standing of the United States, but what kind of credit we can bring to ourselves as Members of this body, and what kind of credibility we can bring to the arguments that we are able to make about the budget: How we balance it, what we do about that, what we do about tax credits, what we do about whether or not there should be tax cuts; and that we argue this thing in a manner and in a context that establishes for the people of the United States, our colleagues, and those who may be viewing or observing our deliberations, that we do it in such a manner and in a context that reflects well not just on us, but on the seriousness of the issues at hand.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I close by reiterating my plea that we do not utilize the debt limit extension as one of the fundamental blocks in the building of whatever political stance we may take with respect to balancing the budget or any other aspect of the political discussion that has been under way in these last days.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2113

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CHRYSLER] at 9 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 652, TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

Mr. BLILEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate bill (S. 652) to provide for a pro-competitive, deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-458)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 652), to provide for a pro-competitive, deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the

text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Telecommunications Act of 1996".

(b) *REFERENCES.*—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES

Subtitle A—Telecommunications Services

Sec. 101. Establishment of part II of title II.

"PART II—DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETITIVE MARKETS

"Sec. 251. Interconnection.

"Sec. 252. Procedures for negotiation, arbitration, and approval of agreements.

"Sec. 253. Removal of barriers to entry.

"Sec. 254. Universal service.

"Sec. 255. Access by persons with disabilities.

"Sec. 256. Coordination for interconnectivity.

"Sec. 257. Market entry barriers proceeding.

"Sec. 258. Illegal changes in subscriber carrier selections.

"Sec. 259. Infrastructure sharing.

"Sec. 260. Provision of telemessaging service.

"Sec. 261. Effect on other requirements."

Sec. 102. Eligible telecommunications carriers.

Sec. 103. Exempt telecommunications companies.

Sec. 104. Nondiscrimination principle.

Subtitle B—Special Provisions Concerning Bell Operating Companies

Sec. 151. Bell operating company provisions.

"PART III—SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING BELL OPERATING COMPANIES

"Sec. 271. Bell operating company entry into interLATA services.

"Sec. 272. Separate affiliate; safeguards.

"Sec. 273. Manufacturing by Bell operating companies.

"Sec. 274. Electronic publishing by Bell operating companies.

"Sec. 275. Alarm monitoring services.

"Sec. 276. Provision of payphone service."

TITLE II—BROADCAST SERVICES

Sec. 201. Broadcast spectrum flexibility.

"Sec. 336. Broadcast spectrum flexibility."

Sec. 202. Broadcast ownership.

Sec. 203. Term of licenses.

Sec. 204. Broadcast license renewal procedures.

Sec. 205. Direct broadcast satellite service.

Sec. 206. Automated ship distress and safety systems.

"Sec. 365. Automated ship distress and safety systems."

Sec. 207. Restrictions on over-the-air reception devices.

TITLE III—CABLE SERVICES

Sec. 301. Cable Act reform.

Sec. 302. Cable service provided by telephone companies.

"PART V—VIDEO PROGRAMMING SERVICES PROVIDED BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES

"Sec. 651. Regulatory treatment of video programming services.

"Sec. 652. Prohibition on buy outs.