

# HEINONLINE

Citation: 3 Bernard D. Reams Jr. & William H. Manz Federal  
Law A Legislative History of the Telecommunications  
of 1996 Pub. L. No. 104-104 110 Stat. 56 1996  
the Communications Decency Act E1579 1997

Content downloaded/printed from  
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)  
Wed Mar 20 16:18:32 2013

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance  
of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license  
agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from  
uncorrected OCR text.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS, RON  
RUHLAND

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartiest congratulations to Mr. Ron Ruhland on his appointment to the Michigan State Waterways Commission. Governor Engler could not have made a finer choice.

As a Member whose district includes more shoreline than most entire States, and with a district that includes a significant number of lakes, bays, and rivers, I have a great interest in waterways issues. The development and maintenance of harbors, channels, and docking and launching facilities is vital to thousands of people throughout my district. It is one of the key reasons why I sought membership on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ron Ruhland understands the waterways in Michigan's 5th Congressional District. Living so close to the area and continuing to enjoy the waterways himself, he has first-hand knowledge of the benefits and needs of our water resources. He is also an accomplished sailor and boatsman for 35 years, and serves as vice commodore of the Saginaw Bay Yacht Club.

As one of the seven members of the Michigan State Waterways Commission, many of us are looking to Ron to being a strong advocate for our needs. His reputation as a successful and innovative business owner, and a thoughtful Commissioner on both the Bay County Board of Commissioners and the Bay County Planning and Zoning Commission, make everyone who knows him confident that he will be a positive and active influence on the Waterways Commission.

I look forward to working with Ron in a partnership to maintain and improve Michigan's waterway resources for our residents and our many, many visitors. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our colleagues in wishing Mr. Ron Ruhland the very best as he undertakes this new and most important task.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
THOMAS E. MORGAN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the passing of Thomas E. Morgan, former Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania and former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who died yesterday in his native Pennsylvania at the age of 88.

Doc Morgan served this institution with distinction for 32 years, beginning in 1944. For most of his career he was the only practicing physician serving in the U.S. Congress.

For 17 years from 1959 to 1976, Morgan was the able chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—renamed the Committee on International Relations during the 94th Congress. His stewardship was the longest of any chairman in the committee's history.

Doc Morgan presided over crucial debates on foreign assistance, arms control, the Cuba missile crisis, the Vietnam war, and relations with the Soviet Union. He led U.S. delegations to international meetings and parliamentary conclaves, and advised several Presidents and Secretaries of State.

Yet Doc Morgan never dwelt on his foreign policy expertise or the role he played in Washington's foreign policy deliberations. He simply referred to himself as a country doctor. He never lost his sense of humor. He never lost touch with his patients, whom he continued to see after he came to Congress. His priority in Congress remained the same throughout his career: to improve economic conditions for his southwestern Pennsylvania constituents.

The son of a Welsh coal miner, Doc Morgan remained close to his Monongahela River Valley roots his entire life. He returned to Pennsylvania upon his retirement but played a key role as chairman of the Permanent Joint Board on Defense—United States and Canada.

Our prayers and sympathy go to Doc Morgan's wife, Winifred, to his daughter, Marianne, and to other members of his family. They can be proud of his many accomplishments and of his dedicated service to his Nation. It was my distinct honor and privilege to work with Doc Morgan. He served his constituents, State and Nation with extraordinary distinction. He set a marvelous example of public service for all of us.

SALUTING FREEDOM FLIGHT  
AMERICA

HON. HENRY BONILLA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, this year, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, we have much to be thankful for. As Americans, we are blessed to live in the greatest and most free Nation in the history of mankind. The freedom we enjoy today is the result of the sacrifices of millions of Americans during that war 50 years ago.

Not only must we honor those who sacrificed for our freedom, we must never forget the titanic global battle to protect freedom. On August 2 and 3 the people of El Paso will be honoring our great victory in a truly remarkable fashion when Freedom Flight America arrives.

Freedom Flight America is a coast to coast Journey featuring hundreds of World War II

vintage aircraft. Some of the aircraft that won the war—DC-3's, T-6s, F-4U Corsairs and P-51 mustangs—will be on view. This remarkable display will entertain and educate the people of El Paso on the role of American airpower in the defeat of global tyranny. I salute the organizers of the event and extend my support for this undertaking.

God bless our airmen, young and old, present and departed and God bless America.

TELECOM BILL IS PRO-COMPETITION,  
PRO-JOBS AND PRO-CONSUMER

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week—perhaps as early as tomorrow—the House is expected to consider sweeping telecommunications legislation, H.R. 1555. This landmark regulatory reform bill will offer countless benefits to American consumers and open telecommunications markets to competition by eliminating layers of burdensome Federal regulations.

I would like to include an editorial from Friday's Washington Times for the RECORD. It sets out the reasons why the long distance carriers withdrew their support for H.R. 1555. I hope that my colleagues will read this article, and I urge them to vote in favor of the bill with the manager's amendment.

[From the Washington Times, July 28, 1995]

WHO'S AFRAID OF THE BABY BELLS?

Up for a vote next week in the House is the long-awaited and hard-fought telecommunications legislation. Accordingly, the AT&T, MCI and Sprint coalition got down to the serious business of retail politics yesterday, busing and training thousands of their employees into the Capitol to flood members' offices and to demand that the telecom bill be changed to their advantage. Happily, that is not likely to happen.

the bill, as it originally emerged from Rep. Thomas Bliley's House Commerce Committee, was packed full of the long-distance companies' druthers. The package of goodies for AT&T, MCI and Sprint posed a big enough threat to competition that the Republican leadership had a talk with Mr. Bliley, who agreed that when the bill comes up for a vote next week he will offer what is known as a "Manager's amendment" stripping the legislation of the provisions expected to hobble the Baby Bells. With Mr. Bliley offering the amendment, it is expected to pass easily, which is why the long-distance coalition put the full-court press on yesterday.

For all the complexities of the bill, the basic issue dividing the Baby Bells from the long-distance group is fairly simple. Marketing studies done by both camps show that the big prize goes to whoever is first at offering consumers simple, complete phone service. Phone customers are tired of having separate bills and companies for local and long distance, and would sign up with the first

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.  
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

company to offer inexpensive combined service. All the jockeying between the Bells and the long-distance firms is about determining who will get the first shot at combining local and long-distance plans.

The provisions that AT&T et al. succeeded in working into the original committee bill, H.R. 1555, would have placed a series of hazards and roadblocks in the way of the Bell companies, while leaving their path to the market wide open.

The most important of these was the requirement that a local Bell company have a "facilities-based" competitor in its market before being allowed to compete in the long-distance market. In other words, the local company would be blocked from offering long-distance service until some other company had come into its market and built a physical network of wires comparable to the network the local Bell already has in place. In practice, that would be a very, very long time.

Since the legislation also requires the Bells to sell time on their own networks to the long-distance companies at a discount so the time can be resold as part of a local and long-distance package, AT&T, MCI and Sprint would have no reason to build local networks of their own. They would have been able to use the Bell local networks to get into the local service business, while at the same time keeping the Bells from competing with them in the long-distance business.

The Bells successfully fought that provision, arguing that the market should be opened for everybody all at the same time. So too a slew of other provisions that would also have hindered the Bells' entrance into the long-distance market. That entry is feared by a long-distance industry that appears to have a very cozy environment going for itself.

For all the television ads touting the cut-throat competition among AT&T, MCI and Sprint, it turns out that basic long-distance rates have been going up for the last couple of years, by more than 5 percent a year. More disturbing still, the big three companies, which account for more than 95 percent of the long-distance market, have raised their prices in lock step. This is a happenstance that will likely end once the various Baby Bells are able to bring a new round of competition into the long-distance market.

As for the long-distance companies' argument that the Bells will be able to use their "monopoly" position to dominate the market, it is a little hard to see how a financial behemoth like AT&T is going to be intimidated by a regional phone company. Given that the Bells will be required to discount their lines to the long-distance companies for resale, the Bells' local monopolies become meaningless.

The long-distance coalition plans to do everything it can to kill the telecom bill as it now stands—with the manager's amendment. No bill at all, from the big three's perspective, is almost as good as a bill written to their liking. The long-distance companies can get into the local phone business if local law allows, as it does in almost half the states. But it takes a change in federal law to allow the Baby Bells into the interstate business of long-distance. Nonetheless, the bill is expected to pass next week with the support of the House leadership and Mr. Billy. That is good news for consumers, for whom the greater the competition, the better.

## UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH SOUTH KOREA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Congress met in joint session to welcome South Korean President Kim Yong-sam.

Four decades after the Korean war, South Korea enjoys a thriving economy and an open political system. Our security interests in Korea have been complemented by a growing American economic interest.

The moving dedication of the Korean War Memorial was testimony to the blood shed by Americans to ensure Korea's future and to our continued interest in Korean prosperity. Mr. Hamilton, ranking member of the International Relations Committee, recently spoke on the state of American-Korean relations at an Asia society meeting.

I commend Mr. Hamilton's remarks to my colleagues. His speech, "The U.S. and South Korea: A Successful Partnership," provides an insightful review of our mutual interests:

THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH KOREA: A SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIP  
(By Lee H. Hamilton)

### I. INTRODUCTION

South Korea has been much on our minds of late. We watched with sorrow at the climbing casualty list from last month's tragedy in Seoul. We also celebrated with the South Korean people as survivors were miraculously pulled from the rubble of the collapsed department store.

South Korea captures our attention for other reasons, of course. The Korean peninsula presents some of the most challenging issues facing U.S. foreign policy. We are concerned about North Korea's nuclear program, the uncertainties of its leadership succession, and relations between South and North Korea.

Next week, we will welcome Korean President Kim Yong-sam to Washington. We will bestow upon him the honor of addressing a joint session of Congress. That is a true measure of the importance of our friendship with South Korea. Our countries have excellent bilateral relations, marked by a strong security alliance and broad economic ties.

### II. SOUTH KOREA'S SUCCESS

South Korea is a great success story. Consider Korea in 1945. It had been the victim of harsh colonialism for 50 years. The defeat of Japan brought not liberation, but division of the Korean nation along the 38th parallel. Families were torn apart. Customary patterns of trade, communication, and exchange were broken. Soviet occupiers ravaged the northern half of the country.

Five years later saw the resumption of warfare—all the more bitter because it was Korean against Korean. Armies surged up and down the peninsula, bringing death and devastation. Millions lost their lives. Tens of millions more were displaced.

The 1953 armistice brought no real peace. The peninsula remained divided. South Korea, the less prosperous half, was saddled with huge defense burdens to guard against future attack.

What a difference a few decades have made! South Korea is a thriving democracy. It is one of the world's most prosperous countries. Per capita income, which did not reach even \$100 until the 1960s, is now nearly \$10,000. South Korea is no longer a foreign aid recipient; it is a foreign aid donor. The World

Bank points to South Korea to show how a country with few natural resources—other than its people—can transform itself in a generation from one of the poorest countries in Asia to one of the richest.

### II. THE U.S.-KOREAN PARTNERSHIP

The Korean-American alliance is robust. It is a treaty commitment, but also a mature friendship built on shared commitments to democracy and free markets.

In fact, South Korea is a major success story for American foreign policy. A free and prosperous South Korea has contributed to peace and stability in a strategic corner of the world—where China, Russia and Japan intersect.

Korea also is a close partner and friend. We share a keen interest in regional stability, economic prosperity, and the control of weapons of mass destruction. Together, we seek to spread democracy and human rights to those Asian countries through which the winds of freedom have yet to sweep.

Nearly a quarter million Americans gave their lives in three Asian wars in the past half century for those objectives, but many times more Koreans died during that same bloody period. We are linked by bonds of common sacrifice.

One startling change in our relations has been the decline in anti-Americanism in Korea. It was not long ago that Korea saw widespread student demonstrations against the United States and frequent demands that U.S. troops be withdrawn. Today there is little of this discord.

The presence of 37,000 American troops in Korea is, as you might expect, an irritant from time to time. Crimes are sometimes committed against the civilian population, and South Korean critics complain that their court have only limited jurisdiction over U.S. servicemen and their dependents.

But by and large, the South Korean people and their government have grown accustomed to Americans. They are no longer controversial or distasteful. The alliance is viewed as mutually beneficial, a normal part of everyday existence. South Koreans, for example, were relieved earlier this year when the Clinton administration announced it would maintain a 100,000 troop level in East Asia.

### III. THE U.S.-SOUTH KOREAN SECURITY ALLIANCE

I need not dwell on the reasons for the Korean-American security alliance. On the U.S. side, the stability of Asia is critical to our overall security and prosperity, and our security relationships with Korea and Japan are the linchpins of our presence in Asia.

For South Korea, the benefits are also clear. A hostile North Korea still stations two-thirds of its 1.2 million man army near the Demilitarized Zone. The North has enough artillery targeted on Seoul to reduce it to rubble. It has SCUD missiles and is developing longer-range ballistic missiles. Its dictators have committed terrorist acts. It has had, until recently, a secret nuclear weapons program flaunting the will of the international community.

This does not suggest the North could defeat the South in a war. But it does point out the dangers. The Korean peninsula remains the most dangerous flashpoint in Asia because of its location, North Korea's militarization, and the nature of its government. General Luck, the U.S. commander in Korea, estimates a war on the peninsula could claim a million lives and cost a trillion dollars. Thus, the money we invest in peace and stability on the Korean peninsula is prudent.

### IV. ISSUES IN THE RELATIONSHIP

Let me turn to several key issues in the U.S.-South Korean relationship.

## **Document No. 65**

