

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 S12363 1997

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Wed Mar 20 16:30:52 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.

Ryan Hilley, Gilbert Winn, Robert Parker, Kristy Moss, Jeff Faberman, Kathryn Tucker, Blake Rutherford, Toby Bender, Dean Tallikas, Jonathan Rosen, Deborah Gordon, Alex Winnick, Sarina Sasson.

Jennifer Heyman, Jonathan Weisman, Stephen Cohen, Michael Boland, Annie Singleton, Tyler Blitt, Cristin Gunther, Max Coslov, Lauren McCray, Adam Lazait, Rebecca Long, Erika Benke, Casey Smith, Jane Gingrich, Tracie Souza, Elissa Varen, John Tuck, Kirk Plstick.*

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN (EMSC) 10th ANNIVERSARY

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Emergency Medical Services for Children (EMSC) Grant Program on its 10th anniversary, and acknowledge the progress it has made in meeting the emergency care needs of our Nation's children. Before the authorization legislation was passed in 1984 most emergency care training focused on adult care while the needs of children were underrecognized. Little was known regarding appropriate drugs and dosages for children, and pediatric equipment was not readily available in emergency departments nor in ambulances. Now, more than 40 States have received funding to improve the emergency care provided to acutely ill and seriously injured children, and training in pediatric emergency health care has been greatly expanded nationwide.

It is a tremendous source of pride for me, as I am sure it is for Senator HATCH and Senator KENNEDY, to have introduced this legislation in the Congress a decade ago and to witness the dedication of those who have worked so diligently toward implementation of the various EMSC programs across the country. Few people realize that emergency medical service systems are relatively new—in fact, development of a network of lifesaving resources and technology began a scant 30 years ago. Even fewer realize that these systems initially made no allowance for the unique medical needs of children. During the past 10 years, many people have striven to correct this situation, and EMSC has proven to be an investment in our children that has paid countless dividends in the form of lives saved.

Few of us will ever forget the images of innocent people suffering in the wake of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah building in Oklahoma City. Our Nation's collective emotion galvanized around the unforgettable image of the limp body of a child being carried by a firefighter. If that tragedy had occurred 4 years earlier, prior to an EMSC implementation grant awarded to the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Oklahoma Health Services Center, many lifesaving components would not have been in place. Each ambulance that responded to the incident was equipped with pediatric emergency care resources above the national standard. Firefighters, police, doctors, and nurses on the scene were

able to assist children effectively because they were trained in pediatric emergency care. All of these things were possible because of EMSC funding at the Federal level to the State of Oklahoma.

Because our children are our most precious resource, our challenge is to take the EMSC infrastructure that now exists and extend it everywhere so that the system works for all children. A recent Institute of Medicine report on pediatric emergency care documented many remaining gaps. Health care providers remain uninformed about emergency pediatric care, many communities lack even the basic elements of a functional system for emergency care, much of the public remains untrained in CPR and bystander care, and many injury prevention technologies have yet to be generally adopted. We still have much to learn. Research and evaluation are critical in identifying problems, assessing how effectively our strategies address those problems, and enhancing every aspect of care.

Join me in celebrating this important 10 year anniversary by pledging continued support for EMSC so that the special needs of vulnerable children will be met. I extend my best wishes for the future as EMSC reaches for its goal to serve every region of our country and to provide our children with the highest quality emergency care possible. I would also like to recognize the outstanding contributions of Dr. Jean Athey, the current program administrator, and my long-time friend, Dr. Cal Sia, a visionary among pediatricians, who have been so vital to the success of this invaluable program. Congratulations, EMSC, for 10 years of dedicated service.

RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S SATURDAY RADIO ADDRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have prepared and taped for broadcast the Republican response to President Clinton's national radio address. My comments address the need to reform our Nation's welfare system. The August recess should give all Senators the opportunity to discuss with our constituents their views on welfare reform. When we return in September, I look forward the passage of a welfare reform bill that will be signed by President Clinton.

I ask that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

THE REPUBLICAN RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S SATURDAY RADIO ADDRESS

If there is any area of government activity that cries out for radical change it is our welfare programs. While the President has talked about changing the system, it was the Republican leadership that stepped forward with specific proposals for reform.

As a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton promised to "end welfare as we know it." Yet for the first two years of the Clinton Administration—when the Democrats controlled not only the White House but both Houses of Congress—nothing was done.

In the State Houses and in Congress, Republicans are making things happen. We have had legislation introduced in the Senate by Bob DOLE to replace the current welfare system with a fundamentally new approach. That approach rests on several key ideas.

First, we want to give the states the flexibility to manage their own programs. The states have been successful in developing new programs that put able bodied people to work. Governor Thompson of Wisconsin, for example, has worked closely with his legislature and put in place a very different welfare program that is working by emphasizing work. The welfare roles in Wisconsin have been cut by 27 percent with a monthly savings of 17 and a half million dollars. Those are the kinds of results we can expect with greater flexibility at the state level.

Secondly, our approach gets local administrators and case workers to concentrate on moving the welfare caseload off welfare and into the workforce. Most importantly, by stressing employment, it gets able bodied welfare recipients to support themselves and their families. Our plan requires welfare recipients to be working after two years and it limits the duration of eligibility for benefits.

Last week, Democrats in the Senate finally introduced their welfare bill. That bill not only keeps welfare as a federal entitlement, but expands the range of benefits. Furthermore, it flatters ignores pleas from the Nation's Governors to give them more flexibility in designing and managing their own welfare-to-work programs. To continue believing that Washington "can do it better" is to ignore the experience of the past sixty years.

The real tragedy with the current system is the effect it is having on children. In Los Angeles, 62 percent of the children are on welfare. In Chicago, 43 percent of the children are on welfare. In Detroit, the rate is 73 percent. Clearly, we have a system that is not working, and it is even making matters worse.

Today, too many welfare recipients have a greater incentive to remain on welfare than to work. We must change the incentives and break the cycle of dependency. Most who are living under these conditions want a much different life for themselves and their children. But there has been very little encouragement, and too many have no hope at all.

We can change directions; but we must have a program that emphasizes parental support for children, the value of work, and individual responsibility. The Republican leadership plan does that.

Enacting real welfare reform is one of the greatest challenges facing Congress and the Administration. Your Congressman and Senators will be back in their states during the August recess. Let them know how you feel about this issue. We believe our approach is much closer to the kind of change the American people want. Please support our effort if you agree.

SPECTRUM REFORM

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to the historic action taken in the House of Representatives on August 4. Our colleagues in the other body, under the able leadership of Chairmen TOM BLAILEY and JACK FIELDS and ranking minority member JOHN DINGELL, overwhelmingly approved, on a broad bipartisan vote of 305 to 117, H. R. 1555, a companion bill to S. 652, the Senate telecommunications reform bill. As my

colleagues will recall, in June the Senate overwhelmingly approved the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995 by a vote of 81 to 18. We have moved in record time—through both houses of Congress—the most comprehensive rewrite of America's telecommunications laws in over 60 years.

Since the 1970's, Congress has considered broad based legislation to modernize our laws governing the telecommunications industry. Nothing, however, has been enacted into law. The Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995 will make dramatic and long needed changes in the Government's regulatory oversight of the telecommunications industry. It promotes unprecedented competition among the various providers of telecommunications products, services, and technologies and dramatically reduces costly and counterproductive regulation of this vitally important sector of American industry.

The changes made in the legislation are long overdue. The dramatic enhancements in technology over the last few years have vastly outstripped the existing regulatory process. A major overhaul of this process is essential if we want competition and its results: better jobs, more exports, greater choice and lower prices. That is exactly what the telecommunications reform bill does.

In moving forward to pass reform legislation, we are shunning the old way of doing business. Instead of splitting the difference between warring commercial interests and special pleaders, we must keep our focus on a free-market outcome that will benefit consumers and taxpayers across the country.

Americans trust this country's free enterprise system. Consumers know there is far too much regulation in much of American business. We have witnessed a burgeoning computer industry develop over the past decade precisely because it has been unfettered by excessive Government regulation. Many parts of the telecommunications sector have been less dynamic, because of excessive Government regulation and micromangement. Consumers know that more competition means more choices, lower prices, better quality and more technological innovation. That is what the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995 is all about.

The bill affirms the tenets of the American free enterprise system by establishing that the marketplace shall determine the winners and losers, not those companies who have demonstrated prowess in protecting markets through the courts and the regulatory process.

Mr. President, passage of telecommunications reform legislation is but one step in moving America forward in the information age of the 21st century. As a next step forward, I intend to press ahead with dramatic radio spectrum reform.

Mr. President, many Americans are aware that wireless technology provides the magic of radio broadcasting and the miracle of television. What is not as well known, but equally important, is that the radio spectrum also enables consumers to receive and transmit a wide variety of wireless voice, data, graphic and video information over the airwaves. At a hearing of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, which I chaired on July 27, Members saw demonstrations of a variety of advanced spectrum services.

Wireless communications often are overlooked by many experts in the policy community who rely far too heavily on a high fiber diet. This is unfortunate. Wireless communications is a rapidly expanding multi-billion dollar industry that is transforming modern American life as profoundly as the landline telephone system did at the beginning of this century.

This is especially important in parts of our country dominated by small cities and towns such as in my home State of South Dakota. Such places experience a significant cost differential between wireless and wireline communications—and wireless is far less expensive. Wireless technology could provide solutions to universal service problems we face currently.

Equally profound is the effect wireless communications will have on the once-sacrosanct local wireline telephone monopoly. The introduction of radio technologies into the long distance segment of the telecommunications market in the 1950's led directly to the breakup of the monopoly for long distance services. New generations of wireless telephones will work the same transformation in the local exchange market. This, of course, is one of the fundamental purposes of S. 652.

Today, two out of every three requests for new telephone service are wireless. There are 25 million cellular telephone subscribers and 20 million users of paging technology. Direct Broadcast Satellite DBS service is providing over 200 digital video and audio channels in competition with cable TV. This is only the beginning.

Mr. President, America—indeed the world—is on the cusp of a golden wireless age of communications. Just yesterday I had the great privilege of making the first PCS call in America—to my mother in South Dakota. PCS, or personal communications service, is a fully digital, wireless communications system with advanced features. The launching of PCS service in America is an especially important milestone in our march to the wireless age.

While many people talk about how telecommunications promotes productivity, mobile radio services provide positive proof. Moreover, radio frequency systems are important from a social policy perspective. Mobile radio is a liberating technology. Wireless communications also play an impor-

tant role against crime, saving lives and promoting public safety. There are over a half-million wireless calls per month to 911 nationwide.

On July 27, the Commerce Committee saw demonstrations of advanced products, services and technologies utilizing the radio frequency spectrum. We also heard witnesses present an informative discussion of new spectrum policy reform initiatives to increase American competitiveness and consumer options. To spark a major reform of our Nation's spectrum use, I will promote legislation for more auctions of spectrum and for more flexibility in spectrum use as part of the reconciliation process.

The spectrum is an enormously valuable, yet finite resource. Unless a reform plan is developed that creates a more effective and efficient use of the spectrum, as well as a more stable supply of spectrum for private sector use, a vast array of new spectrum-based products, services, and technologies will go unrealized.

Such a prospect is particularly disheartening when one considers the benefits that are derived from current spectrum-based technology. The example of cellular telephone technology is a cautionary example. In 1982, AT&T was operating its first experimental cellular telephone system. It was not until 20 years later that the first cellular licenses were handed out by the FCC. Bureaucratic delay and inefficient regulation hampered the development and availability of cellular phones for years. Today, the cellular industry generates about \$14.2 billion in revenues a year.

From its very beginning, wireless communications has played a vital role in protecting lives and property and, subsequently—through the development of radio and television broadcasting—in delivering information and entertainment programming to the public at large. More recently, there has been a realization that wireless, spectrum-based telecommunications services, products and technologies are indispensable enablers or drivers of productivity and economic growth, as well as international competitiveness.

The use of spectrum, however, is determined through bureaucratic licensing rules, regulations and procedures first developed in the 1920's. Under this Byzantine system, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) determines the general uses for the radio spectrum, allocates bands of frequencies to each of those uses, and then issues/assigns licenses for the use of frequencies in each band for specific uses. Spectrum utilized by Federal Government agencies is managed by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) of the Department of Commerce.

Compared to that of most other countries, the U.S. spectrum management system allows for some degree of private sector involvement in spectrum. Yet, the system involves a

central Government planning scheme by Federal regulators and bureaucrats. It is, in short, electromagnetic industrial policy. The FCC must determine which services, which frequencies and the conditions under which they will be provided, and often the specific technology to be used.

The spectrum management system currently utilized in the U.S. tends to result in an inefficient use of the spectrum resource. Federal regulators—rather than consumers—decide whether taxis, telephone service, broadcasters, or foresters are in greatest need of spectrum.

Most importantly, new services, products and technologies face inordinate delays which impose tremendous costs on society. It typically takes many years to get a new service approved by the FCC. The lengthy delay in making cellular telephone service available, as noted earlier, imposed a huge cost on the economy. One recent study estimated the delay cost our economy \$50 billion.

In addition, the system constrains competition. One of the most important determinants of a competitive industry is the ability of new firms to enter the business. The allocation process typically provides for a set number of licenses for each service, precluding additional competitors. Only two cellular franchises, for instance, are allowed in each market. This takes on added significance when one considers the important role wireless services will play in bringing competitive alternatives to the wireline telephone system.

Changes in new communications technologies, especially the digitization phenomenon, are making the bureaucratic system even more unworkable. New wireless communications technologies, services and products are being developed at an ever accelerating rate. Even if the FCC were able to weigh the needs and merits of the relatively few spectrum-based services which existed in the 1930's, it is simply not able to do so today. Even if it could, the lengthy delays associated with the allocation and assignment processes, while perhaps acceptable in a slow-changing analog world, are seriously out of step with the fast-changing digitized world of today.

Spectrum auctions employing competitive bidding for spectrum would give applicants for spectrum the right incentives. Applicants would have incentives to bid only for that amount they truly need, and to use it in the most efficient manner possible. The Government would be compensated at a fair market value for granting an applicant the use of the spectrum. There is already a vigorous private market for spectrum rights. The only difference between the private auctions and FCC auctions is that taxpayers, rather than lucky lottery or comparative hearing winners, receive the revenue.

In addition to expanded auctioning authority, I also intend to pursue spectrum flexibility reforms. Historically, when Government allocated a portion of the spectrum was allocated, they have done so for one and only one use. More flexible use of spectrum would be more productive. Since the 1980's, the FCC has allowed the cellular industry to use its spectrum for alternative purposes. As a result of this increased flexibility, we have seen the advent of data services. The recently passed Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995, S. 652, contains provisions for spectrum flexibility for broadcasters. Now is the time to expand on this important spectrum reform.

Recent digital technological developments make other applications of flexible spectrum use feasible. Smart radios using microprocessor technology now make continuous communications possible on tiny slivers of shifting, non-contiguous spectrum. Such spread spectrum technologies also make it possible to program a cellular telephone to operate on different frequencies based on the part of town from which it is transmitting, or even on the time of day.

Mr. President, our country's future hinges on our ability to maintain our leadership in telecommunications, computing and information technology and innovation. The growth in jobs, productivity and international competitiveness will come in the telecommunications, computing and information sector if the Government gets out of the way. By passing a major overhaul and deregulation of telecommunications, and following this with reform of the spectrum system, this Congress can make a major contribution toward greater consumer choices, jobs creation and U.S. competitiveness in global markets.

A TRIBUTE TO THE RELIEF VOLUNTEERS OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, it is with great sadness and yet tremendous pride that I look back to the tragic events in Oklahoma City which have impacted Oklahomans as well as all Americans. Etched in our memory is what happened on Wednesday, April 19, at 9:02 a.m. when Oklahoma was stunned by an explosion at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City. As we reflect on our devastating loss, we realize that the old adage is true—every cloud does have a silver lining. The silver lining we found in Oklahoma City was the outpouring of love, selfless effort, and resources.

We are, forever, indebted to those volunteers who created that silver lining, and they have our utmost respect and gratitude. The individuals are innumerable, but none is forgotten. Each remains as an example for us to emulate. We have learned many lessons

from them: lessons of compassion, charity, cooperation, perseverance, and bravery.

First of all, I have been touched by the loving compassion that has motivated the volunteers. The reflections of Dr. Robert C. Bjorklund, a local pastor from Oklahoma City, captured the compassionate spirit found among the rescue workers. He recounted for me his experience while providing counseling assistance at the site just days after the bombing. He had been debriefing the rescue workers as they started and finished their shifts where they were exposed to incredible and tragic images. He expressed how moved he was by the caring and compassion of the rescue workers who seemed more concerned about his condition than their own. Dr. Bjorklund was right when he suggested that the tragedy has been overshadowed by the community's spirit of mutual care and concern. He learned from them firsthand as the rest of us are learning from their example.

The phenomenal generosity of the private donors, rescue workers, and large corporations have also made them models of charity. I was amazed by the immediate and enthusiastic response of citizens donating food, flashlights, batteries, and other supplies to the rescue crews. One young man named Chris Gross from Santa Clara, CA, has given up his salary for 1 year to start the Children of Oklahoma City Scholarship Fund. The selfless rescue workers, such as Dr. Hernando Garzon and his rescue crew from Sacramento, CA, came from far and wide and worked around the clock.

So many sacrificed their time, money, and talents to the cause. The Oklahoma Restaurant Association was especially generous by donating thousands of meals to families and volunteers. For instance, Pizza Hut donated free meals for more than a month to 300 affected families while Cain's Coffee provided 24-hour service to rescue crews. Companies and individuals in Oklahoma and around the country such as Southwestern Bell, Kerr-McGee, Phillips Petroleum, Bridgestone/Firestone, Anheuser Busch, Conoco, Boatman's Bank, American Airlines, Presbyterian Health Foundation, Koch Oil Co., C.R. Anthony, Henry Kravis, Ford Motor Co., Liberty National Bank, Chubb Insurance, ONEOK Employees Credit Union, the Lloyd Noble Center, Branson Cares Benefit, the Burlington County Times, the Xerox Corp., and countless others made significant donations for the relief effort.

I have also learned a lesson from the cooperation that unified all the workers into one efficient force. I was struck by the number of people successfully working simultaneously on many different tasks in order to accomplish the same goal. We have their coordinated effort to thank for the rescue of the survivors and the care of many grievers. Specifically, Amateur Radio provided an essential service to rescue operations. Within minutes of

Document No. 72

