

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 S8008 1997

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Tue Mar 19 23:53:40 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.

desk, and I might tell the Senate the modification is to form only, not to substance. And I ask the modification be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1264), as modified, is as follows:

On page 82, line 23, beginning with the word "after", delete all that follows through page 81, line 25, and insert the following:

"to the extent approved by the Commission and the Attorney General".

"In accordance with the provisions of subsection (c):

"(2) InterLATA telecommunications services originating in any area where that company is not the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d); and

"(3) InterLATA services that are incidental services in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e).

"(b) SPECIFIC INTERLATA INTERCONNECTION REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A Bell operating company may provide InterLATA services in accordance with this section only if that company has reached an interconnection agreement under section 251 and that agreement provides, at a minimum, for interconnection that meets the competitive checklist requirements of paragraph (2).

"(2) COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST.—Interconnection provided by a Bell operating company to other telecommunications carriers under section 251 shall include:

"(A) Nondiscriminatory access on an unbundled basis to the network functions and services of the Bell operating company's telecommunications network that is at least equal in type, quality, and price to the access the Bell operating company affords to itself or any other entity.

"(B) The capability to exchange telecommunications between customers of the Bell operating company and the telecommunications carrier seeking interconnection.

"(C) Nondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the Bell operating company at just and reasonable rates where it has the legal authority to permit such access.

"(D) Local loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services.

"(E) Local transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services.

"(F) Local switching unbundled from transport, local loop transmission, or other services.

"(G) Nondiscriminatory access to—

"(i) 911 and E911 services;

"(ii) directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers; and

"(iii) operator call completion services.

"(H) White pages directory listings for customers of the other carrier's telephone exchange service.

"(I) Until the date by which neutral telephone number administration guidelines, plan, or rules are established, nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to the other carrier's telephone exchange service customers. After that date, compliance with such guidelines, plan, or rules.

"(J) Nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling, including signaling links, signaling service control

points, and signaling service transfer points, necessary for call routing and completion.

"(K) Until the date by which the Commission determines that final telecommunications number portability is technically feasible and must be made available, interim telecommunications number portability through remote call forwarding, direct inward dialing trunks, or other comparable arrangements, with as little impairment of functioning, quality, reliability, and convenience as possible. After that date, full compliance with final telecommunications number portability.

"(L) Nondiscriminatory access to whatever services or information may be necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in a manner that permits consumers to be able to dial the same number of digits when using any telecommunications carrier providing telephone exchange service or exchange access service.

"(M) Reciprocal compensation arrangements on a nondiscriminatory basis for the origination and termination of telecommunications.

"(N) Telecommunications services and network functions provided on an unbundled basis without any conditions or restrictions on the resale or sharing of those services or functions, including both origination and termination of telecommunications services, other than reasonable conditions required by the Commission or a State. For purposes of this subparagraph, it is not an unreasonable condition for the Commission or a State to limit the resale—

"(i) of services included in the definition of universal service to a telecommunications carrier who intends to resell that service to a category of customers different from the category of customers being offered that universal service by such carrier if the Commission or State orders a carrier to provide the same service to different categories of customers at different prices necessary to promote universal service; or

"(ii) of subsidized universal service in a manner that allows companies to charge another carrier rates which reflect the actual cost of providing those services to that carrier, exclusive of any universal service support received for providing such services in accordance with section 214(d)(3).

"(3) JOINT MARKETING OF LOCAL AND LONG DISTANCE SERVICES.—Until a Bell operating company is authorized to provide InterLATA services in a telephone exchange "area where that company is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service", a telecommunications carrier may not jointly market in such telephone exchange area telephone exchange service purchased from such company with InterLATA services offered by that telecommunications carrier.

"(4) COMMISSION MAY NOT EXPAND COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST.—The Commission may not, by rule or otherwise, limit or extend the terms used in the competitive checklist.

"(c) IN-REGION SERVICES.—

"(1) APPLICATION.—Upon the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995, a Bell operating company or its affiliate may apply to the Commission and Attorney General for authorization notwithstanding the Modification of Final Judgment to provide InterLATA telecommunications service originating in any area where such Bell operating company is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service. The application shall describe with particularity the nature and scope of the activity and of each product market or service market, and each geographic market for which authorization is sought.

"(2) DETERMINATION BY COMMISSION.—

"(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after receiving an application under paragraph (1), the Commission shall issue a written determination, on the record after a hearing and opportunity for comment, granting or denying the application in whole or in part.

"(B) APPROVAL.—The Commission may only approve the authorization requested in an application submitted under paragraph (1) if it finds that—

"(i) the petitioning Bell operating company has fully implemented the competitive checklist found in subsection (b)(2); and

"(ii) the requested authority will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 252,

and if the Commission determines that the requested authorization is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. If the Commission does not approve an application under this subparagraph, it shall state the basis for its denial of the application.

"(C) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 10 days after issuing a determination under paragraph (2), the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a brief description of the determination.

"(4) DETERMINATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

"(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after receiving an application made under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall issue a written determination with respect to the authorization for which a Bell operating company or its subsidiary or affiliate has applied. In making such determination, the Attorney General shall review the whole record.

"(B) APPROVAL.—The Attorney General shall approve the authorization requested in any application submitted under paragraph (1) only to the extent that the Attorney General finds that there is no substantial possibility that such company or its subsidiaries or its affiliates could use monopoly power in a telephone exchange or exchange access service market to impede competition in the InterLATA telecommunications service market such company or its subsidiary or affiliate seeks to enter. The Attorney General shall deny the remainder of the requested authorization."

"(C) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 10 days after issuing a determination under paragraph (4), the Attorney General shall publish the determination in the Federal Register."

"(4) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

"(A) COMMENCEMENT OF ACTION.—Not later than 45 days after a determination by the Commission or Attorney General is published under paragraph (3), the Bell operating company or its subsidiary or affiliate that applied to the Commission and Attorney General under paragraph (1), or any person who would be threatened with loss or damage as a result of the determination regarding such company's engaging in the activity described in its application, may commence an action in any United States Court of Appeals against the Commission or the Attorney General for judicial review of the determination regarding the application.

"(B) JUDGMENT.—

"(i) The Court shall enter a judgment after reviewing the determination in accordance with section 706 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(ii) A judgment—

"(i) affirming any part of the determination that approves granting all or part of the requested authorization, or

"(ii) reversing any part of the determination that denies all or part of the requested authorization, shall describe with particularity the nature and scope of the activity, and

of each product market or service market, and each geographic market, to which the affirmative or reversal applies.

"(6) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SEPARATE AFFILIATE SAFEGUARDS; AND INTRALATA TOLL DIALING PARITY.—

"(A) SEPARATE AFFILIATE SAFEGUARDS.—Other than InterLATA services * * *"

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am probably a good witness to settle this case because much of what has been referred to is what we did last year and the year before.

As the Clinton administration came to office, we had the original hearing. I remember it well. Secretary Brown of Commerce appeared. He asked for the Department of Justice. I cross-examined him very thoroughly on that because what we were trying to do was deregulate, what we were trying to do is sort of give us the term in the market, one-stop shopping. And if there were any inadequacies in the administrative body, namely the Federal Communications Commission, it was incumbent on me, I felt, as a Senator to make sure those inadequacies were considered. I felt the administration felt very, very strongly about this. And what you do in Government in the art of the possible is you get a bill.

So while I really wanted to have the one-stop shopping, I went along with the majority vote overwhelmingly as has been referred to. We had an 18 to 2 vote, and that kind of thing.

We had the Bell companies, the Senator from North Dakota is quite correct, reading the 8(c) test that is a part of his amendment, and the amendment, of course, of the distinguished senior colleague of mine from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, is whether or not it will substantially lessen competition. One is the no substantial possibility to use monopoly power to impede competition. That is once competition has already ensued. The Dorgan amendment.

The Thurmond amendment is to the effect of reviewing ahead of time a merger, for example, to see whether it would substantially lessen competition.

We begin with the fundamental that to monopolize trade is a felony, and these communications people are not criminals—not yet, in any event, and they do not belong in the Justice Department unless they violate the law.

So looking at the majority vote in the art of the possible in getting a good communications bill passed, I was very careful.

Number one, if all the colleagues would turn to page 8, I think it is, of S. 652, and you look down starting at line 20, section 7, "Effect on other law," I read this simple line:

Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c)—

which have to do with the MFJ and the GTE consent decrees—

Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), nothing in this act shall be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the applicability of any antitrust law. *

So let us clear the air. S. 652 says antitrust, keep all your experts; do all your reviews; study all your studies; make all your motions.

How many years does it take? They are so proud: Well, the Justice Department is the one that broke up the AT&T. Well, if they wait for them to break up the next monopoly in a similar fashion, we will all be term limited. Even the senior Senator might not be here. I do not know. It will be long enough, I can tell you that.

So let us get right down to it. The Antitrust Division has its responsibilities under Section 7 of Clayton. It has its responsibility with respect to the Sherman Act, whether any violations are there because that is how they moved with respect to AT&T.

The thrust here is by the long distance crowd to get some more bureaucracy.

That stated it in a line. Just like my friends, the Bell crowd, wanted to do away with the public trust, this long distance crowd wants to bureaucratize the entire thing like the end of the world is going to happen if you do not have the Justice Department bureaucracy and minions studying, moving, motioning, hearing, and everything else.

I graduated from law school. I had a colleague I think who joined the Louisiana land case down there. Like the Georgia Pacific, they had the Louisiana pulp and paper case. It was a long—well, 13 years later, under the fees he got, he was retired down in Florida. And I always regretted that I went to trying cases in my hometown and did not get connected up with one of those rich antitrust motions.

We are all spoiled. You have a wonderful Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Ms. Anne Bingaman, who has done an outstanding job with respect, for example, to the Microsoft case and engineering the Ameritech consent decree. You have a wonderful set of facts there where they were all petitioning and joining in. They were not enjoining. They were not motioning to estop. They were not appealing. And they were not getting clarifications and everything else, all these other motions that can be made under antitrust with findings and what have you.

This was already under the Department of Justice consent decree, the MFJ consent decree whereby they could come in and motion the judge and agree on a limited market that was outlined, and you did not have to go into the regular antitrust bureaucracy and ritual that takes years on end, which they have already put in the Record, fortunately, for me.

The Senator from North Dakota talked about starting with President Nixon, President Ford, President Carter, and then finally under President Reagan. So there is a strong feeling here that we tried to simplify as much as possible this proceeding.

And under the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota about the

8(c) test, no one knows it better than I because I did cite those letters and understanding and everything else of that kind. Because of the way 1822 was drafted year before last, it had actual and demonstrable competition. That just threw everything into the fan, and before I could get around and explain anything to the colleagues and everything else what we were trying to do, they just had a mindset that the chairman of the Commerce Committee was off on a toot and a little mixed up and it was not going to go anywhere. I had to agree with them; I was not going to go anywhere. So we sat down and over a 2-year period, meeting every Friday with all the Bell companies, and meeting every Tuesday morning with all of the long distance companies and the other long distance competitors in there, we then started spelling out as best we could that checklist of what actual and demonstrable competition would encompass. So we spell this out dutifully.

I wish to read that to you because I wish to show you what actual and demonstrable, what 8(c) is. The idea is that we have disregarded the admission that there be no substantial possibility of using monopoly power to impede competition.

Well, how do you determine that? You determine that best by making a checklist of the unbundling, of the local exchange, the interconnection after it is unbundled. You get the dial parity. You set up a separate subsidiary and all the other particular items listed.

I have a wonderful group here that is very familiar with the bill. They know how exactly to turn to the page and section so I can read it to you. But while they search for it, which is very difficult to find, what we did is we dutifully spelled out the 8(c) test, which is the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, and thereupon put in the bill itself, which, again I think, is on page 89. Understand, we had not disregarded actual and demonstrable competition. On page 16, line 10:

(b) MINIMUM STANDARDS.—An interconnection agreement entered into under this section shall, if requested by a telecommunications carrier requesting interconnection, provide for—

(1) nondiscriminatory access on an unbundled basis to the network functions and services of the local exchange carrier's telecommunications network software to the extent defined in the implementing regulations by the Commission.

(2) nondiscriminatory access on an unbundled basis to any of the local exchange carrier's telecommunications facilities and information, including databases and signaling, necessary to the transmission and routing of any telephone exchange service or exchange access service and the interoperability of both carrier's networks;

(3) interconnection to the local exchange carrier's telecommunications facilities and services at any technically feasible point within the carrier's network;

(4) interconnection that is at least equal in type and quality to and offered at a price no higher than that provided by the local exchange carrier to itself or to any subsidiary.

affiliate, or any other party to which the carrier provides interconnection:

(5) nondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the local exchange carrier at just and reasonable rates;

(6) the local exchange carrier to take whatever action under its control is necessary, as soon as it is technically feasible, to provide telecommunications number portability and local dialing parity in a manner that:

(A) Permits consumers to be able to dial the same number of digits when using any telecommunications carrier providing telephone exchange service or exchange access service in the market served by the local exchange carrier;

(B) permits all such carriers to have nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing with no unreasonable dialing delays; and

(C) provides for a reasonable allocation of costs among the parties to the agreement.

(7) telecommunications services and network functions of the local exchange carrier to be available—

AMENDMENT NO. 198, AS MODIFIED

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 1265), as modified, is as follows:

Strike all after the first word of the pending amendment and insert the following:

(3) Section 309(d) (47 U.S.C. 309(d)) is amended by inserting "(or subsection (k) in the case of renewal of any broadcast station license)" after "with subsection (a)" each place it appears.

SUBTITLE B—TERMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF FINAL JUDGMENT
SEC. 231. REMOVAL OF LONG DISTANCE RESTRICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of title II (47 U.S.C. 251 et seq.), as added by this Act, is amended by inserting after section 254 the following new section:

***SEC. 254. INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any restriction or obligation imposed before the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995 under section II(D) of the Modification of Final Judgment, a Bell operating company that meets the requirements of this section may provide—

"(1) interLATA telecommunications services originating in any region in which it is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service to the extent approved by the Commission and the Attorney General of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c);

"(2) interLATA telecommunications services originating in any area where that company is not the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d); and

"(3) interLATA services that are incidental services in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e).

"(b) SPECIFIC INTERLATA INTERCONNECTION REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A Bell operating company may provide interLATA services in accordance with this section only if that company has reached an interconnection agreement under section 251 and that agreement provides, at a minimum, for interconnection that meets the competitive checklist requirements of paragraph (2).

"(2) COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST.—Interconnection provided by a Bell operating company to other telecommunications carriers under section 251 shall include:

"(A) Nondiscriminatory access on an unbundled basis to the network functions and services of the Bell operating company's telecommunications network that is at least equal in type, quality, and price to the access the Bell operating company affords to itself or any other entity.

"(B) The capability to exchange telecommunications between customers of the Bell operating company and the telecommunications carrier seeking interconnection.

"(C) Nondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the Bell operating company at just and reasonable rates where it has the legal authority to permit such access.

"(D) Local loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services.

"(E) Local transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services.

"(F) Local switching unbundled from transport, local loop transmission, or other services.

"(G) Nondiscriminatory access to—

"(i) 911 and E911 services;

"(ii) directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers; and

"(iii) operator call completion services.

"(H) White pages directory listings for customers of the other carrier's telephone exchange service.

"(I) Until the date by which neutral telephone number administration guidelines, plan, or rules are established, nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to the other carrier's telephone exchange service customers. After that date, compliance with such guidelines, plan, or rules.

"(J) Nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling, including signaling links, signaling service control points, and signaling service transfer points, necessary for call routing and completion.

"(K) Until the date by which the Commission determines that final telecommunications number portability is technically feasible and must be made available, interim telecommunications number portability through remote call forwarding, direct inward dialing trunks, or other comparable arrangements, with as little impairment of functioning, quality, reliability, and convenience as possible. After that date, full compliance with final telecommunications number portability.

"(L) Nondiscriminatory access to whatever services or information may be necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in a manner that permits consumers to be able to dial the same number of digits when using any telecommunications carrier providing telephone exchange service or exchange access service.

"(M) Reciprocal compensation arrangements on a nondiscriminatory basis for the origination and termination of telecommunications.

"(N) Telecommunications services and network functions provided on an unbundled basis without any conditions or restrictions on the resale or sharing of those services or functions, including both origination and termination of telecommunications services, other than reasonable conditions required by the Commission or a State. For purposes of this subparagraph, it is not an unreasonable condition for the Commission or a State to limit the resale—

"(1) of services included in the definition of universal service to a telecommunications carrier who intends to resell that service to a category of customers being offered that universal service by such carrier if the Commission or State orders a carrier to provide the same service to different categories of customers at different prices necessary to promote universal service; or

"(ii) of subsidized universal service in a manner that allows companies to charge another carrier rates which reflect the actual cost of providing those services to that carrier, exclusive of any universal service support received for providing such services in accordance with section 314(d)(5).

"(3) JOINT MARKETING OF LOCAL AND LONG DISTANCE SERVICES.—Until a Bell operating company is authorized to provide interLATA services in a telephone exchange "area where that company is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service," a telecommunications carrier may not jointly market telephone exchange services in such telephone exchange area purchased from such company with interLATA services offered by that telecommunications carrier.

"(4) COMMISSION MAY NOT EXPAND COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST.—The Commission may not, by rule or otherwise, limit or extend the terms used in the competitive checklist.

"(c) IN-REGION SERVICES.—

"(1) APPLICATION.—Upon the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995, a Bell operating company or its affiliate may apply to the Commission and the Attorney General for authorization notwithstanding the Modification of Final Judgment to provide interLATA telecommunications service originating in any area where such Bell operating company is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange service or exchange access service. The application shall describe with particularity the nature and scope of the activity and of each product market or service market, and each geographic market for which authorization is sought.

"(2) DETERMINATION BY COMMISSION AND ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

"(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after receiving an application under paragraph (1), the Commission and the Attorney General shall each issue a written determination, on the record after a hearing and opportunity for comment, granting or denying the application in whole or in part.

"(B) APPROVAL BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may only approve the authorization requested in an application submitted under paragraph (1) if it finds that—

"(i) the petitioning Bell operating company has fully implemented the competitive checklist found in subsection (b)(2); and

"(ii) the requested authority will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 252,

and if the Commission determines that the requested authorization is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. In making its determination whether the requested authorization is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity, the Commission shall not consider the antitrust effects of such authorization in any market for which authorization is sought. If the Commission does not approve an application under this subparagraph, it shall state the basis for its denial of the application.

"(C) APPROVAL BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may only approve the authorization requested in an application submitted under paragraph (1) if the Attorney General finds that the effect of such authorization will not substantially lessen

Document No. 23

INTENTIONAL
BLANK