

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 S12208 1997

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Wed Mar 20 16:25:34 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.

other international forums. Often, we acted in close cooperation with France, in particular since President Mitterrand's highly welcome decision to declare a nuclear test moratorium in 1992. These efforts were combined on 11 May with the decision by the international community to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) for an unlimited period—an important element for the safety of our two countries.

Neither Australia nor any other country has the right to define France's security; however, given the circumstances, the French will certainly permit me to explain why, in our view, France's action is not good for France or for the world.

We believe that these tests endanger our efforts to preserve the effectiveness of the NPT and to achieve universal membership. For the unlimited extension of this treaty it was decisive that a "declaration of principles and goals on nonproliferation and disarmament" was simultaneously negotiated and adopted by all states involved, including the nuclear states.

This declaration announced the speedy conclusion by 1996 at the latest—of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. And until such a treaty comes into effect, the nuclear states have committed themselves to "extreme restraint."

However, "extreme restraint" regarding nuclear tests hardly applies to a program of eight tests. France's decision will certainly make many non-nuclear states wonder about the honesty of all nuclear states.

This will harm the treaty's credibility, which must be preserved if some states, which have not yet signed it, are to be persuaded to do so.

The decision will also increase the problems in the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. Despite President Chirac's gratifying statement that France will sign such a treaty, there is the serious danger that the very difficult treaty negotiations that we are facing in Geneva will become even more difficult.

In particular France's position as a responsible and leading power in the world means that any new French test will play into the hands of potential arms dealers and that any test will make many of those countries hesitate whose support we need to conclude a comprehensive treaty.

We know the arguments for France's nuclear capacity and the strategic dimensions of a nuclear power very well. We argue not merely on the basis of emotions when we say that the biggest responsibility for us all is the one to keep alive the hope for a nuclear-free world, which was born when the Cold War ended. The burden of this responsibility rests most heavily on the nuclear states, particularly after the unlimited extension of the NPT.

And in view of the nuclear experiences in Europe, the biggest challenge for leadership certainly is right in front of Europe's own door. The damaged Chernobyl reactor may have been encased in a sarcophagus, but there are still another 20 reactors with similar design flaws on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Dozens of nuclear powered submarines of the former Soviet fleet are now idle. Nuclear material and nuclear expert knowledge are leaking from the former Soviet Union into illegal markets.

These dangers, as well as the stocks of dismantled nuclear weapons and contaminated areas, are not precisely banished by the development of further nuclear weapons capacities. But France's top international skills in nuclear science and technology could help. How much more respect would France gain and how much more useful would it be if the country were not to concentrate its skills and energy on countering a purely hypothetical threat but on meeting a real threat!

I do not doubt that the Australians want to make it known in France that their attitude is in no way determined by hostility toward the French people or the French nation. Our opposition specifically refers to the French Government's decision to resume the nuclear tests in the Pacific.

In the past Australia's attitude was sometimes understood as an expression of some kind of Anglo-Saxon hostility toward France. However, Australia is certainly not an Anglo-Saxon enclave in the Asia-Pacific region. As the many French who live in Australia can confirm, Australia is a rich multicultural society, in which half of the immigrants come from Asian countries. It is clear that many of these French inhabitants of Australia think that the French Government should rescind its decision.

If they live on Australia's east coast, they know that there is an enormous difference between studying a map of the Pacific in Europe and actually living on the shores of the ocean in Sydney or Brisbane or Auckland. The map shows these places to be far away from Murrumbidgee. However, if one lives in these places, one knows that the South Pacific—no matter how gigantic it is constitutes a single environment and links everyone who participates in it.

The community spirit that the Pacific Ocean gives us is similar to the one given to France by the idea of "Europe." It is the fundamental reason for our opposition to France's decision to resume the tests and for the fact that Australia and its partners in the South Pacific Forum will not stop emphatically presenting our views to the French Government and conveying to the French people, if we can, the depth of our feelings.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator AKAKA intends to introduce an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill this week expressing the sense of the Senate that France must abide by the current international moratorium on nuclear test explosions, and refrain from proceeding with its announced intention of conducting a series of nuclear tests in advance of a comprehensive test ban treaty. I support that amendment, and hope that the French will reconsider their position on conducting these tests and that the CTBT will be signed by the end of next year.

DEFLECTIONS FROM IRAQ

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues may have heard, there have been dramatic developments in the Middle East today.

Two major Iraqi government figures—both members of Saddam Hussein's circle of power—have defected from Iraq and are now in Jordan.

One of the defectors, Lt. Gen. Hussein Kamel Hassan, was in charge of military industrialization in Iraq. The other, Lt. Col. Saddam Kamel Hassan, was in charge of Saddam Hussein's guards. Both—this is really the curious thing—coincidentally, are married to daughters of Saddam Hussein and are thus his sons-in-law.

The development is significant for a number of reasons. Just last week, Ambassador Madeleine Albright testified to the Foreign Relations Committee that Saddam's base of support has been

shrinking. Today's events illustrate that point in an extraordinary way. On a more fundamental level, the defections demonstrate the soundness of United States containment policy toward Iraq, which is designed in part to encourage internal change. It is still too early to assess how the defections will affect Saddam's grip on power; it is clear, however, that there is considerable turmoil in Baghdad's inner sanctum.

As a final note, Mr. President, I would like to add a word of appreciation for Jordan's King Hussein. It is no small gesture for King Hussein to welcome the defectors and provide them safe haven. As unpredictable as Saddam Hussein can be, the King's actions could well provoke an Iraqi response.

President Clinton has said that the United States stands ready to support the King, who by today's actions has shown true courage in defiance of Saddam. I support the President's statement and join him in expressing gratitude to King Hussein.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt, which long ago soared into the stratosphere, fueled by bureaucratic hot air, is sort of like the weather—everybody talks about it but almost nobody did much about it until immediately after the elections last November.

But when the new 104th Congress convened in January, the U.S. House of Representatives quickly approved a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On the Senate side, all but one of the 54 Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment—that was the good news. The bad news is that only 13 Democrats supported it. Since a two-thirds-vote—67 Senators—is necessary to approve a constitutional amendment, the proposed Senate amendment failed by one vote. There will be another vote either this year or next.

Here is today's bad debt boxscore:

As of the close of business Wednesday, August 9, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly \$4,942,218,005,856.98 or \$18,760.74 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

THE MYSTERIOUS V-CHIP

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there's been a lot of hype recently about the so-called V-chip.

President Clinton has endorsed the chip, touting it as an antidote to the gratuitous violence and sexual innuendo that now permeate prime-time television. A majority of the Senate has voted to require that every new television set contain the V-chip. And the House of Representatives has joined the V-chip bandwagon, by including a V-chip mandate in the recently passed telecommunications bill.

With all this support, one would think that the V-chip has been tested and tested in laboratories throughout the country. But guess what? The V-chip doesn't even exist—and it may never exist. It is purely a drawing-board scheme that may make sense in theory—but it's anybody's guess whether it will ever work in practice. We've never seen one.

According to an article appearing in USA Today, "There Is No Such Thing as a V-chip. And There Probably Never Will Be." The San Francisco Chronicle reports that—

No company makes—the V-chip, nor has any company expressed an interest in doing so. In fact, the chip isn't a chip at all. It's really an idea for special circuitry for television, but "V-circuitry" doesn't sound quite as omnipotent as V-chip.

Is development of V-chip technology just around the hi-tech corner? Well, perhaps not. According to experts cited in the USA Today article, it—

Could take 10 years before a V-chip TV is designed, built, marketed, and sold into enough homes to make a difference.

And, in fact, it's likely that the so-called V-chip technology will be overtaken by existing software systems—developed as a direct result of consumer demand—that will give parents more control over what their children watch on television.

So, Mr. President, seeing is believing—and perhaps, just perhaps, the White House may want to reconsider its threat to veto any telecommunications bill that fails to include a V-chip mandate. After all, this bill is the key to our Nation's future economic success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the USA Today and San Francisco Chronicle articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

ONE TREWAS LITTLE PROBLEM WITH THIS NEW V-CHIP

(By Kevin Maney)

There is no such thing as a v-chip. And there probably never will be.

"I don't think Intel's doing it," says Howard High at computer chipmaker Intel. "Our plate's full."

"Not at TI," says Neil McGilone at Texas Instruments. "If our customers tell us it's important, we'll take a look at it."

Congress is demanding that every new TV set contain a v-chip. The provision is in a telecommunications bill passed Friday by the House and in June by the Senate. Computerized chips installed in TVs would have to be able to detect shows that are violent by reading a signal carried along with each show. The signal would tell the chip the rating of the show—similar to movie ratings. Parents could program the chip to block out shows with certain ratings, keeping those shows from their children's eyes.

Great, except nobody's ever made a v-chip. It's like passing a law requiring cars to have air bags before air bags were even invented.

"The v-chip is a theory and a warning flag" to makers of violent TV programs, says Rob Agee, editor of Interactive Television Report. "But it doesn't exist."

In fact, Agee and others say a v-chip for TVs will be overtaken by parental control

software built into cable systems or interactive TV networks. It could take 10 years before a v-chip TV is designed, built, marketed and sold into enough homes to make a difference. Some of the software controls already are on the market or being tested. Among them:

TV Guide On Screen, an interactive on-screen version of the magazine, lets parents lock out channels or individual shows. It also could lock out programs by time—say, no TV until after homework is done. The software will be loaded into upgraded 500-channel cable TV systems starting this fall. "It's parental control as opposed to governmental control," says Larry Miller, vice president of marketing.

The Sega Channel, which lets users play Sega games over cable TV lines, gives parents the option of blocking out games that carry certain ratings. The channel is available on some cable systems.

In Bell Atlantic's tests of TV over phone lines, the viewer has to enter a personal identification number to order movies, games or items from home-shopping channels. The programming can be blocked by rating.

Those companies and others are pushing parental control into their systems because consumers are demanding it, Agee says. "The v-chip is a moot point."

(From the San Francisco Chronicle, July 28, 1995)

V-CHIP STILL ONLY A VISION—DESPITE ALL THE TALK. IT DOESN'T EXIST

(By Michelle Quinn)

The V-chip seems like the perfect use of one technology to solve a problem caused by another—children watching television shows that serve up violence and sex.

In coming weeks, the House of Representatives will consider making the V-chip mandatory in all television sets over 13 inches. Last month, the Senate voted to do so in an amendment to the Telecommunications Act.

But those with a tool belt eager to install the chip into a television set will be disappointed. The chip doesn't exist. No company makes it, nor has any company expressed an interest in doing so. In fact, the chip isn't a chip at all. It's really an idea for special circuitry for television, but "V-Circuitry" doesn't sound quite as omnipotent as V-chip.

All technology starts with ideas. But unlike the creation of the food processor, the electric shaver or the Macintosh computer, the V-chip has sprung mostly from the brow of political imagination and is gaining momentum in an election year.

It started when Representative Edward Markey, D-Mass., asked the Electronic Industries Association, a trade association based in Arlington, Va., that represents electronics equipment manufacturers, to come up with ideas for putting captioning on television sets for people who are deaf or hard of hearing. In 1990, Markey's legislation passed, making it mandatory for television sets to have captioning.

Two years later, Markey asked the trade association to come up with another technology idea, this time for screening out television violence, said Gary Shapiro, group vice president with the association.

Again, the trade association obliged, coming up with a laundry list of how a violence screener might work. Markey dubbed the idea "V-chip" and a political football was born.

The rough plans were that parents should consult a ratings guidebook, and with a remote control, block certain shows. The television industry would come up with the ratings.

The electronics trade association began to work on how the technology might work—and began to take heat from its members, such as television set manufacturers, who said it would be too expensive to rejigger televisions.

Markey attempted to introduce a bill about the V-chip last year but the electronics trade association said the idea wasn't ready. The association occasionally seems ready to drop the V-chip idea, said David Moulton, Markey's chief of staff, perhaps buckling under pressure from members who say it would be too expensive.

"Even now, I can no longer get a firm grasp on when the standards will be done," Moulton said.

So while the V-chip languished on the drawing board, politics took over.

Last month, Senate majority leader Bob Dole took on Hollywood as part of his presidential campaign and denounced movies and television shows with "mindless violence and loveless sex."

Soon after, Senator Kent Conrad, D-N.D., introduced the V-chip as an amendment to the Telecommunications Act. A political stampede took place, with the majority of the Senate shifting its vote at the last minute to pass the amendment 73 to 25.

Even President Clinton got in on the V-chip, telling a Nashville conference on families and the media this month that he supported the new technology.

Broadcasters and cable operators began denouncing the V-chip, saying it would be impossible to agree on a rating system that the chips could read.

Capital Cities/ABC Inc. said it was censorship. "A chip takes choice out of parents' hands and puts it in the hands of government," said a company press release.

Next week, Markey intends to introduce an amendment to the Telecommunications Act in the House making it mandatory for televisions over 13 inches. The industry association contends Markey is breaking a promise by making the V-chip mandatory. "There were no promises, no letters," Moulton said.

Once TV set manufacturers have to include the V-chip, they will be glad for it, Moulton said. They'll "advertise new parent-friendly blocking technology," said Markey's spokesman. "This will be a new reason to buy TV sets."

For Shapiro of the trade association, the V-chip is no longer in his control. Politicians, he said, "use political advantage in it. The V-chip makes a good sound bite."

The V-chip standards could have been ready by early 1996. But with TV set manufacturers and broadcasters fighting it, the V-chip is years off.

And even then, the V-chip won't be foolproof, Shapiro added.

"A smart kid will unplug the television set," he said, "and reset all the ratings."

ANTICOUNTERFEITING CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1995—S. 1136

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Chairman HATCH as an original cosponsor of the "Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1995." We are seeking to give law enforcement additional tools to combat counterfeiting crimes that cost our Nation's companies billions of dollars each year.

Increasingly, we suspect that the lost revenue to legitimate U.S. companies is going into the pockets of international crime syndicates and organized criminals, who manufacture, import and distribute counterfeit goods

Document No. 71

