

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1756

Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BROWN of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MARSHALL, RAHALL, CLAY and FORD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Thursday, June 8, 2006, the house had a vote on rollcall 237, on H Res. 850, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5252) to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5252 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 850 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5252.

□ 1758

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5252) to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically bring the general debate for H.R. 5252, the Communications Opportunity, Promotion, and Enhancement Act of 2006, to the floor of the House of Representatives. The process in getting the bill to

this stage has been long, has been fruitful, and, in my opinion, it has been fair. It has involved more than a year of hearings, as well as staff and Member-level negotiations. That process has clearly borne, I think, positive fruit.

We come to the House today with a bill that has received overwhelming bipartisan support in both the subcommittee and the full committee. The bill passed the subcommittee by a margin of 27-4, with all Republicans voting for it and two-thirds of the Democrat minority party voting for it. In the full committee it was reported by a margin of 42-12, again all Republicans voting for it and a majority of the Democrats voting for it.

The primary focus of this legislation is to create a streamlined cable franchising process in order to increase the number of facilities-based providers for video, voice, and data services everywhere in our great Nation.

Today, there are thousands of local franchising authorities. Each may impose disparate restriction on the provision of cable service in its specific franchising area. The requirement to negotiate such local franchises and the patchwork of obligations that local franchising authorities impose are hindering the deployment of advanced broadband networks that will bring increasingly innovative and competitive services to all of our constituents.

The United States does not even rank in the top 10 of the nations of the world in broadband deployment. This bill should change that statistic.

H.R. 5252 seeks to address this concern and strike the right balance between national standards and local oversight. It would allow the negotiation of local franchises, but make available an alternative national franchise process.

□ 1800

Moreover, the national franchise preserves local franchise fees, municipal control over their rights-of-way, and support for their Public Education and Governmental channels that so many of our Members are strongly in favor of.

The bill also seeks to strike the right balance between ensuring the public Internet remains an open, vibrant marketplace, and ensuring Congress does not hand the FCC a blank check to regulate Internet services, an action that I believe would have a chilling effect on broadband deployment, especially broadband innovation. We need the FCC to stop the cheats without killing honest creativity. We don't need anybody to be the first Secretary of the Internet.

Finally, the bill addresses rules for voiceover Internet protocol services, or VoIP services, to ensure that the Internet voice services become a vibrant competitor to what we call plain old telephone service.

I want to thank Congressman RUSH for his cosponsorship, Subcommittee

Chairman Mr. UPTON for his cosponsorship, Vice Chairman CHIP PICKERING of Mississippi for his leadership, and all the members of the committee and the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored this bipartisan legislation with me.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to a vigorous debate on the amendments that have been made in order by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this measure. It is a bad bill. It does nothing except take care of the special and the vested interests. The baby bells, the telephone companies, and the cable operators are going to cut a fat hog. The consumers are able to anticipate only a few things: One, they are going to get worse service, probably less competition, and almost certainly increases in rates.

Consumers are going to see their cities lose control over their streets and roads to, of all things, the Federal Communications Commission, one of the sorriest of the Federal agencies, and an agency which has neither the staff time nor willingness to address the important questions that are going to be conferred on it by this legislation.

In addition to that, the FCC is going to be clogged. There is going to be deadlock and absolute chaos in that agency because of the total lack of that agency in addressing the serious questions regarding administration of highways, streets, roads, and use of public facilities belonging to cities, counties, and States.

It would be a wonderful argument, which is made by the proponents of this bill, that it will lower cable bills and bring consumers choice. What a wonderful argument, if only it were true. This bill is going to harm our consumers, harm our citizens, and harm commercial users of the Internet.

First, with regard to consumers. The bill will leave many consumers paying higher prices for cable services. There is no general promise of lower prices. In fact, the telephone companies, and listen to this, have been telling Wall Street that the price they get for their services will be higher than cable. That is the competition we are going to see under this legislation.

Worse, the bill is a blow to the universal service principles which Congress has insisted on since 1927. The bill abandons current law that in exchange for the use of public property cable operators are required to serve all consumers, all consumers in the franchise area. Both new and existing cable providers will, under this bill, be allowed to cherrypick and skim cream,