- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS BROWN
- 3 HIF015.160
- 4 #CommActUpdate: PERSPECTIVES FROM FORMER FCC CHAIRMEN
- 5 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2014
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
- 8 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 9 Washington, D.C.

10 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., 11 in Room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg 12 Walden [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta, Shimkus,
Terry, Rogers, Blackburn, Scalise, Lance, Guthrie, Gardner,
Pompeo, Kinzinger, Long, Barton, Upton (ex officio), Eshoo,
Doyle, Matsui, Braley, Lujan, Dingell, Pallone, Matheson and

17 Waxman (ex officio).

18 Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Ray Baum, 19 Senior Policy Advisor/Director of Coalitions; Sean Bonyun, 20 Communications Director; Matt Bravo, Professional Staff 21 Member; Andy Duberstein, Deputy Press Secretary; Gene 22 Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; Kelsey Guyselman, Counsel, 23 Telecom; Sean Hayes, Counsel, O&I; Grace Koh, Counsel, 24 Telecom; Gib Mullan, Chief Counsel, CMT; David Redl, Counsel, 25 Telecom; Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Coordinator; Tom 26 Wilbur, Digital Media Advisor; Jessica Wilkerson, Staff Assistant; Shawn Chang, Chief Counsel for Communications and 27 28 Technology Subcommittee; Margaret McCarthy, Professional 29 Staff Member; Kara van Stralen, Policy Analyst; and Patrick Donovan, FCC Detailee. 30

31 Mr. {Walden.} I will call to order the Subcommittee on 32 Communications and Technology and thank our witnesses for 33 being here for this first of what will be many hearings as we 34 look to update the Communications Act. Few sectors of our 35 economy are equal to the communications and technology sector 36 when it comes to innovation, investment in the American 37 economy and job creation. In these tough economic times, we 38 as policy makers should be committed to fostering this 39 critical sector of the economy. Yet, the laws that regulate 40 the industry are outdated at best, and some are affirmatively 41 damaging. This is why Chairman Upton and I, along with 42 members of this subcommittee, have decided to undertake the 43 difficult task of updating the Communications Act of 1934. 44 In the eight decades since its passage, Congress' have come 45 and gone. Some have even made substantial though targeted 46 changes to the law. But none have undertaken to rethink the 47 act for the environment of convergence and innovation in 48 which we live today. It is time for our laws to reflect our 49 modern technological landscape, one grounded in the networks 50 and services of our past and drive by our IP and mobile

51 future.

52 Just yesterday, the D.C. Circuit issued its decision in the Net Neutrality case, striking down the rules ordered by 53 54 the Federal Communications Commission. I for one was pleased 55 to see the Court remove the government from the business of 56 making management judgments and give providers the freedom to 57 make decisions that are pro-competitive and pro-consumer. 58 While this decision benefits consumers and providers alike by 59 keeping the Internet free from government interference, the 60 rationale highlights the ongoing confusion regarding 61 regulation of different services. This is yet another 62 example of why it is vital that we take a hard look at the laws in this space and reconcile them with the realities of 63 64 technology. The answer is not to subject new technology to outdated regulations, but rather to craft laws appropriate to 65 66 innovative services and platforms.

As we embark on this effort, it should come as no surprise that I am focused on ensuring that we engage in a transparent and collaborative process, not just with our colleagues here in the Congress but also with the many stakeholders outside of these halls. All we want is a

72 dialog.

Tast week, the Committee released the first of what will be a series of white papers seeking input from the public. And I hope that interested parties will take the opportunity to make their voices heard to us.

77 Today's witnesses provide a unique and valuable 78 perspective on the Communications Act. As chairman of the 79 agency tasked with carrying out Congress' will in 80 implementing the Act, the four witnesses today have had a 81 front row seat to witness the Act in the real world to see where it works and where it doesn't. These chairmen have 82 83 varied experiences and viewpoints that in many ways represent 84 the evolution of modern communications.

When Chairman Wiley led the agency, telephone service 85 was a government regulated monopoly. Consumers got their 86 87 news from broadcast television and print newspapers, and the 88 Internet was still years away. Sixteen years later, when 89 Reed Hundt took the reins, the Internet was coming into full 90 force and mobility was beginning to take off. Chairman 91 Powell's tenure saw the convergence of services towards the bundled offerings we see today, as well as the deployment of 92

93 broadband to Americans. And in the four years since Michael 94 Copps served as Acting Chairman, there have been dramatic 95 changes to the way we communicate and the technology that 96 powers our lives. For example, the title of today's hearing 97 contains a hashtag. Twitter, then with no vowels in its 98 name, had yet to be discovered by -- at South by Southwest. 99 Neither we nor the august panel before us can predict 100 the future and what technology changes it will bring. But by 101 learning the lessons of the past, we can do our best to 102 create a legal and regulatory environment that will foster 103 innovation and competition, encourage consumer choice and 104 optimum services. 105 So again, I want to thank you for -- to our witnesses for this impressive panel. We look forward to hearing your 106 107 testimony. And we appreciate your public service. With 108 that, I would yield to the Vice-Chair of the Subcommittee, 109 Mr. Latta, for any opening comments he may have. 110 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]

Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much to our panel of distinguished witnesses for testifying before us today. I appreciate you all being here.

116 Since 1966, we have witnessed an unprecedented 117 technological evolution in the communications industry. The 118 rapid emergence of new and innovative technologies has 119 fostered increased investment throughout the industry in the 120 development of a vibrant, competitive communications 121 marketplace. As we move into the future, it is important to 122 examine the Communications Act to ensure that our public 123 policy continues to encourage this kind of growth in innovation that is essential to fueling our economy. Reforms 124 125 to current law should reflect the technology we enjoy to 126 today and be able to adapt to the technology of tomorrow 127 without further government intervention. Our efforts should 128 be dedicated to ensure that the laws governing the 129 communications marketplace do not stifle current and future 130 investment, innovation, economic growth and consumer choice in this dynamic and converging digital age of communications. 131

132	I look forward to the testimony from our witnesses
133	today. And again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much for
134	holding this hearing.
135	[The prepared statement of Mr. Latta follows:]

148

Mr. {Walden.} I thank the gentleman for his comments.
Now, I turn to the gentlelady from California, Ms. Eshoo, the
Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, for her opening comments.
Good morning.

Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you, to all of the members and the warmest welcome to each of the witnesses that are at the table. Your combined public service is--really stands as a hallmark of devoted service to our country, but also to move the country forward in one of its most important economic sectors. So welcome to you. It is wonderful to see all of you at the same time at the table.

With news of the Court's Net Neutrality decision,

today's hearing I think is a timely opportunity to hear from 149 150 each one of you who have led the expert agency, the FCC. And 151 combined, it represents over 4 decades of services. That is 152 nothing short of extraordinary. And each of you have had a 153 hand in really I think changing our nation's communications 154 and technology landscape. So not only kudos to you, thank you to you, but a recognition of what each one of you 155 156 accomplished.

157 When Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, it was my second term in Congress, my first term on the 158 159 Committee. And there were just 11 references to the 160 Internet--the word Internet, and only one mention of broadband across a 128 page bill. Many proponents of 161 updating the Act have cited this as evidence that the Act is 162 163 outdated and unable to keep up with changes in technology. 164 But as Chairman Wheeler affirmed last week, the 165 Communications Act continues to provide the FCC with ample authority to exercise its role in this new environment. The 166 Court's decision yesterday I believe furthers this argument 167 168 by upholding the FCC's existing authority to oversee 169 broadband services. And I think that is very important for 170 consumers across the country.

I make these points not to discourage the Subcommittee's review of the Act. I join with the Chairman to review this. I think that it is a worthy exercise. But rather, we need to ensure that we know what problems we are trying to fix before undertaking a multi-year examination that include hearings, stakeholder meetings, white papers and the such.

177 Since the '96 Act was enacted, hundreds of new entrants

178 of emerged, and more than 1.2 trillion dollars has been 179 invested by U.S. telecommunications companies. I want this 180 success story to be an unending one. And I think that is the 181 goal of everyone on this wonderful Subcommittee. So to that end, my goal throughout the Subcommittee's 182 183 review will be to see more competition, greater consumer 184 choice and more innovation. I am so proud, as the Chairman 185 was making his opening remarks, that so much of this has been 186 born in my congressional district. And so, innovation, 187 innovation, innovation. And these goals were imbedded in the '96 Act, and they remain just as important today. 188 At the same time, our process of examining the 189 190 Communications Act should not derail, in my view, a more 191 immediate update of our video laws, a view shared by a 192 majority of the witnesses at a September Subcommittee hearing. Recurring TV blackouts, coupled with the rising 193 cost of broadcast television programming with limited choice 194 195 has left consumers frustrated and looking to Congress and the 196 FCC for answers. I believe that working together on a 197 bipartisan basis, we can make this happen in 2014. So, Chairman Walden, thank you for holding today's 198

199	hearing on the Communications Act. I welcome the review, and
200	I look forward to hearing the unique insights from the top
201	experts from our country who have given so much in terms of
202	their leadership in leading the expert agency. And with
203	that, I have 34 seconds to yield to Congresswoman Matsui.
204	[The prepared statement of Ms. Eshoo follows:]

Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you, Ranking Member. And I want to 206 207 welcome all the former chairmen. We welcome you here for your ideas and experience that provide a basis for 208 discussions moving forward. 209 210 As technology evolves, I believe it is important that we 211 consider appropriate updates to the Communications Act that 212 with goals that promote competition and innovation in the 213 marketplace. To that point, I am pleased that yesterday, the 214 D.C. Circuit affirmed the FCC's authority to oversee 215 broadband services. In my opinion, that was the crux of the 216 debate, and the FCC's argument prevailed on the question of 217 authority over broadband. The FCC will need to exert its 218 authority to ensure now that all Americans have access to a 219 free and open Internet. A competitive marketplace with checks and balances will fare well for all Americans. 220 221 I look forward to the hearing today, and I yield back 222 the balance of my time. 223 [The prepared statement of Ms. Matsui follows:]

242

Mr. {Walden.} The gentlelady yields back the balance of 225 her time. The Chair now recognizes the distinguished member 226 from Michigan, the Chairman of the Full Committee, Mr. Upton, 227 228 for opening comments. 229 The {Chairman.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 230 Last month, you and I announced our plans for a 231 comprehensive update to the Communications Act of 1934. And 232 the changes in technology since the last update in '96 have been dramatic, and existing laws have failed to keep pace 233 with the vibrant and dynamic telecommunication industry. 234 235 Communications and technology sectors have consistently been areas of American leadership, innovated--innovation and 236 job creation, certainly. But the Communications Act is 237 238 showing its age, and our continued international leadership 239 is indeed at stake. 240 Yesterday's Net Neutrality decision, while a victory for 241 consumers in the economy, illustrates the uncertainty flowing

243 action. It is time to revamp these laws to reflect the new 244 competitive landscape and changing consumer expectations.

from the current statutory scheme and the need for this

245 And as we begin the open process leading to a calm Act update, we are looking for input--yes, we are--from all of 246 the stakeholders in the communications and technology world. 247 Where better to start than with our distinguished panel of 248 former leaders of the FCC? These leaders served during 249 250 diverse times in the evolution of the communications sector, 251 and they have seen the market operate under the strong hand 252 of the U.S. government and the challenges with them divorcing 253 the government from its heavy regulation of the 254 communications sector from times before. They have seen cable grow from its stages of struggling startup. They have 255 256 seen satellite services succeed in bringing competition to the video market, and failed to find success as a competitor 257 to mobile phone service. And they have seen the Internet 258 259 grow from a DOD project to a tool for research universities, and now as the commercial economic force that we know today. 260 261 Throughout the many nuanced iterations of Communications 262 Act, today's witnesses have firsthand seen the Act at its 263 finest, and also when its inability to keep pace with technological innovation has impacted those vital economic 264 265 issues. So I want to thank the witnesses for taking their

266	time to share their experiences with us. We value indeed
267	their expertise and welcome their thoughts on how we can
268	ensure the Communications Act fosters our communications and
269	technology sectors well into this century.
270	And I yield the balance of my time to Vice-Chair
271	[The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]

273 Mrs. {Blackburn.} And thank you, Mr. Chairman. And if 274 I had my iPhone in my hand, I would hit re-tweet for 275 everything that he has just said.

We do appreciate that you all are here. We do want to 276 277 take advantage of the perspective that you have had. Think 278 about what has happened in the past 17 years since '96 and 279 the changes that we have seen, not only in how we communicate 280 but the rapidity of those communications and entertainment 281 and how we access that, how we take it with us, how we consume it. So we know that the pace of change means that we 282 283 have to be very judicious and careful as we look at a 284 rewrite. We know that there are issues that are going to come on the plate that we are going to have to discuss also 285 286 as we look at not only the telecomm rewrite but at the use of 287 the virtual space, privacy, data security, the way the 288 virtual marketplace is used and the way our constituents want 289 to have a toolbox to protect, as I call it, their virtual you 290 online.

291 So we appreciate your time, your willingness to be with 292 us this morning. And I yield back to the Chairman of the

296 The {Chairman.} Yield back. Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Barton, 297 will use some of that time. 298 299 Mr. {Barton.} If it--300 Mr. {Walden.} It is? 301 Mr. {Barton.} Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I 302 have served on this Committee since 1986. I have served with 303 three of the four former chairmen. Mr. Wiley preceded me. 304 We have had some agreements. We have had some disagreements. So it is good to have all four of you gentlemen here today. 305 306 When I was Chairman of the Full Committee back in 1996, 307 my Committee introduced a bill we call the COPE Bill, the 308 Communication Opportunity Promotion Enhancement Act of 2006. 309 It dealt with national franchising, neutrality, public 310 educational and governmental access, E911 and what we now 311 call VOIP. It passed this Committee 42 to 12, and passed the 312 House 321 to 101. But it didn't come up for a vote in the 313 Senate. I voted for the Telecommunications Act of '96 and 314 the Cable Act of '92. And I hope this year to get to vote for another major bill that comes from the leadership of Mr. 315

316	Upton, Mr. Walden, Mr. Waxman and Ms. Eshoo. This is a good
317	thing to be doing. And we are going to get some good
318	information from you gentleman. And we appreciate you being
319	here.
320	[The prepared statement of Mr. Barton follows:]

Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman's time has expired. I 322 appreciate his comments. We will now go to the former 323 324 Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Waxman, for opening comments. Mr. {Waxman.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 325 Ι 326 appreciate your convening this morning's hearing and 327 launching the Subcommittee's examination of potential updates 328 to the Communications Act. And I want to thank our 329 distinguished panel for being here to help us think through 330 these ideas. And I think I have been in Congress during the time that all of you have been the heads of the FCC. 331 332 Technology has changed at a blistering pace since the enactment of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, 18 years ago. 333 334 The communications and technology industries are a thriving 335 sector of our economy. As broadband plays an increasingly 336 central role in the daily life of our nation, having a strong Federal Communications Commission to oversee its successful 337 338 growth is more critical than ever.

339 Yesterday, the D.C. Court affirmed what never should 340 have been in question. The FCC is the expert agency charged 341 by Congress to oversee broadband networks. In doing so, the

342 Court reaffirmed that the FCC has broad, flexible authority to regulate in the broadband and digital age. However, while 343 344 the Court recognized the FCC's jurisdiction, it also 345 overturned the specific rules the Commission had adopted in the open Internet order. I believe the FCC now has an 346 347 opportunity, as well as a duty, to exercise the authority the 348 Court recognized yesterday and reinstate the no-blocking and 349 nondiscrimination rules. And Open Internet is critical to 350 the continuing growth of this economic sector.

351 The Internet is a vibrant platform for commerce, 352 innovation and free speech. Having enforceable, Open 353 Internet rules of the road means that consumers are in 354 control of the experience online. I am pleased that Chairman 355 Wheeler has stated his intention to expeditiously adopt a new 356 set of rules following the Court's guidance. And I look 357 forward to working with the Chairman and my colleagues in 358 Congress to make sure these pro-consumer, pro-competition 359 policies will continue to guide the expansion of broadband 360 services.

361 This Subcommittee is now embarking on a journey to 362 update the Communications Act. And regardless of the

363	advancements in network architecture or transmission
364	protocol, the principles of competition and consumer
365	protection remain as sound today as they were in 1934. I
366	know Chairman Wheeler recognizes the importance of these
367	values and the action of the FCC that plans to take later
368	this month to initiate technology transitions trials reflects
369	that.
370	I look forward to hearing from our witnesses about what
371	Congress can do to help the FCC meet the challenges of the
372	broadband and digital age.
373	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to yield the balance of
374	my time to Mr. Doyle.
375	[The prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]
376	************* COMMITTEE INSERT *************

377 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, Mr. Waxman. Mr. Chairman, 378 thank you for holding this hearing. And thank you to this 379 distinguished panel. It is good to see all of you here in 380 front of the Committee.

381 I just want to briefly concur with Mr. Waxman in light 382 of yesterday's decision by the D.C. Circuit that I want to 383 encourage Chairman Wheeler to work guickly to ensure that the 384 Internet remains an open platform for innovation, competition 385 and economic growth, which the FCC now clearly has the authority to do. I look forward to working with the 386 387 Commission and the stakeholders to put in place a robust 388 framework that sustains an Open Internet. Mr. Waxman, I thank you for your courtesy. And I would 389

390 yield back to you if someone else needs some more time.

391 [The prepared statement of Mr. Doyle follows:]

Mr. {Waxman.} Would--like a minute? If not, I yield it 393 394 back, Mr. Chairman. 395 Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. We will proceed now to our distinguished panel of 396 397 witnesses and begin with Chairman Richard Wiley who was 398 nominated by President Nixon and served as Chairman of the 399 Federal Communications Commission from 1970 to 1977. As 400 Chairman for most of the '70s, Chairman Wiley's tenure at the 401 Commission predates many of the major changes in the 402 communications sector. Chairman, we are glad to have you 403 here today. Pull that microphone up close and then we are 404 good to go. Thank you for being here. You need to push the button on the microphone there one time. 405

406	^STATEMENTS OF RICHARD WILEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE FCC;
407	REED HUNDT, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE FCC; MICHAEL POWELL,
408	FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE FCC; AND MICHAEL COPPS, FORMER
409	CHAIRMAN OF THE FCC
410	^STATEMENT OF RICHARD WILEY
411	} Mr. {Wiley.} Thank you very much, Chairman Walden,
412	Ranking Member Eshoo and other Subcommittee members. Thank
413	you for the invitation to testify today.
414	While I know it is not going to be self-evident due to
415	my youthful appearance, I have been involved for nearly 45
416	years in federal telecommunications policy. And from my own
417	standpoint, what has occurred during that period is simply
418	amazing. When I was at the FCC in the 1970s, the average
419	American enjoyed just three broadcast television stations,
420	and one local and long distance telephone provider. And the
421	Department of Defense had just begun to explore a
422	revolutionary computer project known as ARPANET. But today,
423	our citizens have access to hundreds of video channels

- 424 delivered by countless providers and transmission
- 425 technologies, dozens of voice and tech services, numerous

426 wire line and wireless companies. And, of course, ARPANET 427 has morphed into the Internet, which has become a universal 428 medium of communications.

429 Interestingly, the bulk of this stunning technological 430 metamorphosis has emerged since the 1996 Telecommunications 431 Act was passed. That legislation significantly altered the 432 rules governing virtually every aspect of communications. The Act's purpose was as simple in theory as it was complex 433 434 in implementation. That is to provide for a pro-competitive, 435 deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate the deployment of advanced services and open all telecomm 436 markets to competition. 437

To this end, the statute sought to eliminate crossplatform barriers and to encourage competition among service suppliers, previously treated as monopolies or oligopolies. Now to the credit of the drafters, the 1996 Act helped to bring about the vibrant competition that consumers enjoy today in a variety of communication sectors, be it voice, data or video. Whether delivered by twisted pair coaxial

445 cable, optical fiber or the electromagnetic spectrum, myriad providers today are offering their customers suites of 446 447 advanced services in a marketplace that really could not have been imagined 18 years ago. 448 In my view, where the statute and indeed FCC 449 450 implementation has succeeded is when a lighter regulatory 451 touch has been applied to markets such as mobile and 452 information services. The result has been that these sectors 453 have thrived. For example, in the robustly competitive wireless marketplace, there are now more wireless subscriber 454 connections than the population of the United States. Just 455 456 think of that. And mobile broadband has spawned an entirely new industry. Mobile apps, one that is estimated to employ 457 more than 500,000 developers and related jobs, and 458 459 contributes billions to the economy. A similar success story is unfolding in the delivery of 460 461 digital content where seemingly unlimited video streaming 462 websites have developed to compete against traditional MVPDs 463 offering an eagerly waiting public new ways to consume video. 464 This marketplace, I would suggest, is emerging because of innovation and competition and not because of government 465

466 regulation.

467 Conversely, where the government has been less effective 468 in maintaining is in maintaining highly restrictive regulations on traditional industries like, for example, wire 469 line telephony and broadcasting. The end result has been to 470 471 disadvantage these sectors, even though they may be providing 472 services that are often equivalent to those offered by their 473 less regulated competitors. In the developing IP centric 474 world, all types of providers should be able to market all kinds of services, employing the same computer oriented 475 language that defines digital communications. 476 477 And yet, the 1996 Act continues to regulate communications markets differently based on the conduit used 478 479 to reach the customer, as well as the geographic location 480 where traffic originates and terminates. Now, the underlying 481 problem is not a failure of Congressional or FCC vision. 482 Instead, the reality is that the government has great 483 difficulty in writing laws or promulgating regulations that 484 can keep pace with advancing technology, and especially so in a dynamic and ever changing industry like communications. 485 486 Thus, I would suggest that the objective of a statutory

487 rewrite should not be to legislate premised on the current 488 state of the marketplace, or even on predictions of what it 489 may look like in the future. Instead, Congress may want to 490 consider a flexible and technologically neutral framework 491 that will be capable of adapting to technical invention and 492 innovation, whatever that may prove to be.

493 In this regard, let me close by setting forth a few 494 principles that might guide the drafting of a new statue. 495 First, the industry's silos embedded in the 1996 Act should be abolished. And, instead, functionally equivalent services 496 should be treated in the same manner, regardless of who 497 provides them or how they are delivered to consumers. 498 499 Second, the traditional dichotomy between interstate and intrastate services should be eliminated, because regulatory 500 501 classifications based on geographical end points no longer makes sense in an IP environment. Third, legislation should 502 503 be focused on maintaining consumer protection and public safety regulations. Conversely, economic regulations should 504 505 be considered in the case of non-competitive markets or in the event of demonstrated market failure. And, fourth, new 506 507 regulations should be instituted with a lighter touch, as I

508	said, accompanied by some set provisions so that the rational
509	for continued government intervention can be reviewed on a
510	regular basis.
511	Thank you once again for the opportunity to testify.
512	[The prepared statement of Mr. Wiley follows:]
513	************* INSERT A ***********

Ι

514 Mr. {Walden.} Chairman Wiley, thank you very much for 515 your learned comments. We appreciate your counsel. We go now to Chairman Reed Hundt who was nominated by President 516 Clinton and served as Chairman of the FCC from 1993 to 1997. 517 Chairman Hundt's tenure at the Commission saw the passage of 518 519 the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation of '93, which granted the 520 Commission the authority to auction spectrum licenses, and 521 the Telecommunications Act of '96. So, Chairman Hundt, 522 thanks for joining us today. We look forward to your 523 comments as well.

524 ^STATEMENT OF REED HUNDT 525 Mr. {Hundt.} Thank you, Chairman Walden. Thank you for } inviting me. Good morning to Ranking Member Eshoo and to all 526 527 the other members of this distinguished Committee. I am very 528 proud that many of you have become lifelong friends. And it 529 is a pleasure to be here with you. 530 I also want to thank the D.C. Circuit for giving me a flashback to law school so that I was late last night 531 scrambling to read the key case right before this class. I 532 533 have a feeling I am not the only person here who did that, 534 but I also want to note I didn't have any staff or 535 classmates. So I apologize if I haven't read it correctly, 536 but I thought that I would throw away my remarks and, for 537 whatever it is worth, offer you my reading of the case. 538 In my view, the D.C. Circuit has written, first, a very, 539 very well-reasoned and very important case. There is no 540 question that this reflects that Circuit's experience in these topic areas, and that they have brought that experience 541 to bear in a bipartisan way to express a view about how the 542

543	United States looked to grant the authority to create the
544	legal culture that governs broadband.
545	What have they said? I believe the Court has vindicated
546	the wisdom of Congress in the 1996 Act. Specifically, the
547	Court has said that when Congress, in that Act in Section 706
548	conveyed to its expert agency the ``authority to enact
549	measures encouraging the deployment of broadband
550	infrastructure.'' In doing that, according to the D.C.
551	Circuit, Congress said the FCC, you will be our instrument
552	for creating a flexible and a supple legal culture that will
553	change over time as the market changes and as technology
554	changes, but that can always be used to protect competition,
555	to protect consumers and, fundamentally, to make sure that
556	absolutely everybody in America is participating in the
557	common medium of the Internet, and that absolutely everybody
558	in America is able to use it to publish their views and to
559	review all the views of everyone else. Not all those words
560	are in this decision, but almost all those words are actually
561	in this decision.

562 Section 1706 of course is just one part of the 1996 Act. 563 But I know I don't have to remind many of the members here.

564 Maybe I don't have to remind any of the members here. That 565 was passed by a very large bipartisan vote in the Senate and 566 in the House. We all were--those of us who were in public 567 service then remember being in the Library of Congress when President Clinton, the Democratic President, passed this law 568 569 that was passed by a Senate controlled by the Republicans and 570 a House controlled by the Republicans. And all came together 571 and said we have a common vision. And that is that there 572 will be networks. We did not know technically speaking what 573 they would all exactly look like, but that there would be networks that would connect all of us to each other and to 574 all of the resources of information that in fact would be 575 utilized for entrepreneurship, for innovation and for 576 577 learning. And I have to say, this is what has happened. 578 Now, no one here things the government built these networks. No one thinks the FCC built these networks. But 579 580 everyone should know that the legal culture that was created 581 by Congress and its expert agency, through the terms of 582 Republican and Democratic chairs, the legal culture is the legal culture that is regarded all around the world as the 583 absolute best legal culture for governing the Internet. 584 Any

585 one of us knows 12 things that we think should be done differently, or maybe two dozen. But we ought to recognize, 586 587 just for a little while, that we as a country should pat our country on the back and say, for the last 20 years, the legal 588 589 culture that has been created that has governed the Internet 590 has really created the best possible environment for 591 innovation, for entrepreneurship for consumers. That is what 592 has actually happened. And this Court has said and that law 593 still exists. This Court has said, already, Congress has enacted the law that gives the FCC the authority to protect 594 competition and consumers. And that authority, according to 595 this Court, lies in Section 1706. And the Court also said 596 597 that Congress can--that the FCC can, if it choose, classify broadband as a common carrier. It could use either of these 598 599 methods. It could use one of these methods. But it can 600 accomplish the goals that are stated in the act and that have 601 repeatedly been restated by this Congress.

The only thing the Court said is if you are going to pass rules that look like common carrier rules, and you are going to classify broadband as an information service, then you are going to be creating a contradiction that we won't
606 permit. You can't call it an information service and then 607 pass rules that look like common carrier rules, because if it 608 quacks like a duck, it is a duck. So that is why it was sent 609 back. I read a lot of articles that said that this was a 610 611 victory for Verizon. This is a victory for Congress. If it 612 was a victory for Verizon, it was a Pyrrhic victory. It was 613 the most perfect example of a Pyrrhic victory since Pyrrhus. 614 So I just want to compliment this Congress on passing a 615 supple law that has worked well, and this Court has just said still will permit you to achieve your goals through the 616 617 expert agency. Thank you. 618 [The prepared statement of Mr. Hundt follows:] 619

620 {Voice.} Thank you.

621 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Chairman Hundt. We appreciate your comments and your staying up all night to cram for our 622 hearing. We will now turn to Chairman Michael Powell who was 623 624 nominated by George W. Bush and served as Chairman of the FCC 625 from 2001 to 2005. During Mr. Powell's Chairmanship, they 626 saw a significant increase in the deployment of broadband to 627 American homes, as well as convergence of services toward the development of broadband--toward the bundles of services that 628 are common today, among many other things. Chairman Powell, 629 thank you for joining us today. And please, go ahead. 630

631 ^STATEMENT OF MICHAEL POWELL Mr. {Powell.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And as a former 632 } 633 chairman, I am happy to be sitting around with a bunch of 634 these other chairmen offering, as best we can, our historic 635 perspectives on how to prudently go about rewriting the Act, 636 should that be your intention. And I am pleased to be with 637 Ranking Member Eshoo again and all the distinguished members of the Committee. 638 I think it goes without saying, and all of us will say 639 640 it in different ways that the world has changed guite 641 radically from 20 years ago in terms of markets and services. But don't ask us, ask your kids. Ask them to name three 642 643 broadcast networks, if you will. Ask them to do without the 644 Internet for a week. And for God sakes, ask them to put 645 their phone down at dinner and see what reaction you get. I

646 think you will be convinced.

647 That transformation has taken place largely because of 648 an enormous revolution in network architecture in the form of 649 the Internet, which has unleashed a form of intermodal

650 competition that heretofore wasn't really possible. And it 651 has really introduced an exciting world. And we should 652 remember, gave birth to a host of companies and opportunities 653 that never were envisioned before, the companies that aren't 654 here, Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay, Twitter, Instagram, you 655 name it, all able to be born and flourish because of this 656 transformation.

657 I would say that any consideration of the Act should 658 start with not only cataloging its ills but cataloging its success, as much as Reed was alluding to. I think it is 659 660 really important to note that over this period, we have seen 661 the most stunning amount of investment in infrastructure and architecture that we have ever seen. We have reached 90 662 percent of Americans faster than any other technology in 663 world history. Innovation and growth have continued at 664 665 exponential rates with broadband increasing over 19 times 666 just in the last decade, doubling basically, increasing about 667 50 percent annually. That is a stunning achievement and something we should make sure we keep going. So I think, you 668 know, being guided by the old maxim of do no harm is an 669 670 important cautionary tale.

As I thought about how you might think about architecting a new regime, I am guided by the idea of the Internet itself, which is the fundamental principle of simplicity as a design principle. It has been a very, very powerful one in the Internet. And I think it offers some guidance in this space as well.

677 So I would like to, toward that end, offer--I am going 678 to see Mr. Wiley's four principles and do them three better 679 and offer you seven as briefly as I can. The first is we have heard a lot about innovation. I do think the principle 680 goal of the government should be to nurture that innovation. 681 This is the kind of formenting change we have never been able 682 to harness as fully as we are today. Innovation has allowed 683 us to bring completely new products and services and network 684 changes to the market. It has created a form of creative 685 686 destruction that keeps the market energetic and keeps a 687 monopoly in check. And I think it has created new kinds of 688 transparency for the American consumer through crowdsourcing 689 and visibility. And we should study the conditions that go 690 into innovation and make sure we harness them. I think three are critical. Innovations really do require freer markets. 691

692 And a market that moves at Moore's Law speed, the pace of 693 adaptation, transformation and change are incredibly fast. 694 And there needs to be a constant and intense dialog between 695 producers and consumers. And we should be careful to protect 696 that.

697 Innovation requires risk taking. And ask we know, most 698 new adventures fail. There has to be room in government 699 policy for failure. There has to be room in government 700 policy for encouraging taking those risks. And innovation 701 requires stability. Investing more than a trillion dollars, as Congressman Eshoo was talking about earlier since 1996, is 702 703 stunning. But it requires a stable regulatory environment to 704 provide that uncertainty. Because if investment slows, 705 innovation will slow with it.

The second rule of simplicity I think is once you have created a lighter regulatory environment by trying to pursue the maxim of less is more, organize it better. We certainly have heard about the challenges of silos and buckets.

710 Clearly, that had its place in another time when these

711 technologies, applications and type of companies were deeply

712 intertwined, were not able to provide alternative services in

713 other spaces. That day has moved on, and we certainly crave 714 a more unified, integrated kind of legal regime that doesn't 715 make those sorts of distinctions. In fact, as I have heard 716 mentioned today, I think yesterday's court decision in the 717 multi-year debate on Net Neutrality that illustrates the 718 almost torturous challenges, sometimes, of addressing a 719 modern circumstance in using provisions of last century's 720 rules. I think there is certainly widespread agreement on 721 core principles around an open Internet. After somewhat 722 kludge past we have had to follow in an effort to implement them has made the matter, I believe, infinitely more complex 723 724 and controversial than necessary. And the threat of 725 radically upending the longstanding light regulatory foundation of broadband on which massive investment and 726 727 growth have been built with good effect, to implement one set 728 of rules seems distressing. Any shift of that magnitude, I 729 do think would require Congress'--the people's 730 representatives to weigh in on.

A third principle, give regulators the ability and obligation to address changing markets. As we have said, the markets move drastically. And the FCC often has limited

ability to make those migrations. Yes, in places they have.
There are other instances in which they have not been able
to, even when they concede that the fundamental circumstances
are changed.

738 Fourth, the law should ensure competitive parity and 739 technical neutrality. There is a hodgepodge of applications 740 of statutes I could point out in which certain rules apply to 741 one sector of a service and not to other sectors. This has 742 just really been an outgrowth of the passage of years and the 743 changing nature of companies. But there are many rules that apply to cable, for example, that don't apply to DBS for no 744 745 discernible reason. One very valuable think the Committee do 746 is prune through the statute to try to harmonize those 747 differentiated treatments as best as possible.

Fifth, the FCC should police markets, not create them. I think this is genuinely well understood. But there is a role for a cop on the beat. What I don't think there should be is a master chef who believes it is the Commission's objective to make markets or create the conditions and circumstances for them.

And, finally, the last two, timeliness. If you are

755	working in Moore's Law, you need timely and prompt decisions
756	from the government.
757	Lastly and most importantly, the law still needs to
758	preserve important societal values and protect consumers from
759	harm. And the FCC and the government will always have a
760	sacred responsibility in that regard.
761	Thank you for your time.
762	[The prepared statement of Mr. Powell follows:]

Ι

764 Mr. {Walden.} Chairman, thank you. Speaking of cops on 765 the beat--766 Mr. {Copps.} Here I am. Mr. {Walden.} We will now go to Michael Copps, served 767 as Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission 768 from January to June of 2009, and served as Commissioner from 769 770 2001 to 2011. Prior to joining the Commission, Commissioner 771 Copps worked right here on Capitol Hill and the U.S. 772 Department of Commerce. Commissioner Copps, Chairman Copps, thank you for being with us. And we look forward to your 773 774 comments to round out our panel.

^STATEMENT OF MICHAEL COPPS 775 776 Mr. {Copps.} Thank you, Chairman Walden, Chairman } Upton, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Waxman, Vice-Chairman, Former Chairman 777 778 and all the members of the Committee. I am delighted to be 779 here. 780 We are here today to review whether the Communications 781 Act needs to be updated or otherwise reformed. I have heard 782 some say that simply because the Act is old, it must be obsolete. That no matter how well it has served us, an act 783 784 written 18 years ago cannot have relevance in today's altered 785 world. Now, as someone only a little younger than the original Act of 1934, I would raise a caution flag or two. 786 787 The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were 788 written long ago, too. Yet, we still find them critically 789 relevant in our lives. While it is praiseworthy to ponder 790 changes to the law, I would suggest firstly that the 791 framework of the current statute remains in many ways strong, 792 and secondly that the current Act's provisions can still do much to improve our communication's landscape to enlarge 793

794 economic and social opportunity for all of us and nourish the 795 kind of civic dialog upon which successful self-government 796 inevitably rests. 797 In an ideal world, most of us would welcome an up to the minute rewrite of the law to reflect how we believe it could 798 799 be improved. The last such revision in 1996 was born of a 800 unique political moment that aligned a sufficient and sundry 801 member--number of stakeholders across sectors and 802 constituencies who were able to negotiate a compromised 803 statute that, while far from perfect, at least envisioned delivering to every American, no matter who they are, where 804 805 they live or the particular circumstances of their individual 806 lives, the most advanced communications, technologies and 807 services feasible at reasonable and comparable prices, 808 replete with consumer protections, rights of privacy, 809 assurances of public safety and utilizing competition to help 810 achieve these goals. Putting the statute to work to deliver 811 these benefits was my mission at the FCC, working with some 812 of the most amazing public servants anywhere. Nowadays, I carry out my public interest mission in the non-profit sector 813 814 at common cause.

815 In the immediate wake of the new law's passage, the Commission indeed made important strides to carry out these 816 Congressional mandates. But, alas, things changed. Some of 817 818 the very interests who helped negotiate the new Communications Act spend more time undermining the statute 819 820 than implementing it. Such efforts continue to this day, as 821 we saw in yesterday's court decision that, left unaddressed, 822 will seriously jeopardize the future of the Open Internet. 823 I appeared in front of this panel many times over the years to voice my descent and Commission decisions involving 824

825 the reclassification of communication services, industry 826 consolidation across both our telecomm and media sectors, the 827 elimination of policies that had long safeguarded the public 828 interest, and the heavy toll thereby exacted on consumer 829 choices, consumer prices and slowing the deployment of 830 competitive low-cost high-speed broadband. This century is 831 the most important infrastructure.

We can I know debate for hours, but a record of these hearings needs to show that many people do not share the easy optimism that others express about the state of America's communications readiness. As you consider legislation in the

836 coming months, some will tell you that America is a variable 837 broadband wonderland, a triumph of free market 838 entrepreneurship that puts as at the front of high-tech 839 nations. But there are stubborn facts we must never avoid. 840 The United States, originator of so much of the technology 841 behind the Internet, has fallen from leader to laggard in 842 broadband penetration. According to the OACD, our country is 843 16th in wired broadband connections for 100 residents. 844 Worse, comparative research shows that Americans are paying 845 more and getting less than wired broadband consumers in 846 competitor countries. The Department of Justice has noted 847 that the local wireless marketplace offers consumers little 848 in the way of choice, even as mobile data plans are saddled 849 with data caps that harm consumption and innovation alike. And once again for the third time, the FCC found itself 850 851 unable to certify that we enjoy a competitive wireless 852 marketplace. Surely, the time is now for proactive and pro-853 consumer measures to make quality broadband universally 854 affordable once and for all.

855 While we are not gathered here this morning to rehash 856 those decisions, I do think it is important to understand

857 that many of the faults attributed to the current statute are 858 more the result of powerful industry efforts to undermine it 859 and of Commission decisions that too often aid and abet the effort. So while we open discussions on revising 860 861 communications law, let us recognize that our present statute 862 has been interpreted and implemented in ways not originally 863 intended, and that many of its constituent parts are still 864 relevant, workable and consumer friendly. There is a statute 865 to enforce. And putting that job on hold while we consider changing it is not a good option. 866

Additionally, I think most of us here this morning understand that finding a new correlation of interest that can come together to forge the Communications Act to 2015 or 2020 would be even more challenging than the jockeying that gave birth to the current law.

As the world races ahead, we have a duty to make the best possible use of the laws we have in order to achieve the ongoing goals that Congress laid out. These remain powerful interests. A statute that invokes the public interest over 100 times that highlights the universality of service, competition and consumer protection, and that underlines the

878 necessity for media that informs communities and engages 879 citizens cannot be all bad. Would I have some preferences 880 for a rework statue? Of course. Although a good part of it 881 would be making sure the Commission and the industry follow through on what is already on the books, to foster 882 883 competition and consumer protection, to deliver on public 884 safety, to preserve privacy in this age of massive intrusion, 885 to avoid never ending industry consolidation, to put the 886 brakes in gate keeping in our media, both traditional and 887 new, and to provide the FCC with the resources it needs to discharge its responsibilities. 888

889 My greatest disappointment at the Commission is that we 890 didn't do enough to encourage media that truly reflects the 891 diversity of our people. Can you believe that today there is 892 no African-American owned full power commercial television 893 station anywhere in the land? America is diversity. And if 894 our media fails to represent diversity, diversity of 895 providers and content and viewpoint and ownership, it fails 896 The sad plight of communications across our native lands us. 897 needs to be addressed with renewed urgency and additional resources. Imagine that there are still areas where the 898

899 majority of first Americans cannot access even plain old 900 telephone service, let alone the kind of high speed broadband 901 that is the most powerful tool they could have to create 902 opportunity where there is so little opportunity now. I would hope we could find ways to stimulate basic 903 904 communications research by private public partnerships. I am 905 not talking about the next glitzy app, but the basic 906 fundamental research that will determine who wins and loses 907 in the global sweepstakes. 908 I am for making the Commission more efficient, like doing away with the closed meeting rule that prevents more 909 910 than two commissioners from even talking to one another. And 911 I hope that reform needs to go forward, whether or not it is 912 accompanied by more far reaching revisions. And I believe 913 that when three commissioners have something they want to do 914 at the FCC, that item should go on the agenda.

915 My list could go on, and I welcome the opportunity to 916 discuss such things today. But I always come back to 917 Democracy, because that is what concerns me most. Our 918 country is in trouble, reminiscent in many ways are the 919 severity of the economic global and social crises it faced in

920 the 1930s, and there are no guaranteed happy outcomes. I 921 just do not see how citizens can be expected to navigate 922 through all these issues and come out with smart decisions 923 for our nation's future when the telecommunications tools we need are not available to all. And in a media environment 924 925 where community outlets have been short circuited, 926 investigative journalism hangs by a thread, and wherein we 927 expect some invisible hand to produce those things that the 928 market itself no longer produces and which in fact the market 929 alone has never produced.

Communications are vital to our economy, but they are 930 931 the lifeblood--the lifeblood of our Democracy. They must be 932 available to all, open to all, never the exclusive province of the affluent or the few, always alive to the common good. 933 934 We shouldn't see our communications world as part telecomm, 935 part media or part traditional media, part new media. We have one communications ecosystem. And our job is to make it 936 work for everyone. And I know of no greater challenge that 937 938 confronts the Congress, the Commission or the country. 939 Thank you for holding this hearing today and for inviting me to be a part of it, and I look forward to our 940

944 Mr. {Walden.} Chairman Copps, thank you for your 945 thoughtful presentation. We appreciate it. And as you know, 946 our Subcommittee has moved forward on some of these 947 initiatives, and we welcome encouragement over on the other 948 side of the building on Sunshine Act and a few other things. 949 So I would like to open up the questioning process now 950 with the questioning of Chairman Powell. Since you have 951 presided over the Federal Communications proceedings that 952 classified cable and telco-delivered broadband services as information services, do you think we would have seen the 953 954 same level of broadband investment during the past decade had 955 the FCC classified these services as common carrier 956 communication services? 957 Mr. {Powell.} I think in short, my judgment is no. Ι 958 think the Internet at the time that that classification 959 decision was made was more unknown than known. I think it 960 was a period of rampant experimentation. I think the capital 961 required to drive and produce the broadband networks that were not in place needed conditions that allowed them the 962 flexibility to make those choices without the risk that they 963

964 would be put back into kind of the monopoly era regulatory 965 model. So I think it was an important component, disbursing 966 that investment. 967 Mr. {Walden.} Chairman Wiley, does the Federal Communications Commission need to continue to have broad 968 969 discretion over mergers and acquisitions, or should the 970 Department of Justice anti-trust review be enough? 971 Mr. {Wiley.} Well, I think there has been duplication 972 from time to time. Although I would point out that the 973 Justice Department is looking at anti-trust aspects, and the FCC has got a broader public interest standpoint. I think 974 975 the two agencies need to work together, and I think they have 976 worked together through the years. So I think the process is 977 appropriately developing. But I do worry sometime that we 978 see great delays in the handling of these consolidations and 979 mergers, which I think is contrary to the best interest of the companies involved, and also contrary I think to the 980 981 public interest and consumers.

982 Mr. {Walden.} And to both Chairman Powell and Chairman 983 Wiley, can the FCC ever really future proof regulations given 984 how rapidly technology is changing? And are elements of the

985 Communications Act holding the Commission back from flexibly 986 addressing new technologies? 987 Mr. {Powell.} No, I don't think any agency can future proof the regular environment, no more than Congress could 988 write a statute that wouldn't overtime fray in its relevancy 989 990 in a market that is driven by technological change. I do 991 believe though that there are tools to give greater 992 flexibility and not more prescriptive constraints that we 993 have seen in some regulatory vehicles. So no, they can't 994 future predict. And I thought--I think the other guidance is I think asking the Commission to engage in anything that 995 996 requires predictive judgment about future outcomes should be 997 avoided where possible. 998 Mr. {Wiley.} Yes, and that is why I suggested in my 999 prepared testimony that we ought to have an opportunity to 1000 have a light touch here and have the government have a--in 1001 your statute, have a very flexible technology neutral type of 1002 approach to this, because it is very hard to predict. And 1003 the 1996 drafters did not really foresee the development of 1004 the Internet to become a universal medium. And I don't think 1005 they predicted broadband to be what it is today. So I think

1006	you have to step back a little bit and I think allow the
1007	technology to develop and to allow innovationinvention to
1008	occur without stifling it.
1009	Mr. {Walden.} Okay. I am going to start with Chairman
1010	Powell, and then each of you can take this one in the minute
1011	and a half I have left. Should the Internet be regulated as
1012	a common carrier under Title II?
1013	Mr. {Powell.} Well, for me, that is easy. No. I think
1014	one of the things I would like to say about that though is
1015	that people should fully understand what that means. Even if
1016	that were able to give you a better basis for recovering
1017	these two components of the rules, it would be the instant
1018	application of thousands of pages of decades old regulations
1019	instantly to the Internet where they heretofore have not
1020	been, both throughon a bipartisan basis, we have had a much
1021	more regulatory environment. The shatter to investment
1022	backed expectations that would result I think would be
1023	exceedingly damaging and more than most people realize.
1024	Mr. {Walden.} Chairman Hundt, do you care to comment on
1025	that?
1026	Mr. {Hundt.} Just two points. The 1996 Act was shorter

1027 than the rules for Little League Baseball, meaning Congress 1028 does not necessarily have to write thousands of pages. And 1029 in its wisdom, it did not do so in 1996. And that Act now 1030 has given the FCC the ability to achieve the fundamental 1031 goals. As I mentioned earlier, it can choose to use the 1032 specific methods that are dictated by the Common Carrier 1033 Treatment. But it absolutely does not have to use very many 1034 of these methods to accomplish its goals. In fact, the Court 1035 on page 61 outlined its view of what the FCC should do--1036 Mr. {Walden.} Right. 1037 Mr. {Hundt.} -- and said you can treat it as common carrier and have about 30 words that establish the 1038 1039 principles. I am not saying they should do that. I am 1040 saying they can do that. 1041 Mr. {Walden.} Do you think they should? Mr. {Hundt.} I think what they should do--and I 1042 1043 hesitate to say to the current Chairman what he ought to do, 1044 but since you asked, I think they ought to take a fresh look 1045 at all the facts and law as exist right now, and they also 1046 ought to be down here listening to you all and having a 1047 robust discussion. But the key point is they have the

1048 authority. 1049 {Voice.} Um-hum. 1050 Mr. {Walden.} Got it. Real quickly, the two remaining, 1051 because I have gone over my time--violated the rule. 1052 Conclude. 1053 Mr. {Wiley.} I think--okay. 1054 Mr. {Walden.} No, go ahead. 1055 Mr. {Wiley.} All right. I think it would be a big 1056 mistake to turn away from the information service pathway 1057 that we have started and go back to common carrier regulation 1058 however that might be defined. I think we want to provide an 1059 environment where there is I think opportunities for 1060 investment, encouraging innovation, allowing businessmen to 1061 try to experiment and try to find ways to serve the customer. 1062 And I think to go back to a 1934 style common carrier 1063 regulation, which was really based on regulating the 1064 railroads, I think doesn't make any sense at all. 1065 Mr. {Walden.} All right. Mr. Copps, real quick? 1066 Mr. {Copps.} My answer is yes, I do. The Court says we 1067 have the authority to do that. Whatever we do, we need to do 1068 it quickly, promptly and provide some certainty in the

1069 marketplace. 1070 Mr. {Walden.} Okay. Mr. {Copps.} I have always stressed the importance of 1071 1072 that reclassification. People talk about Section 706. I 1073 have always said that there is authority there to do a lot of 1074 things. But what--we don't need now to get into months of 1075 third ways and fourth ways and fifth ways to thread this 1076 needle. We need some clarity. Business needs clarity. 1077 Mr. {Walden.} Right. 1078 Mr. {Copps.} Consumers need clarity. 1079 {Voice.} Um-hum. 1080 Mr. {Walden.} Yeah--1081 Mr. {Copps.} The Commission needs clarity, too. And we have to make sure whatever we do that things like 1082 1083 interconnection and those things, consumer protections, are 1084 provided. 1085 Mr. {Walden.} Appreciate that. I thank the indulgence 1086 of the committee. I turn now to the Ranking Member, Ms. 1087 Eshoo, for 5 minutes. 1088 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to each one of our distinguished witnesses. What a rich, rich hearing 1089

1090 with your testimony. Thank you very, very much. To Chairman 1091 Hundt, thank you for your eloquent summation, without any 1092 staff or other counsel to assist you late last night. 1093 In your testimony, you discussed the importance of the 1094 decision that this country made to allow Internet service 1095 providers full use of the existing telephone network without 1096 paying the owners anything. It was a very, very--I mean one 1097 of the essential platforms in the success of the Internet. 1098 So, essentially, we said the incumbents could not be gate 1099 keepers that charge a toll for getting online. In your view, 1100 does yesterday's circuit decision reverse that longstanding 1101 policy? 1102 Mr. {Hundt.} No, it doesn't. And I think, Congresswoman, that you have put your finger on the central 1103 1104 issue, if I may say. Yes, Internet service providers are 1105 gate keepers. And they also are two-sided networks--or twosided gate keepers, like any gate keepers. 1106 1107 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. 1108 Mr. {Hundt.} There is somebody on one side and somebody 1109 on the other side. 1110 Ms. {Eshoo.} On the other--um-hum.

1111 Mr. {Hundt.} And so the situation then is very similar 1112 to the credit card industry. So we all have credit cards. 1113 And then there is the credit card company. And then on the 1114 other side of that, there is the restaurant. And it is very 1115 useful for restaurants that we all have credit cards. And it 1116 is useful for us that all the restaurants will take them. 1117 But it is not so useful if the gate keeper says now, some of 1118 these restaurants, we are not going to allow them to 1119 participate in the system. 1120 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. 1121 Mr. {Hundt.} Translating that to the present, if the 1122 Internet service provider were to say, you know, not all the 1123 people that are putting the content on their computers, we 1124 don't want all of them to be able to have access to all of 1125 the users. 1126 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. 1127 Mr. {Hundt.} That is a problem if the gate keeper 1128 behaves that way. 1129 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. Thank you very much. 1130 That is the central issue. Mr. {Hundt.} Ms. {Eshoo.} Yes, thank you very much. To Chairman 1131

1132 Powell, it is wonderful to see you again. As you know, under 1133 current law, cable subscribers are required to buy the so 1134 called broadcast basic tier as a condition of getting access 1135 to any other cable programming. As we transmission consent 1136 fees continue to rise and are inevitably being passed on to 1137 consumers in the form of below the line fees--I mean, I don't 1138 think it is a sustainable business model, most frankly. Ι 1139 just don't think that it can continue to work this way. Do 1140 you think that the so called must buy requirement makes any 1141 sense? Shouldn't consumers have the ability to lower their 1142 bills by electing to receive broadcast channels over the air? 1143 Mr. {Powell.} I don't. I think it should be an 1144 extraordinary circumstance in which the government tells the 1145 consumer you have to buy a television package as a 1146 prerequisite of buying more of what you want, which is 1147 essentially what the rule does. 1148 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. 1149 Mr. {Powell.} The other grounds on which I think it is 1150 fatally flawed is only cable subscribers have that

1151 obligation. Dish and direct satellite subscribers do not 1152 have that obligation. And they are the second and third

1153 largest MVPDs in the United States. Yet, a consumer who 1154 subscribes to Direct TV does not have to, under a must buy 1155 rule, purchase those programming. But if the switch to 1156 Comcast or Time Warner Cable, they do. That is the parity 1157 point that I was making, and I think is a perfect place for 1158 harmonization. 1159 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum. Thank you very much. Chairman 1160 Copps, thank you for being here today, the man with real 1161 wisdom, the man that we always count on to put--place 1162 Democracy front and center of everything. 1163 Mr. {Copps.} Thank you. Ms. {Eshoo.} You know so well that since Citizens 1164 1165 United, the last two election cycles that have set records 1166 for money spent, including hundreds of millions of dollars 1167 from undisclosed sources, the bulk of this so called dark 1168 money spending by outside groups that hide their donors go toward negative TV ads. We all know that. Would you 1169 1170 recommend changes to the Communications Act to ensure that 1171 voters are informed about who exactly is behind these 1172 anonymous TV ads, and is there anything in your view that the FCC can do on its own without Congressional intervention? 1173

1174 Mr. {Copps.} I would recommend enforcing the statute 1175 that we already have. And if you take a close look at 1176 Section 317, which has to do with sponsorship identification, 1177 and which goes back even before the Telecommunication Act of 1178 1934 was written. It goes back to 1927--ensuring that 1179 listeners and viewers, more recently, know by whom they are 1180 trying to be persuaded, whether it is a commercial product or 1181 a political product. Those rules were last revisited in a 1182 meaningful way by the FCC in the 1960s, which repeated that 1183 people have a right to know by whom they are being persuaded. 1184 Since then, we have all these new avenues of dark money and 1185 super pacts and all of the rest. But we also have the 1186 authority, recently reemphasized by the government 1187 accountability office, the recommendation that the Commission 1188 update those rules and get on with the job. So we can have 1189 this kind of information available to consumers so that when 1190 you see that negative ad, and it says brought to you by 1191 citizens for Purple Mountain Majesties and Amber Waves of 1192 Grain, and it is really a chemical company dumping sludge 1193 into the Chesapeake Bay, potential voters--citizens have a right to know that and will know that. That is basic 1194

information that you need to have if you are going to have a 1195 1196 viable civic dialog. So this is something the FCC can do. 1197 It doesn't await a President to making a proposal to do this. 1198 It doesn't involve Congress having to pass a law. It 1199 involves the Federal Communications Commission doing its job. 1200 And it could do this within 90 to 120 days and update the 1201 rules to take mind of the new dark money avenues that I was 1202 talking about earlier. So this would be a real way to shine 1203 a little bit of sunlight on the dark world of TV political 1204 advertising. 1205 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you very much. And, Mr. Wiley, thank you for your wonderful distinguished public service. I 1206 1207 will submit my questions to you in writing. All right? 1208 Mr. {Wiley.} All right. Thank you. 1209 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. We will now turn to the Vice-1210 Chair of the Full Committee, the gentlelady from Tennessee, 1211 1212 Mrs. Blackburn, for 5 minutes. 1213 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank 1214 you all for the time this morning. I want to pick up where 1215 the Subcommittee Chairman left off talking about the

1216 responsibility of the FCC and what it would look like going 1217 forward. I think that it is fair to say--and, Mr. Powell, I will address this to you, because I have heard you say, you 1218 1219 know, AOL was on top at one point when you were on top of the 1220 game. And where are they now I think was the comment. But 1221 anyway, looking at what the FCC would be, and as we look at 1222 the Telecomm Act, should be begin to think in terms of the 1223 FCC being more as enforcement rather than regulatory in its 1224 scope, or in its--really, in its scope? Mr. Powell, and then 1225 Mr. Wiley, I would like to hear from you.

1226 Mr. {Powell.} I think some aspects of that deserves a 1227 fresh examination. You know, the FCC, which I am a huge 1228 supporter of. I have served there with great people, and I think it does an enormously great public service and that we 1229 1230 functions that are critical to it in spectrum management and 1231 many other things. But it is one of the last of the New Deal 1232 era agencies that actually has affirmative economic 1233 regulatory power, that is the ability to set the prices, terms and conditions of market activity as opposed to having 1234 1235 a more significant enforcement, policing or consumer

1236 $\,$ protection role. Not to say that some of that may or may not

1237	still be warranted, but I do think that is a kind of holdover
1238	from judgments of different administrative eras. And I would
1239	recommend if you are going to look atyou should look at the
1240	dichotomy and the balance of that role.
1241	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Look at the balance?
1242	Mr. {Powell.} I do think good leaders, and many of the
1243	sitting at this table have migrated more toward that more
1244	defensible role. But many of those provisions still remain.
1245	And I think they are worthy of second consideration.
1246	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Mr. Wiley?
1247	Mr. {Wiley.} Yes. I would agree withlargely with
1248	what Chairman Powell has suggested. I think the Commission
1249	does have strong enforcement efforts today. And some would
1250	say almost too strong in some instances. But I think frankly
1251	a lighter touch is the way to go in this area.
1252	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Let me ask you this, privacy
1253	data security, it is front page news right now. It is going
1254	to be. Do you think that now is the time for the FCC to
1255	focus on its core competencies, or should it move over and
1256	look at privacy data security, or leave that to the FTC, Mr.
1257	Wiley?

1258	Mr. {Wiley.} I didn't hear that one. I didn't hear it.
1259	I am sorry.
1260	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Oh, privacy data security, leave it
1261	to the FTC and the FCC focus on its core mission, or what is
1262	your thought on that?
1263	Mr. {Wiley.} I think so.
1264	Ms. {Blackburn.} You think so.
1265	Mr. {Wiley.} I would agree with that.
1266	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Mr. Powell, coming back to
1267	you, 706, we are hearing a lot about that today. And you may
1268	have had others who think that, you know, the FCCthat this
1269	is an invitation706 is an invitation to come in and
1270	regulate Internet services. So as you look at 706, do you
1271	agree that the provision was intended to give the FCC the
1272	ability to forebear from regulations that would stifle
1273	broadband investment and innovation?
1274	Mr. {Powell.} I agree that the decision certainly gives
1275	them the power to forebear. And for many years, many people
1276	interpreted 706 as principally deregulatory. It speaks of
1277	removing barriers and removing obstacles, less so than
1278	introducing them. I certainly was serving at a time where

1279 the commissions had held that that was not a separate basis 1280 of authority. And in fairness to the facts, every commission 1281 had so held until recently. So that was the position of the 1282 law when I was there at least. I will say though that I 1283 think if the Commission is going to have a role in broadband, 1284 I highly would prefer that be under the construct of the 1285 light regulatory information services definitions that reside 1286 around with 706 than to make a radical transformation to 1287 Title II as a regulatory framework for those questions. 1288 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time. 1289 1290 Mr. {Walden.} The gentlelady yields back, and the Chair 1291 now recognizes the gentleman from California, the Ranking 1292 Member of the Committee on the Democrat side, Mr. Waxman. 1293 Mr. {Waxman.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My colleague, Ms. Blackburn, suggested the FCC needs to act more 1294 like the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC does important 1295 1296 consumer protection work. But I believe we need an agency 1297 like the FCC that can write forward looking rules of the road 1298 for industry and consumers. Chairman Hundt and Copps, do you 1299 agree with that?
1300 Mr. {Hundt.} Absolutely, Mr. Waxman. Forward looking 1301 is--here is the best example of a useful forward looking law. It is in the incentive auction legislation that you passed 1302 1303 where this Congress said we want the FCC to establish before 1304 the auction a generally applicable rule about how much 1305 spectrum anybody can buy. That has to be forward looking. 1306 You don't want to go into the auction with your money and not 1307 know whether or not you are going to be permitted to win in 1308 the--keep the license that you thought you were the high 1309 bidder on. That has to be forward looking. So that is a 1310 great example of you all asking for a forward looking rule and really deserving a forward looking rule. 1311 1312 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. And, Mr. Copps? Mr. {Copps.} Absolutely. I concur. We all talk about 1313 1314 how rapidly the telecommunications, technology and services 1315 are changing. The Commission has to be aware of that, have the flexibility to react to that, and certainly to fulfill 1316 1317 its responsibilities to look into the future and try to 1318 determine how best to fulfill its mission, which includes 1319 consumer protection, includes privacy and includes ubiquity of services. 1320

1321 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. Mr. Powell, in light of 1322 yesterday's decision, the D.C. Court circuit recognized the 1323 authority granted by Congress to the FCC in the '96 Act. Do 1324 you believe that the Agency can properly oversee the growth 1325 of broadband infrastructure services? 1326 Mr. {Powell.} I do. For a matter of record, as 1327 Chairman of the FCC and the Commission that classified 1328 broadband the way that it is today, we guite pointedly 1329 recognized that the importance of that continuing role to a 1330 degree. And we believe that the authority existed within 1331 that Title I framework to take care of those circumstances. 1332 Whether you agree or disagree, the Court certainly validated 1333 yesterday, from a judicial standpoint, that Title I and 706 1334 do provide that flexible authority. 1335 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. And, Mr. Wiley--1336 Mr. {Wiley.} Yeah. 1337 Mr. {Waxman.} --if you agree the FCC has the authority, 1338 do you think it ought to use it? 1339 Mr. {Wiley.} Well, the Court said that the Commission 1340 could have authority in this area. I would strongly advise, in my own view, the Commission to let the marketplace develop 1341

1342 and if problems do exist, then to step in. There are 1343 avenues--if we find blocking, if we find discrimination, 1344 there are avenues that can be taken. I think the problem is 1345 sometimes we are in search of a problem here that may not 1346 exist. I think if you look at all the suggestions of the 1347 carriers that have come out of the decision from yesterday, 1348 all want to keep the marketplace open, all want to give 1349 consumers access to various kind of content. And I take them 1350 at their word. I think that is going to develop.

Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. Mr. Hundt, if we want to keep the marketplace open, isn't it reasonable to anticipate that some of the players will not want it to be so open if it is to their financial advantage? Shouldn't the FCC play a role to make sure prospectively that we have an open, competitive market with the consumers being in charge?

Mr. {Hundt.} I completely agree. And if I might, I think it is important--well, let me say this. I have the view that the case and the statute have the following meaning. Section 1706 gives the FCC the authority to accomplish the goals you just stated, without also requiring the FCC to make a classification decision.

1363 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. 1364 Mr. {Hundt.} That is to say it can make a 1365 classification decision and act with the authority that would 1366 come from that, but it doesn't need to do that in order to pass rules that are authorized under Section 1706. Meaning 1367 1368 1706 and the common carrier provision are two independent 1369 bases for FCC action. That is why the FCC can choose both or 1370 either in order to have a--making that would accomplish the 1371 goals you described. 1372 Mr. {Waxman.} Didn't the Court say that the FCC made the wrong choice and they have two titles they can rely on? 1373 1374 You are saying they don't need either title, they can just go 1375 ahead and think about regulation? 1376 Mr. {Hundt.} Yeah, I think what the Court said is if 1377 you do choose the information services classification, then 1378 you are bound by the restrictions in that. 1379 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. 1380 Mr. {Hundt.} But you don't need to make that choice in 1381 order to accomplish the goals that you are desiring, which 1382 the Court has said that it approves of the goals. Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. And you don't need to be a--1383

1384 regulate as a common carrier either? 1385 Mr. {Hundt.} Beg your pardon? 1386 Mr. {Waxman.} You don't have to regulate it as a common carrier either? 1387 1388 Mr. {Hundt.} The Court has said you can choose that, or 1389 you can choose 706 or you could choose both. The only thing 1390 you can't do is choose information services classification 1391 and pass common carrier like rules. 1392 Mr. {Waxman.} Um-hum. I see. Thank you. That is very 1393 helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yield back my time. 1394 Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman yields back. And the Chair now recognizes for 5 minutes the former Chairman of the Full 1395 1396 Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Barton. 1397 Mr. {Barton.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened 1398 to our testimony and our questions so far. I am going to 1399 make a brief statement before I ask a question. I was here in 1996. And that Act was a philosophical 1400 1401 change from where the Committee had been and, to some extent, 1402 where the country had been in terms of telecommunications 1403 policy. You had a Republican Congress, House and Senate for the first time in over 50 years, maybe 60 years. You had a 1404

Democratic President, Mr. Clinton, who came from a kind of 1405 1406 conservative pro-business background down in Arkansas. And the former chairman of the Committee, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. 1407 1408 Waxman and Mr. Marky and some of those folks, had a very 1409 regulatory approach, although not totally so, and the Telco Act of '96, Mr. Bhlcy and Mr. Fields, we went--we decided to 1410 1411 go with a market approach. And, Mr. Copps, as he has pointed 1412 out, markets don't always work. But, generically, if they 1413 are open and transparent, unless there is a natural monopoly, 1414 they do give a lot more choice to people. And that is what 1415 the Telco Act of '96 did. It rejected the philosophy that 1416 the government knows best, that the regulatory knows best, 1417 that people can't--if they have access to appropriate 1418 information, can't make choices that are good choices. And we see reflected today in some of the questions that Mr. 1419 Waxman especially just asked, you know, that some of my 1420 1421 friends on the Democrat side just don't like a market 1422 approach. You know, how dare it be possible that under Title 1423 I, Informational Services, you can have an open, transparent 1424 Internet, and you don't need the FCC to tell you what to do? My God, that is scary. We better get that FCC back on the 1425

1426 job. They just maybe--you know, if they can't do it under 1427 Title II as a common carrier, well, they are just going to 1428 have to figure out how to regulate under Title I. 1429 Well, you know, if you look at the explosion and what has happened, I mean, I have--I had somebody--a young person-1430 1431 -a very young person about 9 years old come into my office 1432 down in Texas and apparently did not know there was such a 1433 thing as a hard line telephone--did not know what that was on 1434 my desk. This young lady thought a phone was just something 1435 you carried around with you. And her parents were very young, and they didn't have hard line phones in their home. 1436 And they--you know, her dad worked out of his truck doing 1437 1438 stuff and--contracting and stuff. She didn't know what it 1439 was. 1440 So, you know, this thing that Mr. Upton and Mr. Walden are starting to take a real comprehensive review, and working 1441

1442 with Mr. Waxman and Ms. Eshoo, it is a good thing. But 1443 philosophically, I don't want to go back to where I have to 1444 depend on the intelligence of Mr. Copps or Mr. Powell or Mr. 1445 Hundt or Mr. Wiley and the three or four other wise people at 1446 the FCC to know what is best for me in telecommunications

1447 policy. You know, I think if we set the ground rules--and I 1448 agree that you have to have a traffic cop. But I don't agree 1449 that you got to be so prescriptive that the market just flat 1450 gets strangled before it even has a chance to get underway. 1451 So my question, and I throw it open to the panel, is 1452 there still a need for a Title I--I mean, for Title II, for 1453 common--in the telecommunication marketplace today, could we 1454 deregulate the telephone companies in totality because, you 1455 know, there really is no such thing as a natural monopoly 1456 anymore?

1457 Mr. {Copps.} If we can find a way to assure that some 1458 of the qualities that people fought for long and hard in 1459 terms of privacy and public safety and consumer protection do not accompany the new tools of broadband and the Internet as 1460 1461 the accompanied telephone, then I think we are in trouble. I 1462 like the market approach, too. And it was decided long ago 1463 that the telecommunications industry, the media industries 1464 would operate on the capitalistic system. And you don't 1465 blame business for trying to seize market control or capture the market, or even to have gate keeping. But we have 1466 always, since very early in the last century, had protections 1467

1468 against untrammeled building toward monopoly and duopoloy. 1469 I read the '96 Act, and I wasn't as intimately involved 1470 with it as you were. But I followed it with some degree of 1471 interest. As being somewhat more proactive, I read that Act 1472 as instructing the Federal Communications Commission to do 1473 what it needs to do to encourage bringing the most advanced 1474 telecommunications feasible to all of our citizens, no matter 1475 where they live at reasonably, comparable prices, reasonably, 1476 comparable services, allowing them to access media that 1477 serves communities and provides information that are necessary to exercise a citizen's responsibilities in a 1478 1479 Democratic society. So I think yes, a light touch where 1480 possible. But, you know, we set here and talk about well, we 1481 have to do away with these stove pipes and all. And I agree to that with some extent. But we have--in trying that--I 1482 1483 mean, if we are going to say we are going to treat a 1484 telephone call you make in the Internet entirely different 1485 than we make a telephone call somewhere else, that is not 1486 functional equivalent. That is not treating technologies 1487 alike. So I think--

1488 Mr. {Barton.} It is just an--I mean, I know my time is

1489 way over. But it is something to think about, because we 1490 have got a real chance in the rest of this Congress and the 1491 next Congress to build on what we started in '96. 1492 Mr. {Wiley.} I would just like to say that I agree with 1493 much of what you say. I think in a competitive marketplace 1494 that we see today with the kind of IP centric world, I think 1495 economic regulation has to be considered with some 1496 skepticism. Because if the markets are competitive, if you 1497 don't have market failure, then the question is why should 1498 the government be stepping in? Consumer protection, E911, 1499 you know, those kinds of things, that is a different story. 1500 Mr. {Barton.} Right. 1501 Mr. {Wiley.} But we are talking about economic regulation here. And I think it is more questionable. And I 1502 1503 certainly wouldn't be thinking about going back to common 1504 carrier world in an information services environment. I don't think that makes sense. 1505 1506 Mr. {Walden.} Well, thank you. The gentleman's time 1507 has expired. And the Chair recognizes for 5 minutes the 1508 gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Doyle. 1509 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again,

1510 thank you to our witnesses for your testimony today. We have 1511 talked a lot about net neutrality in the court decision. So I would like to maybe go to a couple different topics and ask 1512 1513 Chairman Hundt and Chairman Copps about special access. How 1514 can the FCC enhance competition in the special access 1515 marketplace? And is new statutory authority necessary, or do 1516 you think the Commission has the sufficient authority to 1517 ensure that the markets are competitive? 1518 Mr. {Copps.} On a special access, I think what needs to 1519 happen, yes, I think the Commission has the authorities for 1520 the FCC to make up its mind. I was before this Committee, 1521 and I think you were here too. And perhaps it was Mr. Marky 1522 or somebody who asked us all back in 2007 to sign a letter saying we would have this problem resolved by September. And 1523 1524 we all said whoopee, let us do that. And it hasn't been done 1525 yet. All these seven years have gone by. Enormous amounts of money are at stake here. The ability of competitors to 1526 1527 enter the business and to compete is at stake here. I am 1528 pleased to--at some signs now that the FCC is beginning to 1529 move. And I want to especially commend you, because I know you were a big proponent of getting this data collection 1530

1531 process going. And that is the prerequisite of doing 1532 something final on this. The Commission also has to look at 1533 allegations of anti-competitive practices in special access, 1534 such things as loyalty mandates and excessive early 1535 termination and shortfall penalties. But getting this right 1536 is important. And each year that goes on is billions of 1537 dollars going to maybe where they should go or maybe where 1538 they shouldn't be going. 1539 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you. Commissioner Hundt? 1540 Mr. {Hundt.} I echo Commissioner Copps' remarks and would just add this is another example of a very useful 1541 1542 forward looking rule. Or to put it another way, we could all 1543 use a forward looking rule on this topic. 1544 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you. Yes. And, Commissioner Copps, 1545 we have been waiting years and years and years. And I hope before my tenure in Congress is over that we will see the FCC 1546 do something on special access. 1547 1548 Mr. {Copps.} Yes. 1549 Mr. {Doyle.} And I intend to be here a little bit 1550 longer. Commissioner Copps, the FCC recently closed a very successful low power FM application process, and is currently 1551

1552 considering thousands of LPFM applications. And I want to 1553 personally thank you for your efforts in that regards, and 1554 ask you what other opportunities you see for the FCC to 1555 further empower communities in innovative ways? 1556 Mr. {Copps.} Well, first of all, I want to thank you, 1557 because without you and the leadership of your colleagues 1558 here, this would not have happened. We wouldn't have had 1559 that window, the first one opened since 2000. And it is a 1560 window of enormous potential. So number one, we want that to 1561 move forward with all dispatch and maybe go from 800 low power stations to maybe thousands of them. 1562 Going beyond that though, we just have to look at 1563 1564 whatever kind of options we can think of to encourage community radio, to revivify the peg channels and make sure 1565 1566 that they are not just cast aside as some of the big companies seem to want to do, look at new models for non-1567 commercial media, non-profit media. And that applies not 1568 1569 just to media companies but to telecom companies, newspapers 1570 and so many other things. And there is a lot of potential 1571 here in a market that doesn't seem to be able to provide all the tools that we need for media and for news for non-profit 1572

1573	media to step in. But they are also dragging its feet on
1574	making a lot of these determinations that it should be
1575	making. So low power, yes, looking at channels five and six
1576	are all sorts of options out there, put some special emphasis
1577	on using community radio and diversity in communities and
1578	native lands. It is just a field that is rife with potential
1579	if we can just step up to the plate and realize our
1580	responsibility to do it.
1581	Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you. Gentlemen, thank you for your
1582	insight today. We appreciate it here on the Committee. And
1583	I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.
1584	Mr. {Walden.} Thank you very much. The gentleman
1585	yields back the balance of his time. And the Chair now
1586	recognizes himself for 5 minutes.
1587	And, Mr. Powell, thanks again for you being here today.
1588	And if I could just start with some questions to you?
1589	Mr. {Powell.} Yes, sir.
1590	Mr. {Walden.} Yeah, it is kind of interesting, because
1591	I am reviewing your testimony and also Mr. Wiley's. You both
1592	used very similar language in spots. And in your opening
1593	statement, you said that this market requires a greater

1594 degree of business flexibility, fewer prescriptive rules and 1595 an assurance that any government involvement is applied on a 1596 technology neutral basis and creates a better investment 1597 climate. And I also saw that Mr. Wiley also had said in his 1598 testimony about the government can't keep up, and there is a 1599 need for flexibility and technology neutral framework in his 1600 testimony. So very similar language. 1601 But in your testimony, when you go through it--and I 1602 found it interesting, because when you are going through your 1603 seven points--and for simplicity--and one of the things that 1604 you bring out--because you were also talking about that 1605 flexibility and also having a better business climate, you 1606 state in your testimony that since 1996, we have seen a 1607 trillion dollars invested in an Internet infrastructure. And 1608 then you also laid out that, you know, the simplicity that 1609 has to be there. But also in that simplicity, you said that, 1610 you know, practicing simplicity can be scary. 1611 Mr. {Powell.} Yeah. 1612 Mr. {Walden.} And it takes courage to discourage--1613 discard old ideas and rules that are no longer needed. Could

1614 you give a couple examples of those?

1615 Mr. {Powell.} Yeah. It is a great challenging 1616 question. I think I might actually go back to some of what 1617 Mr. Barton was talking about. If you think about one of the 1618 wisest things that was done in the 1996 Act, it has nothing to do with the individual rules. It was the fundamental 1619 1620 judgment that the government rejected the natural monopoly 1621 thesis and believed instead that competition was the more 1622 fruitful approach. But common carriage law inherently is 1623 about a government sanctioned monopoly. It is essentially 1624 the queen of the realm who grants an exclusive license to a 1625 ferry boat captain to go across the river in exchange for all 1626 the privileges of that monopoly, they agree to be bound to 1627 serve all the citizens in a non-discriminatory way and other things that the sovereign wishes to have as part of that 1628 1629 exclusive benefit. Mutual in some regards, the monopolist gets the exclusive profits, and the realm gets the benefits 1630 1631 of serving all the citizens.

In some ways, in 1996, the government sued for divorce from companies through, you know, the notion of an exclusive monopoly and instead said go compete, raise your own capital, no guaranteed return on investment, no guaranteed success.

1636 But yet, the lingering notions of common carriage, which are 1637 still in the statute and, by the way, still being raised in 1638 the context of the net neutrality debate, still hover around 1639 our regulatory questions. To me, whether the country comes 1640 to some committed conclusion that even with its challenges 1641 and the need for oversight that we are really about 1642 competition and are really ready to let go of common carriage 1643 is a great example, a fundamental one, of how to make that 1644 decision.

Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. And let me follow-up with another question. And when you are looking at the--assessing the competition in the communications industry, do you think an updating Communications Act should modify how the FCC currently conducts its competitive analysis?

Mr. {Powell.} I think so, only because I think there is some ambiguity there that when managed in responsible hands works fine. At times, it doesn't. I am worried about the FCC merger review process in part because it professes to do a competitive analysis following essentially anti-trust guidelines administered by other departments. But under the public interest standard, which I do think is valuable, it

turns into a competition of conditions. And as an anti-trust 1657 1658 lawyer, I used to believe that the FCC, if they are doing 1659 something bad, shoot them. If they are not, don't let them 1660 cure harm by how many good jelly beans you can put on the 1661 scale and to make the thing go away. And then by doing it in 1662 a way that it extracts these concessions as a voluntary 1663 proffer, you make sure that the case can't be appealed to the 1664 courts, because you no longer have standing. I think 1665 insulating the review process from judicial review through 1666 the conditioning mechanism, and allowing the commissioning mechanism to be a vehicle by which the Commission can 1667 1668 legislate beyond its authority can get companies to do things 1669 in the context of that proceeding it couldn't pass laws 1670 about, borders on kind of administrative improbability. So 1671 does that happen every time? No. Do I think it happens sometimes? Yes. And I think Congress should at least 1672 1673 examine the review process and see if whether better controls 1674 could be in place.

1675 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you very much. And I see my time 1676 has expired. And the Chair now recognizes for 5 minutes the 1677 gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui.

1678 Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to 1679 thank all of the former chairmen for being here. This has 1680 been really an interesting and formative discussion. 1681 Under Section 254, carriers have certain obligations to provide universal access. In the D.C. Circuit's decision 1682 1683 yesterday, the Court made clear the FCC has a similar charge 1684 under 706 to ensure that all Americans have access to 1685 broadband and that the FCC has authority over broadband 1686 providers to meet that mandate from Congress. I have two 1687 questions for all of the chairmen relating to the Court's 1688 decision yesterday. The first, do you agree the FCC should and must promote 1689 universal access to broadband for all Americans, Mr. Wiley? 1690 1691 Mr. {Wiley.} Yes, I would agree with that. 1692 Ms. {Matsui.} Sir? 1693 Mr. {Hundt.} Yes. 1694 Ms. {Matsui.} Mr. Powell? 1695 Mr. {Powell.} Yes. 1696 Mr. {Copps.} Absolutely. There is no way you can be a 1697 functioning member of society without access to this 1698 technology.

1699 Ms. {Matsui.} Okay. Then does the Court's decision 1700 yesterday affirm the FCC's authority to transition the 1701 universal service fund to broadband, Chairman Wiley? 1702 Mr. {Wiley.} Yes, I think the FCC has done a good job 1703 in looking at that. I am concerned somewhat with the size 1704 and the growth of the universal service fund, and I think the 1705 Commission has got to look at the competency, the pay and the 1706 covering that and some issue that has got to be looked at, I 1707 think. 1708 Ms. {Matsui.} But it is generally yes. Chairman Hundt? Mr. {Hundt.} Yes. 1709 Mr. {Powell.} Yes, I would commend Chairman Genachowski 1710 1711 for migrating the fund toward broadband, and he did it on a 1712 theory of 706. So in that extent, I think seven--the ruling 1713 yesterday only strengthens the Commission moving in that 1714 direction. 1715 Ms. {Matsui.} Good. 1716 Mr. {Copps.} Yes. 1717 Ms. {Matsui.} Chairman Copps? That is great. I 1718 appreciate your views, because I believe that it is one of 1719 the potentially biggest unintended consequences avoided by

1720	the Court's decision, because transitioning a USF to
1721	broadband is really a critical step toward achieving
1722	universal access and adoption in this country.
1723	Chairman Hundt, you said that yesterday's circuit
1724	decision is a victory for Congress and the smart flexible
1725	approach of the 1996 Telecom Act. How can we continue that
1726	success? Are there any unintended consequences we should
1727	watch out for as this Committee starts the process of
1728	updating the Communications Act?
1729	Mr. {Hundt.} Well, I think as a number of you have
1730	mentioned, of course the FCC on remand needs to commence a
1731	new proceeding, which I believe Chairman Wheeler has already
1732	said that he intends to do.
1733	Ms. {Matsui.} Um-hum.
1734	Mr. {Hundt.} And, naturally, that should be and will be
1735	an open proceeding. I am sure this Committee will have an
1736	ample opportunity to express its views. I don't myself have
1737	the ability to forecast where that will come out or should
1738	come out, because I think it is really, really important to
1739	examine all the new facts about emerging network
1740	architectures and about competition problems on both sides of

1741	the two-sided network. I would just say that is why it is so
1742	useful that the Court has said that the FCC's authority is
1743	broad and powerful, because the technologies in the network
1744	architectures and the competition problems are constantly
1745	changing. And the FCC, in rulemaking, has the ability to
1746	adapt to those changes, sometimes eliminating rules,
1747	sometimes writing new rules. So this is a very, very
1748	workable process that we have here. And, as I said before,
1749	congratulations to this Committee for the 1996 Act which did
1750	create this legal culture.
1751	Ms. {Matsui.} Um-hum. Chairman Powell, would you like
1752	to comment?
1753	Mr. {Powell.} I am sorry. Can you refresh the
1754	question?
1755	Ms. {Matsui.} Well, I really
1756	Mr. {Powell.} Sorry.
1757	Ms. {Matsui.} You know, weas Chairman Hundt
1758	commenting that the Court decision he felt was a victory for
1759	Congress and for the smart flexible approach of the '96 Act,
1760	are there any unintended consequences that we should watch
1761	out for as we reexamine and update the Communications Act

moving forward? 1762 1763 Mr. {Powell.} Yeah. Yeah, I more or less would agree 1764 with Chairman Hundt. 1765 Ms. {Matsui.} Oh. Mr. {Powell.} I mean, I think to the degree that, you 1766 1767 know, in some ways I saw a quote the other day that I thought 1768 summed it up great, which is it is not a victory for any 1769 side, but it might have been a victory for the debate. And 1770 that is that the Commission continues to have a meaningful 1771 role in the oversight and protection of broadband without crossing the line into the more dangerous concerns around 1772 1773 common carriage. And if that is ultimately the outcome, 1774 maybe that is workable. Unintended consequences, I do think 1775 the Court even struggled with them itself, which is 706 is an 1776 extraordinarily broad, unconstrained provision. How it is interpreted, and how responsibly it is interpreted and 1777 applied, I think is important, because I think, you know, 1778 1779 Congress hasn't spoken with much specificity about broadband 1780 regulation. And to take a provision as open-ended as vague 1781 as 706 and see that as the foundation for everything broadband going forward has potential risks and dangers, but 1782

I think that will be worked out over time through the--1783 1784 through its application and through dialog with Congress. 1785 Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you very much. Chairman Copps? 1786 Mr. {Copps.} While I am pleased that the Court recognized the authority of the Commission, I don't know that 1787 1788 I am ready to declare victory yet. If it is a victory for 1789 the debate, that is not necessarily a good thing, because we 1790 have had so many years of debate while the evolution of the 1791 Internet continues and gate keeping shows the rise of its 1792 ugly head. So it is a victory if the Commission reacts and 1793 reacts promptly and provides some certainty and some 1794 quarantees. But we have lost a couple of years looking for 1795 third ways and other ways, and I don't want to lose a couple 1796 more years going down that road. 1797 Ms. {Matsui.} Well, I think it is an opportunity here. Mr. {Wiley.} Well, I was just going to say--1798 Ms. {Matsui.} Yes? 1799 1800 Mr. {Wiley.} --I think if it is a victory, I think it 1801 is a victory for technical innovation, a victory for 1802 investment, and ultimately a victory for the consumer. And I 1803 think that we ought to see how the marketplace develops in

1804	this area, and see where the problems, as I said earlier,
1805	really come about as some people predict.
1806	Ms. {Matsui.} Well, I think this is an interesting
1807	moment in time. And we have to provide a thoughtful way as
1808	we move forward. And I appreciate all your comments. Thank
1809	you very much, and I yield back.
1810	Mr. {Walden.} The gentlelady yields back. The Chairman
1811	now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus.
1812	Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome you
1813	all. It is good to have you. And I think it would be safe
1814	to say that no one envisioned this world in which we live in
1815	technologically, no one envisioned in '96. So really, the
1816	basic first question is, in a rewrite for public policy
1817	elected officials, or even folks in a commission to envision
1818	what the world will be like 10 years after a rewrite, that is
1819	going to bethat is impossible to do, is thatmost people
1820	view that as correct? No one knew what '96 would come. So
1821	that talks about what these basic premises that I enjoy,
1822	Democracy, freedom, marketplace, capitalism. The one thing
1823	that hasn't really been addressed is consumer choice, and how
1824	that really does drive innovation and drivesand it is that

1825 marketplace that--and I remember going to the consumer 1826 electronics show, and the MP3 was being unveiled. And I just 1827 was amazed at how much capital flowed for just music in this 1828 space, in the technology space. And that is the same thing 1829 now with Internet, broadband, downloads, Pandora, you name 1830 it. It has all migrated to that. So we don't ever want to 1831 lose the aspect of the power of the individual consumer in 1832 this debate, you know, versus what some people would say 1833 would be the power of a governmental regulatory arena or 1834 agency. And, Mr. Copps, I think that is true for these segments of society that feel they don't have access. I 1835 1836 think that you can pull together, based upon technology, 1837 ability to get the word out through broadband information, 1838 newsletters and the like. I mean, the technology has allowed 1839 us to really--there is really no excuse for people not to 1840 have access to information flow today, even if they go 1841 through a universal service fund or they go to the library, 1842 they get on broadband through what we have been able to do 1843 through the E-Rates and all that other stuff, which we talked 1844 about a lot in your day, Mr. Hundt. So here is the basic 1845 question I have, because I--and a couple of you, in your

1846 opening statements, talk about silos. You were all members 1847 of the Commission, and you all were chairmen, which is a 1848 different position than just being a standard commissioner, 1849 because you had the responsibility for the whole body of 1850 workers within the FCC. So we have got consumer--we have got 1851 the bureaus and other things other than the bureaus. I only 1852 talk about bureaus. But you go on the website, you see all 1853 these other little offices and stuff, consumer and government 1854 affairs, enforcement, international media, public safety, 1855 wireless and wire line. So in a rewrite of the '96 Act, should there not be some discussion on how we reform the 1856 1857 Commission itself based upon what current technology is today? And I think, Mr. Wiley, you kind of talked about this 1858 1859 a little bit. And just a quess at where it might head in the 1860 future? I mean, there is a future look, right, Mr. Copps? 1861 There is a future. But how do we reform the FCC itself and 1862 start tearing down some of these silos, which some of you 1863 have addressed are a problem? And if we can go from left to 1864 right? Mr. Wiley, if you want to go first? And that will be 1865 the end of my questions.

1866 Mr. {Wiley.} Yeah. I think what has changed in the

1867	Internet world is that you find different parties doing the
1868	same kinds of services, providing the same kind of activities
1869	that you wouldn't have thought of before.
1870	Mr. {Shimkus.} Right.
1871	Mr. {Wiley.} You wouldn't have thought of broadcasters
1872	being in the technology end, or cable being in the wire line
1873	field. But this is happening now. And I think therefore the
1874	Commission probably does have to change its internal
1875	structure. In a digital world, if you have functionally
1876	equivalent services being provided by different parties, I
1877	think they should be regulated in a functionally equivalent
1878	way. And that is not the way the Commission has done it
1879	through the years. It is not the way they are organized. It
1880	is going to take some change. I
1881	Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you. Mr. Hundt?
1882	Mr. {Hundt.} You know, the French say well, that works
1883	in practice, but, you know, maybe it doesn't really work in
1884	theory. And I think it is really, really important to focus
1885	on practice. The current structure allows the FCC Chair, in
1886	what I will definitely describe as an open process, to
1887	reorganize the FCC to meet the objectives that are set by any

1888 particular Congress in any particular situation. And that is 1889 a good thing. So when this Congress had the wisdom to ask 1890 the FCC to auction spectrum in 1993, I was allowed--thanks to 1891 you--but not because of a statutory mandate, but because of 1892 flexibility, I was allowed to create a wireless bureau which 1893 previously did not exist. At any given moment, it is hard to 1894 say exactly what the administrative structure ought to be. 1895 And I think the current system, which tells the Chair, figure 1896 it out, tell us what it is, you are held accountable. That 1897 is a good system.

Mr. {Powell.} I do think form follows function. And I 1898 1899 think certainly when I was Chairman, we merged few bureaus. 1900 Cable was a separate bureau from broadcasting. Today, it is 1901 the media bureau now with changes we made to try to reflect. 1902 I think a common principle is organize around the way it is 1903 seen through the eyes and the ears of consumers. And, you 1904 know, to me, at the time, television was television to most 1905 Americans. And making sure you had cross- pollenization of 1906 the bureaucrats, professionals who--the bureaucracy and the 1907 professionals who manage that I thought was important so that they saw their functions through the same eyes of our 1908

1909 constituents. And I think that is one principle you can 1910 follow. I do agree with Reed. I think the Chairman is also CEO. The statute assigns them that responsibility. I don't 1911 1912 think we talk enough about the CEO role and the management of 1913 that operation. But I think there is plenty of flexibility 1914 to respond to that, if it is clear what it is we are trying 1915 to execute. 1916 Mr. {Copps.} I don't think there is any magic formula. 1917 Certainly, there have been times when the stove pipe approach 1918 has been too much in presence. I think Michael tried to work 1919 against that and go towards a little more holistic type of 1920 view. So did Chairman Genachowski. That being said though, 1921 you need the experts in these specific bureaus. There is a 1922 specific telecom expertise in the wire line and the wireless 1923 and all the details of that, and special access and 1924 everything else we are talking about. So I think you still have to have those bureaus. But if you can have--I think 1925 1926 Chairman Genachowski established a consumer taskforce whose 1927 job it was to go across those agencies and look at whatever--1928 or those bureaus -- at whatever those bureaus were doing to assess the impact on consumer wellbeing. So I think that is 1929

1930 a good approach. But it is a management thin and something 1931 that I think is the product of good leadership at the 1932 Commission and good oversight by the Committee. 1933 {Voice.} Mr.--1934 Mr. {Walden.} We need to move on to Mr. Dingell, I 1935 think, for the next 5 minutes. Mr. Chairman? 1936 Mr. {Dingell.} I want to commend you for this hearing. 1937 I think this has been an important hearing. In the events of 1938 this week, you tell us that it is time that the Committee is 1939 going to have to start looking at what we are going to do 1940 about bringing the '96 Act up to date. I have enjoyed the 1941 comments that my dear friend, Mr. Barton, in announcing my 1942 position is being strongly regulatory. Sometimes I have a 1943 hard time recognizing my position when it is set forth by 1944 other members. In any event, that is not important. But I 1945 would just like to remind everybody that this business of the 1946 '96 Act started when we began to try and get Judge Reed out 1947 of the business of regulating the Telecommunications 1948 industry. It also started when we started trying to get the 1949 amount of spectrum that was held out of use by industry and business and government, and get that available to people, 1950

1951 and to see to it that we had a fair program for dealing with 1952 our legislation and a fair program for dealing with these 1953 matters. I would like to welcome our friends, the chairmen 1954 here for their appearance and for their assistance to us, and 1955 for what it is that they have done with us over the years. 1956 If there is an attempt made to update the Communications Act, I will offer my support. Yesterday's court decision 1957 1958 vacating the anti-discrimination and anti-blocking rules of 1959 the Federal Communications Commission Open Internet order is 1960 proof that the Congress needs to bring our communication laws 1961 into the 21st century. Only clear direction from Congress 1962 will strengthen consumer protections, promote competitions 1963 and give industry the regulatory certainty it needs to 1964 innovate in the future.

Now, as we go about this important work, I caution that we do so with great care, and on the benefit of a carefully collected and substantial body of evidence. This is going to require a rigorous oversight by the Committee and considerable work to get the information that we have need of so that we can legislate properly. And I hope that the undertaking will be bipartisan in order so that any final

1972	product that we complete here moves through the Senate and to
1973	the President's desk for signature.
1974	We have to resolve a number of very important high line
1975	and hard questions to inform our work as we move forward. I
1976	respectfully suggest that these questions includedor rather
1977	include but are not limited to the following. First, how do
1978	we improve and protect American's access to content, while
1979	also preserving the ability of private companies to monetize
1980	their investments for future growth? Likewise, how do we
1981	best foster the ongoing development of future technologies
1982	that will ensure American leadership in the fields of
1983	technology and communications? And then we have to decide
1984	how we are to promote the more efficient and fair use of
1985	value and increasingly scarce commodities like spectrum,
1986	which we have not administered too well of late, and if
1987	administered at off times on the basis of perhaps the amount
1988	that we could get for it in money rather than how it would
1989	serve the nation to allocate this spectrum? Lastly, we are
1990	going to have to decide how we will ensure that the Federal
1991	Communications Commission, the National Telecommunications
1992	and Information Administration, and other related bodies

1993 function smoothly, protect consumers and promote growth 1994 rather than hindering it. Regardless of these answers, and 1995 the answers to these questions and others, I submit that our 1996 work should proceed from the conviction that the public 1997 interest is still and always going to remain the central 1998 concern that we have with regard to the Communications Act. 1999 I have had the good fortune to be one of the authors of 2000 almost every major piece of telecommunications legislation 2001 passed by the Congress in the past three decades. And the 2002 public interest is in the heart of each, going back to the 2003 '33 and '34 Act. I see no reason why that should be any 2004 different this time around. The only issue here worth 2005 exploring is what that standard has meant in years past, and whether there is any reason to give the Commission different 2006 quidance for the future in interpreting it as we address the 2007 2008 other questions I have just outlined.

2009 Mr. Chairman, I wish you God speed in this endeavor. 2010 And I offer you my support. And I am delighted that the 2011 Chairman of the Commission who have been here this morning to 2012 assist us in beginning this process, which I hope will go 2013 forward with reasonable speed, with great care and again,

2014	with great attention to the public interest. I thank you all
2015	for listening to me.
2016	Mr. {Walden.} Chairman Dingell, thank you for your kind
2017	comments and your always generous words and willingness to
2018	work to improve our communication and other laws. We look
2019	forward to working with you. My only disappointment is you
2020	did not have a list of yes or no questions for this panel.
2021	{Voice.} Yes.
2022	Mr. {Walden.} Now, with that, we will turn to Mr. Terry
2023	from Nebraska. And we look forward to your comments and
2024	questions, sir.
2025	Mr. {Terry.} Yes, you do. Thank you. And I just, for
2026	our esteemed guests here today, I want to follow-up on what
2027	my friend from California, Ms. Matsui, began. And that is
2028	with high cost areas. But I want to take it from a little
2029	bit different angle and get your input.
2030	As kind of mentioned here, we have seen a convergence of
2031	technologies and services that are all kind of being wrapped
2032	into one anymore. And the same aswe talked about it in my
2033	early days on this Committee in voice, and Barton brought
2034	that up. Well, now, it is in video. And so when we talk

about a rural telecom and the Internet as a basis of 2035 2036 delivering video today, it is kind of making--well, it is 2037 altering the way that rural telecoms used to work. And so we 2038 have a current legal structure with this QRA, and a mindset 2039 of--on treating rural telecoms like old copper wires, which a 2040 lot of them still are using. So I just want to ask your 2041 opinions about in Reform 4--or within the FCC, should rural 2042 and high cost areas--so, Mr. Copps, it even comes back to 2043 inner-city where you have low-take by high-cost. How do we 2044 think about this differently in making sure that if you live 2045 in rural America, or you are setting up a wind farm where you 2046 want to continuously oversee but remotely, thereby requiring broad broadband for all of that data? Do we need to think 2047 2048 about things differently than high-cost, rural high-cost, 2049 inner-city? Mr. Wiley, why don't we start with you? Mr. {Wiley.} Well, I am not an expert in the rural 2050 2051 telephone area. But I still think there is a concern that is 2052 different than in the big cities. And I think, therefore, 2053 high-cost funds still are something that have to be part of 2054 the full equation, in my opinion. And you know that better than anybody in Nebraska. 2055
2056 Mr. {Terry.} Yeah. 2057 Mr. {Wiley.} So I don't have any huge input to you 2058 today as to how to change the system. 2059 Mr. {Terry.} Yeah. And later, I guess to clarify, since video and Internet are becoming the same, and your 2060 telecom is really maybe your sole provider of that, it is all 2061 2062 meshed together. Does that change anything, Mr. Hundt? 2063 Mr. {Hundt.} I think that many people have said we 2064 really want broadband to be the network for everyone in the 2065 country. In rural areas, as I am sure you know, Congressman, there are many places where the cable broadband penetration 2066 2067 is as low as 15 and 20 percent, not anything nearly as high 2068 as it is in Washington D.C. or in the suburbs. Now, that is a problem that the FCC really does need to think about in 2069 conjunction with the industry that Michael represents so 2070 ably. And in particular, not to touch too many other 2071 2072 buttons, the recent increases in the prices of the content 2073 have a disproportionate impact in rural America. Because 2074 when those content price increases are passed on by the cable 2075 industry, they are taking a lot of money out of the wallets of the people in those areas, and those are the same areas 2076

2077 where broadband is expensive. And so as people are paying 2078 more for the broadcast content and the cable channel content, 2079 they have less available to purchase broadband. This is a 2080 problem that is real and existing right now. And this also 2081 gives me a chance to pass the solution over to the--to 2082 Chairman Powell.

2083 Mr. {Powell.} Congressman, I think you make a couple of 2084 important points that we should just put top of mind, which 2085 is the challenge of reaching that last five to seven percent 2086 is because under traditional market fundamentals, they are 2087 uneconomic. And if they are uneconomic, the only way to cure 2088 something is you have to change the economic equation. This 2089 is why I have always had no problem understanding and 2090 respecting the government has a meaningful and significant 2091 role in terms of our ubiquity objectives in universal 2092 service, of universality and affordability, to play a role 2093 through either the universal service program or any other 2094 properly constructed program to try to change the economic 2095 equation that attracts the infrastructure that those 2096 communities deserve.

2097 I think it is a more optimistic scenario in the modern

2098 world than it was before. Because in the old world, we had a 2099 single technology that tried to string twisted copper wire 2100 between two farms 300 miles apart, and that was enormously 2101 and hideously expensive. One of the things I think really 2102 opens up an opportunity today is because of a common IP 2103 platform, we can essentially deliver almost any kind of 2104 service over almost any kind of network. So that means that 2105 wireless and probably its companion of satellite available 2106 services have real hope and promise for rural America. That 2107 is they have very dynamically different cost characteristics. 2108 A satellite at 28,000 feet sees rural Nebraska no differently 2109 than it sees Manhattan. Wireless has a much lower cost 2110 infrastructure for some of those areas. So I think that 2111 isn't a complete answer. But putting a lot of energy and 2112 investment into how those services will solve those problems 2113 is useful. And I think as the Chairman of the FCC is moving toward and IP network common regulatory proceeding, that 2114 2115 convergence you are talking about also can get harmonized and 2116 the universal service program get harmonized along with it. 2117 Mr. {Terry.} Thank you. Agree.

2118 Mr. {Copps.} I have a little different answer.

2119 Reasonably comparable services at reasonably comparable 2120 prices is the injunction and the charge of the 2121 Telecommunications Act. Reforming USF, which the Commission 2122 is in the process of doing with lots of wrinkles and problems 2123 to work out, no question about that, is certainly an 2124 important part of the equation. But anybody who thinks that 2125 the universal service fund alone is going to bring this 2126 country the kind of high speed low-cost broadband that we 2127 need to have to be competitive in the world arena in the 21st 2128 century, I think is not looking at the situation as it is. 2129 This has to be an infrastructure mission. Our country has 2130 had infrastructure missions before when we came together to 2131 build highways and railroads and rural electricity, and so on 2132 and so forth. And that is what we need now. We are not 2133 going to be competitive. We are not going to get out of the holes that we are in unless every citizen in this country has 2134 2135 that access. And, yes, it is reaching that last five to 2136 seven percent. That is extremely important. But way more than half of our homes don't have the kind of high speed, 2137 2138 low-cost broadband, fiber broadband, that we are going to really need to be competitive. So we need to look at that, 2139

2140 not just as an FCC problem but as a problem confronting our 2141 government and our society, and act upon it and figure out 2142 whether we are really serious of being competitive in the 2143 global sweepstakes. 2144 Mr. {Terry.} Thank you. 2145 Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman yields back. I look to the 2146 gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Lujan, for 5--2147 Mr. {Lujan.} Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. And I 2148 must say, I was concerned with some of the approach that was 2149 being taken in the line of questioning leading up to those 2150 last responses to my colleague where for the first time I heard the importance of rural America. Coming from a western 2151 2152 state, a congressional district that represents 17 of New 2153 Mexico's 22 tribes and the sprawling nature associated with 2154 what the west brings us, many parts of rural America where 2155 our food is grown, where energy is generated, critically 2156 important to be able to get coverage to these areas. And as 2157 I joked with Chairman Wheeler when we had him in front of us 2158 a couple of weeks ago, I explained to him that, you know, 2159 these last flights home, it has been great to see the TSA debating whether we can make phone calls at 30,000 feet. 2160 Ι

2161 know that I have streaming video content at 30,000 feet. I 2162 can communicate with my office and anyone else that I so 2163 choose to. So if I can communicate with constituents and get 2164 the video content that I want at 30,000 feet, why can't I do 2165 it on the ground in rural America? The technology is here. 2166 And there is no reason that we can't push it out. To the 2167 three responses, I just can't say thanks enough for that. 2168 Chairman Copps, with the response associated with the 2169 very aggressive push to infrastructure investment in America, 2170 it is absolutely needed. And we shouldn't forget, especially 2171 as we talk about different ideals and philosophies that we have on this Committee, and even in this Congress and across 2172 2173 the country, that it was in many conservative and rural parts 2174 of America that benefited from government investment with 2175 rural electrification, with major water projects that provide 2176 us power now that could be in question because of water 2177 flows--a whole other topic of conversation, but nonetheless 2178 that we need to make sure that we are addressing. So, Chairman Powell, you talked about twisted pairs and 2179

2180 what that brought us, decisions that were made as a result of 2181 the '96 Act. And looking at Section 706(a), I am not certain

2182 what we are arguing about with concerns in that particular 2183 area. It is encouraging deployment of reasonable and timely 2184 basis on advanced telecom, especially for educational 2185 purposes. There may be some concerns with some of my 2186 colleagues on a price cap regulation. But regulatory for 2187 bands, measures that promote competition in local markets. 2188 This could be read by any member on this Committee, 2189 encouraging ideals that I think that we all share. 2190 But one thing that hasn't been talked about very much--2191 and even given the fact that there was a huge data breach 2192 with Target, 70 million customers that were impacted, is the security of this network. I would hope that -- and I would 2193 2194 like to get your opinion if 706(a) provides us the necessary 2195 standards to be able to bring safeguards, or if you think 2196 that that is something that needs to be addressed? And I 2197 would like to invite comments from each of you. Mr. Hundt? Mr. {Hundt.} As Chairman Powell said, Section 1706 is 2198 2199 very broad. And I think that it is an opportunity and a duty for the FCC to dig into it and to create an appropriate 2200 2201 framework, with the help of this Committee and its counterpart in the Senate. If I might continue your point --2202

2203 your theme of rural America, there are a number of other 2204 provisions as well in the '96 Act that the FCC can use to try 2205 to achieve the goal of completely widespread broadband, even 2206 in rural and high cost areas. And one that I would identify 2207 is the current proceeding to re-imagine the E-Rate. 2208 The E-Rate, if we went--I just recently met with the 2209 chief librarian in Pima County, Arizona, which isn't very far 2210 away from you. And you know the geography is not dissimilar. 2211 They have a fantastic system of broadband for not just the 2212 central library in Tucson, but all the branch libraries. All 2213 over this very, very sparsely populated geography, the 2214 library is the number one public Internet access point in 2215 southern Arizona. Therefore, it is the proper focus of extra E-Rate support, and the proper focus of the combination of 2216 2217 network architectures that might well resemble what Chairman 2218 Powell was talking about. We shouldn't decide that part. 2219 But we should decide that is a very flexible tool, also, that 2220 can be used to deliver the right participation in the 2221 American community to rural America. 2222 Mr. {Lujan.} Chairman Powell? 2223 Mr. {Powell.} Congressman, I really would like to put a

2224 punctuation on what you raise. Because I think it goes to 2225 the Committee's desire, I hope, to try to harmonize and see 2226 the communication landscape as a single ecosystem. All the 2227 wonderful benefits we are bragging and celebrating are continuously and daily at risk. I think cyber threat, data 2228 2229 retention, breach are all issues that are the Achilles Heel 2230 of all the promise of the network that we are celebrating. 2231 But they require very complex solutions that look through an 2232 entire ecosystem. 706 is no more--is not particularly up to 2233 that job. Why? Even for no other reason that you can't have 2234 a discussion without software involved. The cyber security 2235 question on a global--ecosystem basis means a conversation 2236 with every element of that massive connective chain. And 2237 that is the web companies, the infrastructure companies, 2238 wireless companies, content companies, there is just no way, 2239 in my opinion, even with its breadth that one could look 2240 hopefully to that as the single point of authority to make 2241 the most meaningful impact on this issue, mostly because 50 percent of that ecosystem aren't even implicated by that 2242 2243 provision.

2244 Mr. {Lujan.} Chairman?

2245 Mr. {Copps.} I hope 706 is up to the job. I think it 2246 does confer a lot of authority. But I don't want this to 2247 become just a solution de jure and we talk about 706 for the 2248 next 2 years. And then another court somewhere strikes that 2249 down or whatever. I do want to highlight one thing that you 2250 mentioned in terms of getting broadband out. And I commend 2251 you for your interest and your work with native lands and 2252 Native Americans. And one area where I think maybe a rewrite 2253 would help would be to more formally institutionalize--put 2254 some flesh on the bones of the trust relationship and the 2255 consulted--consultative mechanisms that we have between the 2256 Commission and Native Americans. It is not--it is working 2257 better than it has. I think there has been more emphasis in recent years. Obviously, back in Chairman Kennard's time, 2258 2259 who is not here today, there was an interest in moving us 2260 forward and getting us into a new trust relationship. But that is 13 or 14 years ago. And the situation, as you point 2261 2262 out, is so dire when one member of a tribe can't call 2263 somebody else, but you can make the call from 30,000 feet. 2264 That is something wrong there. But that might be a concrete area where the Commission can--or where the Congress can 2265

2266	actually lend a hand.
2267	Mr. {Lujan.} Appreciate that.
2268	Mr. {Walden.} Appreciate that. The gentleman's time
2269	has expired. We will now go to the gentleman from New
2270	Jersey, Mr. Lance, for 5 minutes.
2271	Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And to the
2272	distinguished panel, this is among the most interesting
2273	hearings in which I have ever participated. And it is my
2274	honor to be able to meet all of you.
2275	I gather there is a consensus from the distinguished
2276	panel that the 1996 legislation needs, to some extent,
2277	statutory update and revision, is that accurate, from the
2278	panel?
2279	{Voice.} I would agree.
2280	Mr. {Hundt.} I don't agree.
2281	Mr. {Guthrie.} And, Chairman Hundt, if you would
2282	indicate why you do not agree there needs to be statutory
2283	update?
2284	Mr. {Hundt.} I think that the D.C. Circuit has made it
2285	very clear that the '96 Act has given the authority to the
2286	FCC to address all the economic and social problems that this

2287	Committee, in recent years and in past years, has asked the
2288	FCC to address.
2289	Mr. {Guthrie.} Other distinguished members
2290	Mr. {Copps.} I basically concur and agree with what
2291	Chairman Hundt has said.
2292	Mr. {Guthrie.} Um-hum.
2293	Mr. {Copps.} Sure, it is always nice to have some
2294	additional clarity. But time is of the essence here. We
2295	have a statute that I think can deliver on a lot of the
2296	things that need to be delivered, and we should be about that
2297	job. I justit is so difficult to see the correlation of
2298	forces coming together to give birth to an act after what we
2299	went through in 1996. And I don't think it is going to be
2300	any easier in 2014 to do that than it was 18 years ago.
2301	Mr. {Guthrie.} Chairman Powell?
2302	Mr. {Powell.} I think by any measure, a deliberative
2303	process in the legislature would take a meaningful number of
2304	years, as the chairmanas Chairman Walden himself has
2305	recognized in setting out a multi-year process. I do think
2306	there are sufficient conditions to justify the institution of
2307	that kind of examination over that period of time, because I

2308	think the market is radically different and the relevancy of
2309	law as applied to reality should be a core principle of
2310	governance.
2311	Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you.
2312	Mr. {Wiley.} I think the very fact that you didn't have
2313	the Internet really developed, you didn't have broadband, you
2314	didn't have all the technological changes that have occurred
2315	since 1996, really gives I think substance to taking another
2316	look. And I think that gives Congress an opportunity I think
2317	to perhaps make some suggestions to the regulatory body that
2318	I think would be very helpful.
2319	Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you, Chairman Wiley. Am I
2320	accurateI have not read the decision. I have reviewed its
2321	consequences, but I have not read it. And I certainly will
2322	read yesterday's decision. Am I accurate that the FCC
2323	decided in 2004 that Internet access services would not be
2324	classified as telecommunications services? Is that true,
2325	Chairman Powell?
2326	Mr. {Powell.} Yes, sir. That is correct.
2327	Mr. {Guthrie.} And if that decision were to be
2328	revisited, that could be revisited by the administrative

2329	agency, is that accurate as to how it could proceed?
2330	Mr. {Powell.} It is accurate. It could.
2331	Mr. {Guthrie.} And if there were to be a revisiting of
2332	the 2004 decision that this is not classified as
2333	telecommunications services, then there would have to be an
2334	extensive period of review, and there would have to be some
2335	sort of high level determination as to why a different
2336	decision were to be made. Is that the way it would work?
2337	Mr. {Powell.} Yes. Under administrative law, even with
2338	deference, the Agency has to provide a reasoned explanation
2339	for its change in policy. It would require a notice and
2340	comment proceeding, which is open.
2341	Mr. {Guthrie.} Yes.
2342	Mr. {Powell.} And I wouldn'tyou know, the suggestion
2343	has been made that somehow that would lead to instant
2344	clarity. It would lead to another three to four year period
2345	of conflict and litigation
2346	Mr. {Guthrie.} And litigation. And, Chairman Copps?
2347	Mr. {Copps.} But I would just say I don't think it
2348	would take forever to compile that record. I and a lot of
2349	other people I know would be happy to contribute to the

2350	rational for that sort of action. So it is not really
2351	starting aton the tabula rasa. I think a lot of that
2352	information is out there. It was just a route not taken.
2353	And now we need to go back and look at it.
2354	Mr. {Guthrie.} And the FCC's reclassification would be
2355	considered arbitrary and capricious unless there were a
2356	period of comment and refreshing the record, and some sort of
2357	heightened standard, is that accurate legally?
2358	Mr. {Powell.} Yes, sir. They have to follow the
2359	Administrative Procedure Act obligations.
2360	{Voice.} And I am certain they would.
2361	Mr. {Guthrie.} I would presume that would be the case.
2362	And, finally, the decision that yesterday possibly could be
2363	appealed to the Supreme Court, but it is not clear whether or
2364	not either side is likely to do that.
2365	{Voice.} That is correct.
2366	Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you very much. My time has
2367	expired, Mr. Chairman.
2368	Mr. {Walden.} I thank the gentleman. Now, I turn to
2369	Mr. Long from Missouri. I think our last member to ask
2370	questions. Please go ahead.

Mr. {Long.} Thank you, Chairman. And, Chairman Hundt, 2371 2372 last night you said that you spent quite a bit of time trying 2373 to go through the court ruling of yesterday. And most of the 2374 congressmen were home trying to read through a 1,562 page bill that we are going to be voting on this afternoon. So I 2375 have ordered my staff to bring a copy of that to you. And if 2376 2377 you could peruse that over your lunch hour and kind of 2378 decipher it for me, I would appreciate it.

2379 Earlier in your testimony, Chairman Hundt, you said 2380 that--and I didn't get--understand your point, I don't think, 2381 concerning the auction. You said, if I remember right, that 2382 we need a cap so people know what they are buying. Can you 2383 kind of tell me what you were--in full disclosure, I come 2384 from a 30 year career as an auctioneer before I came to 2385 Congress a few years ago. So I have got a lot of interest in 2386 how an auction operates and try and make it operate the best 2387 it can for the public and the taxpayers.

2388 Mr. {Hundt.} I remember very well that in our first 2389 auction, we had Senator Burns who had a--

2390 Mr. {Long.} Conrad Burns, you are right.

2391 Mr. {Hundt.} --come and conduct the very first auction.

2392 Mr. {Long.} He is from Missouri. Now, he served from 2393 Montana, but he is originally from Missouri. So that is two 2394 of us. 2395 Mr. {Hundt.} He did claim that particular heritage. And he did a great job. And I would recommend to Chairman 2396 2397 Wheeler that he should come and ask you to conduct the next 2398 auction. 2399 Mr. {Long.} I am not worried about conducting as much 2400 as I am the--you know, how it is put together. And that is 2401 what I have been trying to drill down on. 2402 Mr. {Hundt.} Well--Mr. {Long.} But what was your comment? I didn't 2403 2404 understand you said that we need a cap so people know what 2405 they are buying. What exactly did you mean? 2406 Mr. {Hundt.} So in any auction, when folks come in, you 2407 want the high bidder to be able to walk away with whatever 2408 was auctioned. And the way to do that I believe is to make 2409 sure that everybody bidding in that auction knows the 2410 following, what are the rules about how much you can buy. It 2411 doesn't have to be a cap. It could be -- some people think it should be an aggregation level. There is many different ways 2412

2413 to define it. But people ought to know as they are about to 2414 take the money out of the wallet, as they are about to raise 2415 the hand and say that they are putting in the high bid, they 2416 ought to know that they can walk away with whatever they can 2417 buy, instead of having to have another proceeding where they 2418 ask the FCC or the Department of Justice later, am I 2419 permitted to walk away with this, because I don't know 2420 whether or not I have violated any of your aggregation rules. 2421 So this Congress, in the Incentive Auction Rule, did say that 2422 the FCC should create a generally applicable aggregation rule. And I think that was a very wise thing to do, that way 2423 2424 everybody going into the auction can estimate in advance 2425 whether or not what they buy is what they--what they bid on 2426 and win on is what they can walk away with.

Mr. {Long.} Okay. Talking to the interested parties that are interested in buying this spectrum, they have told me--and this is probably a topic for another day. But they said if they can buy A, B and C spectrum, then maybe they want to buy L, M, N, O, P later in the auction. Or if they can't buy A, B and C, L, M, N, O, P doesn't--if they can't but that too, then the first three things that they bought--

2434 so it is a very confusing situation. So do you any of you 2435 have any staff--anybody you want to get with my staff that we 2436 can talk about to kind of sort that out, I would appreciate 2437 it. 2438 I want to move to Chairman Wiley for a minute. If you 2439 turn on the TV at night, the only reason it is not 100 2440 percent phone company ads and the cellular companies and 2441 things is because it is interspersed with auto insurance ads. 2442 So there would be more--so it seems like there is quite a bit 2443 of competition out there now. And as far as the auction that 2444 I was talking about with Chairman Hundt, the wireless market 2445 I think appears to be extremely competitive. And you do have 2446 larger companies, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, Sprint. And given 2447 that, doesn't it make sense that the FCC--why will they-should they not--they shouldn't handicap bidders, should 2448 2449 they, to get the most money for the taxpayers and have the 2450 best auction they can where either some people are wanting to 2451 limit who can buy what? Can you kind of walk me through 2452 that?

2453 Mr. {Wiley.} Well, my view is that the auction ought to 2454 be available, open to all. I think if Congress really wants

to see the maximum amount of revenue derived in order to 2455 2456 support the public safety network we are going to have to pay 2457 the broadcasters, it is a very complex process. And I do--I 2458 am concerned about the fact that we start to begin to limit people in this that you are going to find you are going to 2459 2460 have less revenue than might be otherwise anticipated. I 2461 think a free auction ought to be open to all. 2462 Mr. {Long.} All right. When people would attend my 2463 auction, I was always interested in having the most people 2464 there and having them spend the most money that they could. And if they didn't want to bid, I would bid for them. I 2465 2466 would tell them just to hold their hand up in the air. And 2467 when they paid enough, I would tell them to take it down. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2468 2469 That is quite an auction. {Voice.}

Mr. {Walden.} I want to thank our distinguished panel of witnessed, both for your prior government service and your continuing involvement and interest in public policy to assist us in our mission and goals in updating the Communications Act. I draw attention to those who are observing our hearing. They can go to our hashtag and--at

2476	CommsActUpdate. I think it is right in front hereand give
2477	us your information. A lot of people have been doing that
2478	during the hearing. We appreciate that. Another reflection
2479	of how technology is changing the world, and we need to keep
2480	up with it. So thank you for your participation. Our
2481	Subcommittee stands adjourned.
2482	[Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., the subcommittee was
2483	adjourned.]