

Steady, sustainable growth requires making it easier for small businesses to access capital and new markets. And when about one-third of small businesses in the region are run by women, then steady, sustainable growth requires every woman's ability to fully participate in the economy. That's true in the United States; that's true everywhere.

Steady, sustainable growth requires promoting policies and practices that keep the Internet open and accessible.

Steady, sustainable growth requires a planet where citizens can breathe clean air and drink clean water and eat safe food and make a living fishing healthy oceans.

Steady, sustainable growth requires mobilizing the talents and resources of all our people, regardless of gender or religion or color or creed; offering them the opportunity to participate in open and transparent political and economic systems, where we cast a harsh light on bribery and corruption and a well-deserved spotlight on those who strive to play by the rules.

Those are all some of the areas we'll be focused on at APEC this week and going forward. And obviously, every country is different; no country is following the same model. But there are things that bind us together, and despite our differences, we know there are certain standards and ideals that will benefit all people.

We know that if given a choice, our young people would demand more access to the world's information, not less. We know that if allowed to organize, our workers would better—demand working conditions that don't injure them, that keep them safe; that they're looking for stronger labor and environmental safeguards, not weaker. We know that if given a voice, women wouldn't say give us less;

they'd speak up for more access to more markets, more access to capital, more seats in our legislature and our boardrooms.

And so these are all key issues in growth as well. Sometimes, we focus just on trade and investment and dollars and cents, but these things are important as well. These ideals aren't just topics for summits and state visits, they're touchstones of the world that we're going to leave to our children. The United States is not just here in Asia to check a box, we're here because we believe our shared future is here in Asia, just as our shared past has been.

We're looking to a future where a worker in any of our countries can afford to provide for his family; where his daughter can go to school and start a business and have a fair shot at success; where fundamental rights are cherished and protected and not denied. And that future is one where our success is defined less by armies and less by bureaucrats, and more by entrepreneurs and innovators, by dreamers and doers, by business leaders who focus as much on the workers they empower as the prosperity that they create. That's the future that we seek. That's why we're here. It's why we've worked so closely together these past several years. And as long as I'm America's President, I'm going to be invested in your success because I believe it is essential to our success as well.

Thank you very much. *Xiè xie.*

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:51 p.m. at the China National Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Andrew N. Liveris, president, chairman, and chief executive officer, Dow Chemical Co. He also referred to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) terrorist organization; and the Information Technology Agreement (ITA).

Statement on Internet Neutrality November 10, 2014

An open Internet is essential to the American economy and increasingly to our very way of life. By lowering the cost of launching a new idea, igniting new political move-

ments, and bringing communities closer together, it has been one of the most significant democratizing influences the world has ever known.

“Net neutrality” has been built into the fabric of the Internet since its creation, but it is also a principle that we cannot take for granted. We cannot allow Internet service providers (ISPs) to restrict the best access or to pick winners and losers in the online marketplace for services and ideas. That is why today I am asking the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to answer the call of almost 4 million public comments and implement the strongest possible rules to protect net neutrality.

When I was a candidate for this office, I made clear my commitment to a free and open Internet, and my commitment remains as strong as ever. Four years ago, the FCC tried to implement rules that would protect net neutrality with little to no impact on the telecommunications companies that make important investments in our economy. After the rules were challenged, the court reviewing the rules agreed with the FCC that net neutrality was essential for preserving an environment that encourages new investment in the network, new online services and content, and everything else that makes up the Internet as we now know it. Unfortunately, the court ultimately struck down the rules, not because it disagreed with the need to protect net neutrality, but because it believed the FCC had taken the wrong legal approach.

The FCC is an independent agency, and ultimately this decision is theirs alone. I believe the FCC should create a new set of rules protecting net neutrality and ensuring that neither the cable company nor the phone company will be able to act as a gatekeeper, restricting what you can do or see online. The rules I am asking for are simple, commonsense steps that reflect the Internet you and I use every day and that some ISPs already observe. These bright-line rules include:

- *No blocking.* If a consumer requests access to a website or service, and the content is legal, your ISP should not be permitted to block it. That way, every player—not just those commercially affiliated with an ISP—gets a fair shot at your business.
- *No throttling.* Nor should ISPs be able to intentionally slow down some content or speed up others—through a process often called “throttling”—based on the type of service or your ISP’s preferences.
- *Increased transparency.* The connection between consumers and ISPs—the so-called last mile—is not the only place some sites might get special treatment. So I am also asking the FCC to make full use of the transparency authorities the court recently upheld and, if necessary, to apply net neutrality rules to points of interconnection between the ISP and the rest of the Internet.
- *No paid prioritization.* Simply put: No service should be stuck in a “slow lane” because it does not pay a fee. That kind of gatekeeping would undermine the level playing field essential to the Internet’s growth. So, as I have before, I am asking for an explicit ban on paid prioritization and any other restriction that has a similar effect.

If carefully designed, these rules should not create any undue burden for ISPs and can have clear, monitored exceptions for reasonable network management and for specialized services such as dedicated, mission-critical networks serving a hospital. But combined, these rules mean everything for preserving the Internet’s openness.

The rules also have to reflect the way people use the Internet today, which increasingly means on a mobile device. I believe the FCC should make these rules fully applicable to mobile broadband as well, while recognizing the special challenges that come with managing wireless networks.

To be current, these rules must also build on the lessons of the past. For almost a century, our law has recognized that companies who connect you to the world have special obligations not to exploit the monopoly they enjoy over access in and out of your home or business. That is why a phone call from a customer of one phone company can reliably reach a customer of a different one and why you will

not be penalized solely for calling someone who is using another provider. It is common sense that the same philosophy should guide any service that is based on the transmission of information, whether a phone call or a packet of data.

So the time has come for the FCC to recognize that broadband service is of the same importance and must carry the same obligations as so many of the other vital services do. To do that, I believe the FCC should reclassify consumer broadband service under title II of the Telecommunications Act, while at the same time forbearing from rate regulation and other provisions less relevant to broadband services. This is a basic acknowledgment of the services ISPs provide to American homes and businesses and the straightforward obligations necessary to ensure the network works for everyone, not just one or two companies.

Investment in wired and wireless networks has supported jobs and made America the center of a vibrant ecosystem of digital devices, apps, and platforms that fuel growth and expand opportunity. Importantly, network investment remained strong under the previous net neu-

trality regime, before it was struck down by the court; in fact, the court agreed that protecting net neutrality helps foster more investment and innovation. If the FCC appropriately forbears from the title II regulations that are not needed to implement the principles above—principles that most ISPs have followed for years—it will help ensure new rules are consistent with incentives for further investment in the infrastructure of the Internet.

The Internet has been one of the greatest gifts our economy—and our society—has ever known. The FCC was chartered to promote competition, innovation, and investment in our networks. In service of that mission, there is no higher calling than protecting an open, accessible, and free Internet. I thank the Commissioners for having served this cause with distinction and integrity, and I respectfully ask them to adopt the policies I have outlined here, to preserve this technology's promise for today and future generations to come.

NOTE: A related video of remarks by the President was released by the White House Press Office, and no transcript was provided.

Letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives Transmitting Budget Amendments for Fiscal Year 2015

November 10, 2014

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I ask the Congress to consider the enclosed Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Budget amendments for the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of State and Other International Programs (State/OIP) to fund Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). These amendments would provide \$5.6 billion for OCO activities to degrade and ultimately defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)—including military operations as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Accordingly, this request would provide \$5.0 billion for DOD OCO activities in addition to the \$58.6 billion DOD OCO request I submitted to the Congress in June 2014, and

would result in a total DOD OCO request for FY 2015 of \$63.6 billion. This amount is \$15.8 billion less than the \$79.4 billion placeholder for DOD OCO in the FY 2015 Budget. The request would also provide \$520 million for State/OIP OCO activities, which is in addition to the \$7.3 billion I requested for State/OIP OCO activities in the FY 2015 Budget and the June budget amendment.

The approach to counter ISIL has evolved with emerging requirements identified subsequent to the June OCO amendment, and therefore not previously requested. These amendments include the additional funding necessary to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy.