

2006." Joining me today as original cosponsors of this important legislation are Rep. RICK BOUCHER, Rep. ANNA ESHOO and Rep. JAY INSLEE.

Broadband networks, Mr. Speaker, are the lifeblood of our emerging digital economy. These broadband networks also hold the promise of promoting innovation in various markets and technologies, creating jobs, and furthering education. The worldwide leadership that the U.S. provides in high technology is directly related to the government-driven policies over decades which have ensured that telecommunications networks are open to all lawful uses and all users. The Internet, which is accessible to more and more Americans with every day that goes by on such broadband networks, was also founded upon an open architecture protocol and as a result it has provided low barriers to entry for web-based content, applications, and services.

Recent decisions by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and court interpretations, however, put these aspects of broadband networks and the Internet in jeopardy. The corrosion of historic policies of non-discrimination by the imposition of bottlenecks by broadband network owners endanger economic growth, innovation, job creation, and First Amendment freedom of expression on such networks. Broadband network owners should not be able to determine who can and who cannot offer services over broadband networks or over the Internet. The detrimental effect to the digital economy would be quite severe if such conduct were permitted and became widespread.

This network neutrality bill has essentially three parts. The first part articulates overall broadband and network neutrality goals for the country, and spells out exactly what network neutrality means and puts it into the statute so that it will possess the force of law. The second part embodies reasonable exceptions to the general rules, such as to route emergency communications or offer consumer protection features, such as spam blocking technology. And the final part of the bill features an expedited complaint process to deal with grievances and violations within thirty days.

The legislation states that a broadband network provider may not block, impair, degrade or discriminate against the ability of any person to use a broadband connection to access the content, applications, and services available on broadband networks, including the Internet. It ensures that broadband network providers operate their networks in a non-discriminatory manner. The bill also ensures that consumers can attach any device to the broadband operator's network, such as an Internet phone, or wi-fi router, or settop box, or any other innovative gadget invented in the coming years. Moreover, in order to prevent the warping of the World Wide Web into a system of "tiered service," the legislation will prevent broadband providers from charging new bottleneck fees for enhanced quality of service or the prioritization of bits.

Finally, if a broadband provider chooses to prioritize data of any type, it requires that it do so for all data of that type and not charge a fee for such prioritization. For instance, if a broadband provider wants to prioritize the transmission of bits representing a VOIP phone call for its own VOIP service, it must do so for all VOIP services so as not to put its competitors at an arbitrary disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of Internet time until August of 2005, the Internet's non-discriminatory nature was safeguarded from being compromised by Federal Communications Commission rules that required non-discriminatory treatment by telecommunications carriers. In other words, no commercial telecommunications carrier could engage in discriminatory conduct regarding Internet traffic and Internet access because it was prohibited by law.

In August of 2005, however, the Federal Communications Commission reclassified broadband access to the Internet in a way which removed such legal protections. And how did the industry respond to this change? Just a few weeks after the FCC removed the Internet's protections, the Chairman of then-SBC Communications made the following statement in a November 7th *Business Week* interview: "Now what they [Google, Yahoo, MSN] would like to do is use my pipes free, but I ain't going to let them do that because we have spent this capital and we have to have a return on it. So there's going to have to be some mechanism for these people who use these pipes to pay for the portion they're using. . . ."

In a December 1, 2005 Washington Post article, a BellSouth executive indicated that his company wanted to strike deals to give certain Web sites priority treatment in reaching computer users. The article noted this would "significantly change how the Internet operates" and that the BellSouth executive said "his company should be allowed to charge a rival voice-over-Internet firm so that its service can operate with the same quality as BellSouth's offering." Meaning, that if the rival firm did not pay, or was not permitted to pay for competitive reasons, its service presumably would not "operate with the same quality" as BellSouth's own product.

Finally, on January 6, 2006, the CEO of Verizon, in an address to the Consumer Electronics Show also indicated that Verizon would now be the corporate arbiter of how traffic would be treated when he said the following: "We have to make sure [content providers] don't sit on our network and chew up our capacity."

I think these statements should give pause to those who might argue that we shouldn't do anything to enact strong network neutrality provisions because currently no harm is being done.

Do we really have to wait till these corporate giants divide and conquer the open architecture of the Internet to make that against the law? These telephone company executives are telling us that they intend to discriminate in the prioritization of bits and to discriminate in the offering of "quality of service" functions—for a new fee, a new broadband bottleneck toll—to access high bandwidth customers, we cannot afford to wait until they actually start doing that before we step in to stop it.

Once they start making money by leveraging that bottleneck position in the marketplace, will a future Congress really stare them down and take that revenue stream away?

Mr. Speaker, if we don't protect the openness of the Internet for entrepreneurial activity, we're ruining a wonderful model for low barrier entry, innovation, and job creation. Broadband network owners should not be able to deter-

mine who can and who cannot offer services over broadband networks or over the Internet. The detrimental effect to the digital economy would be quite severe if such conduct were permitted and became widespread. The deterioration of significant policies of non-discrimination by the imposition of artificial bottlenecks by broadband network owners imperil economic growth, innovation, job creation, and First Amendment freedom of expression on such networks.

The Network Neutrality Act of 2006 offers Members a clear choice. It is a choice between favoring the broadband designs of a small handful of very large companies, and safeguarding the dreams of thousands of inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses. This legislation is designed to save the Internet and thwart those who seek to fundamentally and detrimentally alter the Internet as we know it. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill and urge the House to take a decisive stand in favor of network neutrality.

DARFUR PEACE AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2006

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, and I thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Payne, for his leadership on this issue—it is one of the critical moral issues of our times.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It is long overdue, and I hope that we remember that passing this bill is not the end of our country's moral obligation to Darfur—merely a starting point for our nation to begin addressing some of the serious problems in that part of the world.

This legislation arrives on the floor of this House not a moment too soon—at time when famine and war have already killed between 200,000 and 400,000 people and displaced over 2 million more Sudanese. It is nothing less than a humanitarian disaster—and unfortunately one that appears to be getting worse.

Among the many tragedies is that, put simply, it did not have to be this way. With the end of the civil war in southern Sudan, these last six months ought to have been an opportunity for progress in Darfur.

Instead, we have seen only more war, more famine, more despair. According to the latest reports, the latest wave of attacks has found thousands of people being chased from dozens of villages by government-backed militias, with death-squad attacks on civilians in Darfur and violence now spilling over into neighboring Chad as well.

And while the African Union forces—numbering only 7,000—are doing what they can, they simply do not have the resources to carry out such a broad mission—particularly with the Sudanese government appearing to be actively obstructing their work. Indeed, one senior U.N. official recently predicted "massively increased mortality" unless effective peacekeepers are installed.

And unfortunately, that has proven increasingly difficult. After two years of sanctions and countless resolutions adopted by this Congress and by the United Nations, the government of Sudan continues to defy the will of the

international community. That makes our action here today ever more important—extending the embargo against Sudan and giving the Treasury Department the authority to freeze the assets of known supporters of the genocide.

Also critical are this legislation's provisions to get the U.N. back into Darfur. Just last week, the government of Sudan blocked the United Nations' top emergency aid official from visiting the western Darfur region. That is why this bill directs the president to use our nation's position on the U.N. Security Council to resolve this matter.

In my view, the best way to end this bloodshed and this human suffering is for the government of Sudan to immediately let the U.N. in to safeguard the residents of Darfur. But should the U.N. not be allowed in, this bill also grants the president the authority to summon NATO and get it more involved—an authority we must not hesitate to use. NATO's readiness to provide more support to the African Union may well prove critical.

Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at a critical juncture. It has been 12 years since the world saw the horror of genocide in Rwanda—a half-century since we saw it on the European continent. Each time, the world has said “never again,” only to stand by as it happens again and again. Today, the House is giving the Administration the tools it needs to act to stop the killing in Darfur—it is a step forward, but certainly not be the last.

Let's pass this legislation and ensure that the people of Darfur can return to their homes and live their lives in peace.

TRIBUTE TO MR. NENAD RADOJA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2006

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure that I congratulate one of the most dedicated, hardworking citizens of Indiana's First Congressional District, Mr. Nenad Radoja. After working for the U.S. Steel, Gary Works Plant for over seven years, Nenad recently accepted the position of Director of Steel Shop at U.S. Steel in Smederevo, in the country of Serbia and Montenegro. Nenad began his new position on March 20, 2006.

Nenad Radoja was born on June 15, 1971, in East Chicago, Indiana. Nenad is one of two children born to Ray and Sandi Radoja. He is the great-grandson of turn-of-the-century Yugoslavian immigrants who came to United States in search of the American Dream. Nenad's grandparents, Risto and Marija Radoja, also immigrated to the United States in 1951 in search of what America had to offer. Upon his arrival, Risto began working at the steel mills in Northwest Indiana. Nenad, surely inspired by his grandfather's work ethic, chose to pursue a similar career in the steel mills.

A lifetime native of Lake County, Indiana, Nenad graduated from Merrillville High School in 1989. Furthering his education, Nenad went on to complete his Baccalaureate Degree in History at Purdue University-Calumet in Hammond, Indiana. He later earned his Master's Degree in Management from Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana.

Prior to transferring to the U.S. Steel Plant in Serbia and Montenegro, Nenad worked at the U.S. Steel, Gary Works Plant for seven years, where he worked in several capacities. Over the years, he worked his way up from Melter to General Foreman to Desulfurization Coordinator, and finally, to Area Coordinator of Operation, a position he held until accepting his new position in Serbia and Montenegro. His exceptional knowledge and expertise in these areas will surely be missed in Northwest Indiana, but his acquisition in Serbia and Montenegro will be a definite improvement to their organization.

Though extremely dedicated to his work, Nenad selflessly gives much of his free time and energy to his community, his friends, and most importantly, his family. Nenad now resides in the capital city of Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro, with his loving wife, Branka, his daughters, Katarina and Sanja, and his son, Stefan.

Also important to note, Nenad is an avid sports fan. In his spare time, Nenad enjoys playing basketball and watching football games.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending and congratulating Nenad Radoja on beginning his new position as Director of Steel Shop at U.S. Steel in Smederevo, Serbia and Montenegro. Nenad has improved the lives of many residents in Indiana's First Congressional District. Northwest Indiana will surely miss Nenad's loyal service and uncompromising dedication.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL ALEXANDER MEYER

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2006

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Mr. Samuel Alexander Meyer for his induction as a laureate in the 2006 Laredo Business Hall of Fame, and for his incredible dedication to the City of Laredo, Texas.

Samuel Alexander Meyer was born on November 19th, 1917, the only child of the late Samuel Meyer of Rochester, New York, and Maryanne Alexander Meyer of Laredo, Texas. During his summers that he spent as a young boy with his Aunt Frances and Uncle Lewis Alexander on Victoria Street, he got to know the City of Laredo.

He graduated from the University of Rochester in 1940 with a bachelor's degree and attended graduate school at the University of Texas with a degree in Spanish and Latin-American civilization. After graduation, Mr. Meyer served in the United States Navy for four years in the South Pacific as an ensign from 1941 to 1946, and joined the faculty at Laredo Junior College in 1947 where he taught Latin-American history and economics for five years.

Mr. Meyer married Olga Rosenbaum, and had three children, Frances Carolyn, Miriam Alexis, and Alexander Samuel Meyer. In 1953, he became a co-owner of Laredo's only Studebaker automotive dealership, and then later assumed responsibility for one of Laredo's first men's stores, Alexander Fine Men's Wear. He

also started Meyer Investments while running the family business.

Mr. Meyer has admirably served the community of Laredo, Texas, through his membership and work in several civic, social, educational, and governmental organizations as chairman of the board of trustees at Laredo Community College, chairman of the board for the Laredo Public Library, member of the Child Welfare Board for Webb County, director of the Laredo Philharmonic Orchestra, a member of the Socratic Club, president of the Civic Music Association, president of the board of the Boys and Girls Club of Laredo, president of the Astronomy Club, a member of the Somosiete hunting lodge, a member of the French Club, and a member of the Stardusters.

For his dedication and hard work in making the Laredo business community stronger and better, he will be honored by the Junior Achievement League in his induction into the 2006 Business Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to recognize the bravery and dedication of Samuel Alexander Meyer, and I thank you for this time.

WILLIAM SLOAN COFFIN, JR.: A COURAGEOUS MAN

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2006

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, Vermont has lost one of its finest, most ethical and courageous residents. The Reverend William Sloan Coffin, Jr., who lived in Stratford, Vermont, has died at the age of 81.

When the Civil Rights Movement began, when a brave coalition of black and white Americans brought the attention of the Nation to the injustice of segregation, Rev. Coffin was there, standing up for what was right. He was a Freedom Rider in Montgomery, Alabama in the early years of the Civil Rights struggle, and was arrested there in 1961. He was arrested in Baltimore two years later in an anti-segregation protest and again a year later in St. Augustine, Florida as he tried to integrate a lunch counter. He was one of those who, in the phrase of the day, “put their bodies on the line” to bring about a more equitable and just America.

When the United States entered Vietnam, and the war escalated, Rev. Coffin was an articulate voice for peace. As Chaplain at Yale University, he offered the chapel as a sanctuary for those who refused to serve in Vietnam. He delivered the draft cards of antiwar protesters to the Justice Department in an effort to mount a legal challenge to the draft. Instead, the government challenged him, arresting Rev. Coffin, Dr. Benjamin Spock and three others for counseling draft evasion. He was convicted but the verdict was subsequently overturned by an appellate court.

In his years at Yale and later at Riverside Church in New York, his was an eloquent voice for the disadvantaged and disinherited in America. He showed great courage in questioning the ethics of America's military decisions and unstintingly opposed the nuclear arms race. He was a foremost proponent of nuclear disarmament, calling for a nuclear