wages. In a closed economy, corporations have a huge stake in the quality of the national workforce and infrastructure.

The situation is very different in an open economy where investments in innovation, brands, a strong corporate culture or even in certain kinds of equipment can be combined with labour from anywhere in the world. Workers no longer have the same stake in productive investment by companies as it becomes easier for corporations to combine their capital with lower priced labour overseas. Companies, in turn, come to have less of a stake in the quality of the workforce and infrastructure in their home country when they can produce anywhere. Moreover businesses can use the threat of relocating as a lever to extract concessions regarding tax policy, regulations and specific subsidies. Inevitably the cost of these concessions is borne by labour.

The public policy response of withdrawing from the global economy, or reducing the pace of integration, is ultimately untenable. It would generate resentment abroad on a dangerous scale, hurt the economy as other countries retaliated, and make us less competitive as companies in rival countries continue to integrate their production lines with developing countries. As Bill Clinton said in his first major international economic speech as president, ''the United States must compete not retreat''.

The domestic component of a strategy to promote healthy globalisation must rely on strengthening efforts to reduce inequality and insecurity. The international component must focus on the interests of working people in all countries, in addition to the current emphasis on the priorities of global-corporations.

First, the U.S. should take the lead in promoting global co-operation in the international tax arena. There has been a race to the bottom in the taxation of corporate income as nations lower their rates to entice business to issue more debt and invest in their jurisdictions. Closely related is the problem of tax havens that seek to lure wealthy citizens with promises that they can avoid paying taxes altogether on large parts of their fortunes. It might be inevitable that globalisation leads to some increases in inequality; it is not necessary that it also compromise the possibility of progressive taxation.

Second, an increased focus of international economic diplomacy should be to prevent harmful regulatory competition. In many areas it is appropriate that regulations differ between countries in response to local circumstances. But there is a reason why progressives in the early part of the 20th century sought to have the federal government take over many kinds of regulatory responsibility. They were concerned that competition for business across states, and their ease of being able to move, would lead to a race to the bottom. Financial regulation is only one example of where the mantra of needing to be ''internationally competitive'' has been invoked too often as a reason to cut back on regulation. There has not been enough serious consideration of the alternative—global co-operation to raise standards. While labour standards arguments have at times been invoked as a cover for protectionism, and this must be avoided, it is entirely appropriate that U.S. policymakers seek to ensure that greater global integration does not become an excuse for eroding labour rights.

To benefit the interests of U.S. citizens and command broadpolitical support, US international economic policy will need to focus on the issues in which the largest number of Americans have the greatest stake. A decoupling of the interests of businesses and nations may be inevitable; a decoupling of international economic policies and the interests of American workers is not.

## EDWARD EARNEST FOSTER: FIERCE ADVOCATE FOR VETERANS

### HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 8, 2008*

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, representing the 36th district of California since 1992 has given me the opportunity to meet many veterans and learn their stories. One special veteran and friend, Ed Foster, has an incredible story—one I would like to share with my colleagues on the eve of his retirement from the Torrance Job Service Office.

Edward Earnest Foster enlisted in the Army at age 19, and served as a medic in the Korean war. As a medic, soldier and veteran, he has touched the lives of countless individuals. He has advanced the cause of veteran's rights throughout the South Bay, and I am not alone in expressing enormous gratitude for all he has done.

Ed received nine medals on his tours of duty in Korea, including a Purple Heart and the Bronze Star with a ''V'' for valor. With the same strength of character that got him those medals, he has fought on behalf of all veterans.

Locally, Ed's contributions have been invaluable. In his post at the State Employment Development Department's Torrance office, he has worked to make sure area veterans find the work and dignity they deserve.

Perhaps his most notable and lasting initiative is the ''Visit a Vet'' program, which promotes visits with veterans at VA hospitals to let them know they are not forgotten and thank them for their service. We should all heed his call of ''let us not just think of our veterans on holidays but do it all year long.''

Ed Foster is a tireless advocate for veterans everywhere, and a wonderfully dedicated man. He represents, to me, what it means to serve one's country for a lifetime. Ed retires this month at the young age of 76. On behalf of the entire community, I say thank you, on behalf of a grateful nation.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE ''INTERNET FREEDOM AND NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2008''

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 8, 2008*

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the ''Internet Freedom and Nondiscrimination Act of 2008,'' legislation that establishes an antitrust remedy for anticompetitive and discriminatory practices by broadband service providers. I am joined by Representative LOFGREN.

Over the last ten years, the Internet has gone from its infancy through a period of exponential growth. Today, it is estimated that over 1.3 billion people use the Internet—that is almost 20 percent of the world's population. In the last 7 years alone, the worldwide use of the Internet has jumped 265 percent.

The Internet has become the dominant venue for the expression of ideas and public discourse. From social networking to get-out-the-vote drives, the Internet is now a leading tool for speech and action. Web sites like Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, and Monster have changed the way people of all ages connect socially and professionally. Political candidates raise more money online with each election cycle. Newspaper Web sites and independent blogs have revolutionized the ways in which news and media are disseminated and consumed. And the Internet has opened up new performance venues to emerging artists and entertainers. In these and many other ways, the technological innovation in communication made possible by the Internet has made it among the most powerful outlets for creativity and free speech.

However, some of the Internet Service Providers, which control 96 percent of the residential market for high-speed Internet access, and are either monopolies or duopolies in most areas of the country, have proposed to give favored treatment to some Internet content and disfavored treatment to other content. Under these proposed business models, what treatment you get will be determined by how much you pay or, potentially, whether the Internet service provider approves of the content or whether the provider has a financial interest at stake. Under these regimes, many of the innovations and ideas that we have enjoyed on the Internet may never have occurred. We would never have had a Google search engine or YouTube videos if ''pay to play'' had been our national policy. To be sure, if we go in this direction, it will stifle both future technological innovation and free speech.

Rather than attempt regulation of the industry, we believe an antitrust remedy is the most appropriate way to deal with the problem. The antitrust laws exist to correct distortions of the free market, where monopolies or cartels have cornered the market, and competition is not being allowed to work. The antitrust laws can help maintain a free and open Internet.

The ''Internet Freedom and Nondiscrimination Act of 2008'' amends the Clayton Act to require that broadband service providers interconnect with the facilities of other network providers on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis. It also requires them to operate their network in a reasonable and nondiscriminatory manner so that all content, applications and services are treated the same and have an equal opportunity to reach consumers. The bill expressly preserves the ability of broadband service providers to manage their network, so long as it is done in a nondiscriminatory manner, and the bill allows the operators to give priority to emergency communications and take reasonable and nondiscriminatory measures to prevent violations of the law.

Americans have come to expect the Internet to be open to everyone and everything. The Internet was designed without gatekeepers for new content and services and without centralized control. If we allow companies with monopoly or duopoly power to control how the Internet operates, start-up companies might never be able to offer their products, network providers could have the power to choose what content is available, and the artists and thinkers of our time could find their speech censored.