



Broadband Everywhere. The truth.
Click here for Phoney tales.

Paid for by the National Cable Telecommunications Association

**National
Journal's**

INSIDER UPDATE:

THE TELECOMACT

Monday, May 01, 2006

Advertisement

Home

**This Week's
Telecom Sked**

**In Brief: Rep.
Rush Takes Heat
Over SBC Gift**

**The Video
Franchise Issue:
Recent Stories**

**The 'Network
Neutrality' Issue:
Recent Stories**

**The Universal
Service Issue:
Recent Stories**

**Senate Panel To
Consider Plan On
'Indecency'**

**Martin Again
Presses Cable On
'A La Carte'**

**FCC: 'A La Carte'
Could Lower Cable
Prices**

**FCC Members
Sketch Broad
Agenda For '06**

**Federal Court
Affirms FCC E-911
Order**

**The 'Brand X'
Decision: High
Court Backs FCC**

**Municipal
Broadband: An
In-Depth Look**

**Drew Clark: Wired
In Washington**

**Who's Lobbying?
July '05 - Present**

Technology Daily

Amazon.com Pushing For Two Net Neutrality Safeguards

By Sarah Lai Stirland

(Tuesday, April 25) Congress should enact two specific proposals to prevent communications companies from making exclusive deals that would discriminate against the transmission of certain Internet content, an Amazon.com lobbyist told members of the House Judiciary Committee.

"We respectfully ask that Congress enact modest but effective safeguards to reinstate limited protections that the FCC recently abandoned and thereby preserve American consumers' longstanding freedom of choice of Internet content," **Paul Misener**, Amazon's vice president for global public policy, said in prepared testimony.

Misener said network neutrality provisions must be included in any legislation granting cable companies video franchising relief. He said the proponents of so-called network neutrality want content traveling across an operator's high-speed Internet network to be prioritized based on the service purchased by consumers -- and not on which firm is transmitting the information.

According to Misener, Amazon also urges that any deals on expediting access to content between owners of Internet pipes and content providers be kept at non-discriminatory rates.

Misener was one of five witnesses called to discuss antitrust and "network neutrality" issues before the Judiciary Committee's Task Force on Telecom and Antitrust. The committee recently formed the task force after AT&T and BellSouth announced plans to merge.

House Judiciary Chairman James Sensenbrenner, R-Wis., has expressed concerns about antitrust issues surrounding the pending union.

National Journal's Technology Daily reported last month that the

TECHNOLOGY*daily*

keeps you on
the cutting edge
of tech politics
and policy.

[\[click here for a free trial\]](#)

Advertisement

Who's Lobbying?
Jan '05 - June '05

Who's Donating?

**Key Players: In
The Industry**

**Key Players:
Members Of
Congress**

**Key Players:
Congressional
Aides**

**Overview: The
Clash Of The
Telecom Titans**

Background Info

Want the latest
telecom news
delivered right
to your inbox
or PDA?

E-mail Alert

About Us

Contacts

Privacy Policy

Advertise

committee may seek a sequential referral of a House Energy and Commerce Committee telecom bill in order to deal with antitrust issues. And the Judiciary panel is working on a related antitrust bill of its own.

Meanwhile, in his testimony before the panel, **Earl Comstock** -- who is president of Comptel, an association of Bell competitors -- said the committee should introduce legislation updating antitrust law, so that authorities can properly enforce competition in the emerging marketplace.

Comstock also urged the committee to clarify how enforcement should be carried out in the wake of a 2004 Supreme Court decision on antitrust enforcement against communications companies.

"The mere presence on the books of a regulatory regime that is not being enforced should not be allowed to nullify the pro-competitive effect of antitrust laws," he said.

But **Walter McCormick**, president of the U.S. Telecom Association -- which includes several Bell firms -- said House telecom modernization efforts should stay within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

He added that there is nothing wrong with communications' companies desire to charge different rates for deployment of different applications.

"If you want more, then you pay more, [which] is as American as it comes," McCormick said. "If an online movie service wanted to purchase that additional bandwidth capacity to speed movie downloads for those of its customers who do not opt for a higher bandwidth service, is this not good news for the consumer?"

POLICY COUNCIL: SPONSORED LINKS

The organizations below are paying members of National Journal's Policy Council. These links, which are included based on relevance to this article, do not involve the National Journal Group editorial staff.

COMPTEL

- [COMPTEL Applauds Actions by House Judiciary Committee](#)
- [Network Neutrality: Earl Comstock Testimony Before the House Judiciary Committee](#)

BellSouth

- [Key Points Regarding Net Neutrality](#)
- [Network Neutrality: Beware the Law of Unintended Consequences](#)

National Association of Counties

- [Local Government Principles for Communications Policy Modernization](#)
- [The American County Platform: Telecommunications & Technology](#)

Cox Enterprises

- [Video Franchising: Comments to the FCC](#)

AT&T

- [Video Franchising: Statement of AT&T Chairman & CEO Edward E. Whitacre, Jr. Before the Senate Commerce Committee](#)
- [State-by-State Breakdown of the Consumer Welfare Cost of Video Franchise Reform Delay](#)

Comcast

- [Network Neutrality: Editorials, Op-Eds and Articles](#)