

Dear FCC,

I am writing to advocate in defense of the rights of millions of Internet users by upholding Title II Net Neutrality protections. Unfortunately, it seems that extreme ideologies with a clear agenda are poisoning the functions of government agencies, and favoring the power of private multi-billionaire corporations and destroying the neutral principles in which our government was founded, which were placed to ensure social, political, educational, and economic freedom and equality for every American. The current Title II Open Internet rules are an important protection to ensure equality across all internet service industries.

The FCC should throw out Chairman Ajit Pai's proposal to give the ISP monopolies like Comcast, Verizon, and AT&T free rein to engage in data discrimination, stripping Internet users of the necessary privacy and access safeguards we fought for and just recently won. It is on historic records that every time corporations are given free rein over an industry, the natural tendency is for the larger corporations to tilt the balance in their favor using their power and size and discriminate against smaller competitors and giving consumers less choice. This is exactly what big corporations will do, destroying free and open competition and ensuring monopolizing power over the industry.

I'm afraid of a "pay-to-play" Internet where ISPs can charge more for certain websites because ISPs could have too much power to determine what I can do online. Thankfully, the current Open Internet rules mean that ISP monopolies can't slow or block Internet users' ability to see certain websites or disrupt online services and create Internet "fast lanes" by charging websites and online services more money to reach people faster. That's exactly the right balance to make sure competition in the Internet space is fair and benefits Internet users and small businesses as well as entrenched Internet companies. Chairman Pai's proposal would transform ISPs into Internet gatekeepers with the ability to veto new expression and innovation and squash away smaller competitors. That's contrary to the basic precepts on which the Internet was built.

I really don't see the need for this administration to dismantle the current Net Neutrality rules. I see that as an effort to remove protections from the public and giving those protections to monopolies. Removing the current protections will create an incredible incentive for monopolies to use their infrastructure as leverage to favor their own media services. For instance, giants like Comcast, who own streaming services and data pipelines of their own, can prioritize their own streaming service against competitors who don't own infrastructure like Netflix or Hulu. Another example, if I get my internet service from AT&T, but I prefer streaming TV service from Sling TV instead of DirecTV Now (AT&T's TV streaming service), there's no stopping AT&T from engaging in the practice of making their own streaming service more robust than the competition on their network. Suddenly Sling TV streams would pause to buffer more frequently or become unwatchable while AT&T's own streaming service would work with no hiccups. This discriminatory practice creates an environment of unfair advantage, and by

definition, limit customer choices and goes against the principles of a free market and healthy competition.

There is a plethora of evidence showing prior efforts to undermine small competitors in this manner. Many people have complained that their home internet phone services like Vonage (or others that do not own data lines) do not operate as well as the phone services owned by the same company that owns the data lines. Is this a coincidence? Another example is how Google Wallet, a mobile payment service, was blocked by AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile because coincidentally, these providers had their own competing mobile payment service. The reason why Title II was ordered was to put a stop on these discriminatory practices which will get worse if Net Neutrality rules are removed.

Ajit Pai's has been quoted saying that he would rather ISPs to "...voluntarily agree.. to not obstruct or slow consumer access to web content." So my question would be, why provide ISPs with the power to slow down, prioritize, or disrupt select online content if they promise not to use that power? It makes no sense.

Ajit Pai has claimed that after the FCC imposed Title II on ISPs infrastructure investments have declined. However, several companies are on record stating that their business has been largely unaffected by the Title II order. In fact, in 2014, Verizon's Executive VP and CFO Francis J. Shammo told their investors that the Title II order "does not influence the way we invest.... we're going to continue to invest in our networks and our platforms, both in wireless and wireline FIOS and where we need to". This directly contradicts Mr. Pai's claims and shows that his claims do not have a solid foundation to stand on.

This proceeding will not restore internet freedom, it will remove it. Therefore, I urge you to keep Title II net neutrality in place, and safeguard Internet users like me and continue to allow free and healthy competition on the internet.

Sincerely,

Mario E. Veras

74 Day St CLIFTON,

NJ 07011