

As the proprietor of a small company employing a dozen associates, I'd like to advocate strongly for net neutrality. The internet should not be biased upon either the *TYPE* nor the *SOURCE* of content. I am not OK with the idea that some content providers may get a "fast lane" (or, let's say a free pass to run red lights) while others have to wait in line. What's important is that small companies have the ability to compete with the "big boys" based on the value they provide to their customers. What we don't need is artificial barriers to competition that require that the right backs get scratched in order for the content to be delivered.

I am OK with marking packets with a priority. So long as the pricing of these packets, and the impact of routing of these packets *only* depends upon the priority and not where it came from, where it is going, or what it contains. In other words, if there is a "fast lane" it should have equal access -- no side deals, no back-scratching contracts, etc. The price should be set in an open market as any commodity, not through favoritism (ie, your high priority packets are \$.01, while Tom's are \$.05).

The rationale for this position should be quite clear. To introduce bias into the Internet (or fail to prevent it from emerging) would be a serious disaster for innovation and the growth of technology industries in this country. What will happen if competition is stifled here is obvious -- it will move elsewhere, to other countries that are smart enough to keep competition on a level playing field.

Our small technology company depends upon having equal access to the Internet as our larger competitors. Take this away, and we will have to close shop; innovation, competition, and consumer prices for goods and services will suffer.

Thanks for your review of this comment and your thoughtful consideration.