

I dislike the fact that my choices are so limited when it comes time to view the news on TV. I choose my cable providers' "basic" package and the range of available political viewpoints available is too limited.

As of now, I can find those missing viewpoints via the internet. Without the "Net Neutrality" principle, I fear my cable provider -- which also provides my internet service -- or another party that controls the flow of internet packets -- may intercede, even if only financially, between me and the voices I want to hear; for example, the commercial providers can afford to pay more than publicly-supported providers, if the cable company or another intermediary decided to charge for packet delivery based on packet content.

It's argued, by those opposed to "net neutrality" legislation, that we must not let the government interfere, lest the companies that provide internet connectivity be shackled financially, so that they won't be able to invest as much in research and other expenditures to advance the technology. I don't think that's true, but I would argue that even if it *were* true, freedom of political speech must take priority over any corporate entities' (or group of such entities') financial concerns.

Respectfully,
Andrew MacGinitie