

I have conducted some study on this issue of "net neutrality". Like all issues, promoted by either political parties or legislative bodies they are named to do exactly the opposite of what the title words mean. So, consumer protection legislation means, more regulatory control of both consumers and industries. The Health Care Act has little to do with health care, but more to do with regulatory authority over the health care industry. Net Neutrality is not about keeping the internet open but to gain regulatory authority by the FCC over issues now solved by industry. The assumption is always that a government agency is a "neutral" force for good. The result is always the same: eventually with such authority, the internet industry will begin to be taxed like phone companies (RBOCS), there will be penalties for not complying and greater regulatory control.

Currently no technology is as fluid as bandwidth on the internet. Like, cellular base station capacities, like the processing power of integrated circuits (CPUs) such capacities double and double again every few years so what was once a problem (and, it's NOT even a problem now) goes away with improved technologies. This rids the "Net Neutrality Act" of the main reason for its consideration.

So, there are two issues: bandwidth/throughput issues and regulatory oversight. I have great faith that ISPs can solve any bandwidth issues, and I'm happy to pay for this directly to the provider if this becomes the case, however, internet access costs are going down, not up, last I looked. RBOCs regulated by the FCC provided T1 connected access for \$1,000 per line per month just two years ago. My ISP provides 5MBPS for less than \$40 per month today. Conversely, the FCC has a track record (as all Federal Government Agencies do) of adding investment confusion into the market so as to diminish capital investment. It's other accomplishment is to chain the RBOCs to fees and taxes preventing them from competing with ISPs which unknown to the FCC at the time of the Telecomm act of --- '96(?), these ISPs can now offer access, voice and video at half the price. Interestingly, the FCC has not removed these taxes and fees from the RBOC to help them compete....

First it's regulation, then taxes, then penalties and a wholly distorted market increasing costs to the consumer. Lastly, such matters implemented creates more lawsuits, and to justify the FCC's authority, this body will certainly look hard to levy stiff penalties on business if something screws

up, which can more easily be fixed by letting the consumer choose their ISP.

Today's ruling by a Federal Appeals Court is welcome and it shows it is not within government's authority to regulate without an act from congress.

Further, and more importantly, if it does gain authority from an act of Congress, nine times out of ten such acts are not good for the consumer or industry.