I read the comments by AT&T's public policy chief Jim Cicconi today commenting regarding "net neutrality" that "As we all know, there is no free lunch, and there's also no cost-free delivery of streaming movies. Someone has to pay that cost." And this is what I do not understand. I pay a lot for my internet access. My monthly Internet bill from just my primary ISP (Comcast) is $56. I also pay for Internet on my phone - for Internet alone I pay $30 for my wife and I. That's $86/month that I pay to get Internet access - to me this is an incredible amount. It's more than my monthly average electricity bill and it's more than my average monthly heating bill. In fact, after my mortgage, it's my second largest monthly recurring charge.

So what I don't understand about net neutrality is that I'm paying to access the Internet and the content that is on it and I don't understand why AT&T and Verizon think that they should also be compensated by the website that I am accessing. They have been paid already - by me, their customer - for the data that I requested. And I expect that their service should be able to provide the data that I want and meet the bandwidth and latency requirements in order for my service to be useful.

I don't understand why carrier companies like Verizon and AT&T expect Netflix - or any other website - to compensate them to allow me to access the data that I am paying them already to provide. It seems like they are collecting a toll from both sides just because they happen to me a virtual monopoly in the middle.

And I don't use the word monopoly lightly - I have very little choice in which provider I go with. In my area there are only two Internet providers providing high speed broadband - Comcast and Centurylink. Their prices are similar and it's a huge hassle to switch from one. So if I am unhappy with the service that Comcast, it's difficult to move to Centurylink and the prices are pretty much the same. So I am left with very little recourse if my internet access is degraded while visiting Netflix, or Youtube, or even just Wikipedia.

So I instead turn to the regulators who are tasked with managing these internet service providing companies and ask you to make sure that they meet the commitments that they make to their customers when they sign up. They already promise speeds that, in practice, are rarely achieveable (which seems to be false advertising) and now they seem to looking to collect money twice in order to deliver the service that they promised when the customer signed up.