

7521149800.txt

I would like to inquire on why you chose to vote "Yes" to approving the "fast lane" clause under the new Net Neutrality rules. You claimed that you are for a truly open internet, however creating a fast lane automatically creates a bias for any information to be transmitted across the internet. That is NOT the definition of an open internet. There should be no bias. There should be no toll. The ISPs have taken an exorbitant amount of tax dollars to pay for and create the infrastructure that we use in this internet. It makes no sense for them to pad their wallets beyond the exorbitant fees they charge the consumer. Let's not forget they're also charging companies to access these lines, as well.

I suggest, and I hope, that you remove any type of pay for play, fast lane, or whatever other catchphrase from Net Neutrality rules. The internet is the backbone of our society's information. Therefore, the internet should be treated like any other carrier. Make ISPs and Broadband a common carrier. Imagine if you wanted to talk to your family or business partners over the phone, and the telco said you had to pay more to talk to them with zero/low latency. Let's also imagine that the telco doesn't expect you to pay extra to talk to their commercial partners' telemarketers with zero latency, but without paying extra your conversations with your mother leave you waiting 10 seconds in between your dialogue to have a normal discussion due to this "fast lane" bias for the commercial partners. It makes absolutely no sense to allow that type of discrimination over information travelling over a telephone line. Why should it be allowed for the internet? If you talk about Verizon on an AT&T phone, they're not allowed to cut off your call, or fill it with static. ISPs shouldn't be allowed to interfere with your Internet either.

This is why it is important to eliminate any bias, toll, fast lane, etc over the internet. Reclassify the internet/Broadband/ISPs to Title II common carriers.

Also, any ambiguous phrase that needs to be subjectively interpreted should not be allowed into our laws. Leaving rules for open interpretation is only a Pandora's box that will create more trouble for consumers and businesses alike. It is very clear the public wants a true open internet, where information travels freely without bias. Competitors can talk about each other, market themselves, and allow for the public to decide on whether or not they want to absorb said information or ignore it.