The ability to impose a "slow lane" and the ability to grant a "fast lane" are, for all intents and purposes, functionally equivalent over a given span of time. This is because unlike analog services (such as the transfer of electricity from point A to point B) there is not some universally applicable "fast speed" by which one could hypothetically measure whether or not one is "slowing" speeds. As our technological capacity changes, what we consider 'fast' and 'slow' internet will also change. (compare the dial-up most users were on a decade or two ago to the broadband speeds of today) So over time, what one considers a 'fast lane' and a 'slow lane' will change, a fact which is infinitely exploitable by ISPs under a ruling which allows for a 'fast lane' but not a 'slow lane.'

A good metaphor is this: say we have two roads. One where 15 mph is the speed limit and one where 30 mph is the speed limit, but most cars can only go 30 mph at the time this is created. Say that the capacity of cars changes to allow them to go 60 mph. If the 'fast lane' is raised to 60 mph but the slow lane does not change, the symmetry between a fast- and slow- lane is more visible. As speed increases, people can go on 'longer trips' and it may become mandatory for some basic services, effectively making the "not-fast-lane" into a "slow lane" that one would only use if they had to. (When you are on the freeway, note that there may be a slower road right alongside it which you could use but never would willingly.) If that freeway only connects to some services and not others, it effectively shunts those services out.

Further, ISPs are *already* making money on data. You pay your ISP for data. Having them be able to charge content providers in addition (who must then in turn charge those who are paying for their services more) would be like if phone companies not only charged me for calling someone, but charged someone for receiving that call. As in many areas of the US one ISP may be the sole provider of internet service to the area or be one of very few options, there is no market solution to this as there is no effective marketplace: infrastructure and regulatory concerns eliminate effective competition, allowing unregulated ISPs to get away with whatever they legally can.

I think a good solution would be to make ISPs into Title II Common Carriers. Frankly, as many ISPs are now merged with phone carriers this would not even impose undue hardship upon them and would simplify legislation in matters where it is unclear whether a piece of data is from a 'phone call' or counts as 'internet use.' (As technology evolves, simpler rules allow for less litigation as it is more obvious what umbrella various technologies fall under) It would also preserve the internet in a way that will allow for increased innovation and development.

In short, I would support ISPs being redefined as Common Carriers and would fight against ISPs being allowed 'fast lane' services, as this is isometric to them being allowed to impose a 'slow lane' over the long-term.