

“Congress could unwittingly interfere with the development of a more robust Internet, capable of delivering more multimedia, faster, in two directions.”

The Oregonian, Editorial, May 15, 2006

“By getting the U.S. federal government involved in a phenomenon – the Internet – that has to date largely avoided regulation, **‘net neutrality’ supporters are inviting the bane of this incredible communication system: the law of unintended consequences.**”

The Arizona Republic, Editorial, June 26, 2006

“‘Don’t ruin the Internet’ is a slogan with a lot of merit. But it comes with a modern corollary, which is **‘Don’t regulate what isn’t broken.’**”

The Wall Street Journal, Editorial, May 18, 2006

“Consumers will benefit if Congress encourages competition. It breeds more choices, lower prices and innovation. Net neutrality stops all that in its tracks.”

Chicago Tribune, Editorial, June 26, 2006

“If you want innovation on the Internet, you need better pipes: ones that are faster, less susceptible to hackers and spammers, or smarter in ways that nobody has yet thought of. The lack of incentives for pipe innovation is more pressing than the lack of incentives to create new Web services.”

The Washington Post, Editorial, June 12, 2006

“There is nothing neutral about tying the hands of network operators. Doing so would only lead to Internet traffic jams and higher costs for consumers, fundamentally altering the lightly regulated Internet, where commerce and ideas move at nearly the speed of light.”

South Florida Sun-Sentinel, Editorial, June 22, 2006

“To transition from copper wires to fiber optics Internet service providers need Wall Street investors to see broadband as a worthy investment. Charging the heaviest users of those networks extra is the natural market solution. **Google and Amazon just want to continue their free ride.**”

The Washington Times, Editorial, June 12, 2006