

COMMENTS BY COMMISSIONER JAMES H. QUELLO  
BEFORE THE INDIANA-ILLINOIS CABLE ASSOCIATION  
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA  
JANUARY 16, 1977

91

I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO BRING MY  
CRYSTAL BALL AND GIVE YOU A READING THIS  
MORNING OF WHAT WILL BE HAPPENING AT FCC  
IN 1977 AFFECTING THE CABLE INDUSTRY.

I THINK I WILL BE ON SAFER GROUND  
IF I TALK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN AT THE  
COMMISSION DURING THE NEXT YEAR. THE ONLY  
ONE WHO KNOWS WHAT WILL HAPPEN IS THE GOOD  
LORD--AND HE ISN'T TALKING. SO, LET'S JUST  
SPECULATE A BIT AND SEE WHAT COMES OF IT.

BEFORE TURNING TO CABLE SPECIFICALLY,  
I AM SURE THERE IS CONSIDERABLE SPECULATION  
AMONG YOU AS TO CHANGES IN THE COMMISSION

~~AFTER~~ JANUARY 20. IF ANY OF YOU HAS A GOOD  
HOT RUMOR, PLEASE LET ME KNOW. MY PERSONAL  
GUESS IS THAT PRESIDENT CARTER WILL, NO DOUBT,  
APPOINT A NEW CHAIRMAN SOMETIME IN 1977---YOU  
CAN BE SURE THAT THE CHAIRMAN WILL BE BLACK  
OR WHITE, MALE OR FEMALE OR PERHAPS A COMBI-  
NATION OF ANY OF THESE. THE PERSON WILL HAVE  
GOOD CREDENTIALS AND BACKING AND WILL IN NO  
WAY THREATEN MY ALL-TIME RECORD OF EIGHT  
DAYS OF CONFIRMATION HEARINGS. IT HAS ALSO  
BEEN PUBLISHED THAT DICK WILEY PLANS TO  
REMAIN AS A COMMISSIONER FOR THE BALANCE OF  
HIS TERM UNTIL JUNE 30 OF THIS YEAR WHICH IS  
FINE WITH ME AND I ASSUME FINE WITH MOST OF YOU.  
I REALLY DON'T KNOW OF CHANGES IN THE IMMEDIATE  
FUTURE AFFECTING THE COMMISSION MAKEUP. NOR

DO I FORESEE ANY CHANGES THAT WILL BE DELETERIOUS  
TO THE CABLE INDUSTRY FROM THE COMMISSION  
STANDPOINT. HOWEVER, I WILL BE READING THE  
VARIOUS TRADE PUBLICATIONS AND NEWSPAPER  
COLUMNS AND SPECULATING JUST AS YOU WILL.

ONE THING THAT WILL NOT HAPPEN IN 1977  
IS THE MARCH 21, 1977 DEADLINE ON FRANCHISE  
COMPLIANCE. BY A NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE  
MAKING WE ARE NOW INQUIRING AS TO WHETHER  
TO CONTINUE THE PRESENT FRANCHISE STANDARDS,  
TO MODIFY THEM, OR TO ELIMINATE THEM ENTIRELY.  
IN MY OWN MIND I HAVE UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS  
AS TO THE NEED FOR THE PRESENT FRANCHISE  
STANDARDS FROM THIS TIME FORWARD. MY OWN  
FEELING IS THAT THE FRANCHISING PROCESS IS A  
MATTER OF LOCAL CONCERN AND THE FEDERAL

INTEREST SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THOSE FEW AREAS WHERE WE HAVE CONCLUDED A FEDERAL ROLE IS NECESSARY--FOR EXAMPLE, PROHIBITING EXCLUSIONARY PROVISIONS AGAINST PAY CABLE OPERATIONS, FRANCHISE FEE LIMITATIONS, ETC. HOPEFULLY WE WILL RECEIVE DETAILED COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING IN THIS MATTER AND WILL BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO JUDGE WHETHER TO CHANGE SOME OF OUR PRESENT REQUIREMENTS.

OUR PRESENT REQUIREMENTS REPRESENT QUITE A CHANGE FROM THE FCC REQUIREMENTS TWO YEARS AGO. COMMENCING IN THE LATTER PART OF 1974 THE COMMISSION STARTED NUMEROUS ACTIONS TO ALLEVIATE MANY OF THE CABLE INDUSTRY'S REGULATORY PROBLEMS. JUST TO NAME A FEW:

-5-

OUR PREEMPTION IN THE FIELD OF TECHNICAL  
REQUIREMENTS INCONSISTENT WITH THE COMMISSION'S  
POLICIES; DELETION OF MANDATORY ORIGINATION;  
ALLEVIATION OF THE PAY CABLE RESTRICTIONS;  
LESS RESTRICTIVE NETWORK NON-DUPLICATION  
REQUIREMENTS; CANCELLATION OF THE 1977 REBUILD  
REQUIREMENT; ELIMINATION OF THE SAME-DAY  
NON-DUPLICATION PROTECTION IN THE MOUNTAIN  
TIME ZONE; PROVISION FOR LESS BURDENSOME AND  
LESS EXPENSIVE SIGNIFICANT-VIEWING SURVEYS  
BY COUNTY RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITIES;  
AMENDMENT OF THE LEAPFROGGING RESTRICTIONS;  
AND RELAXATION OF TECHNICAL STANDARDS.  
  
HOPEFULLY THERE WILL BE MORE ACTIONS IN THE  
RE-REGULATION FIELD IN 1977.



ONE OF OUR MAJOR STEPS LAST MONTH WAS OUR APPROVAL OF EARTH-STATION ANTENNAS SMALLER THAN NINE METERS IN DIAMETER. WE HAVE NOW DETERMINED THAT APPLICATIONS FOR PARABOLIC ANTENNAS AS SMALL AS 4.5 METERS FOR RECEIVE-ONLY CABLE OPERATIONS WILL BE ROUTINELY PROCESSED IF ACCOMPANIED BY CERTAIN SUPPLEMENTAL TECHNICAL DATA. THIS FURTHER OPENS THE DOOR TO THE CABLE INDUSTRY FOR ENTRY INTO THE RECEPTION OF SATELLITE SIGNALS AND IS MOST ASSUREDLY A TREMENDOUS STEP FORWARD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAY CABLE PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION. ANOTHER COMMISSION ACTION IN THIS AREA WAS OUR RECENT APPROVAL OF THE USE OF A NEW TYPE OF COMMON CARRIER DOMESTIC SATELLITE VIDEO SERVICE. WE APPROVED UTILIZATION OF A SATELLITE

TRANSPONDER AS THE VEHICLE TO DISTRIBUTE  
THE SIGNALS OF AN ATLANTA INDEPENDENT  
TELEVISION STATION TO BE RECEIVED BY ELIGIBLE  
CABLE SYSTEMS. THUS, CABLE HAS TAKEN ANOTHER  
STEP TOWARD SOME OF ITS "BLUE SKY" POTENTIAL.  
IN MY OPINION THESE TWO ACTIONS WILL STAND  
AS LANDMARKS IN THE CONTINUING EVOLUTION OF  
THE CABLE INDUSTRY.

1977 MAY WELL SEE THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF DRAFT LEGISLATION WHICH WILL INCLUDE, FOR  
THE FIRST TIME, CABLE TELEVISION. HOWEVER,  
I THINK THAT LEGISLATION ENCOMPASSING CABLE  
WILL EVENTUALLY COME ABOUT THROUGH A COMPRE-  
HENSIVE REWRITE OF THE ENTIRE COMMUNICATIONS  
ACT, RATHER THAN FROM SPECIFIC LEGISLATION

DEALING SOLELY WITH CABLE TELEVISION. I DO NOT ANTICIPATE A COMPLETE AMENDED COMMUNICATIONS ACT IN 1977 OR 1978 FOR THAT MATTER. REWRITING THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT IS A COMPLEX TASK, AT BEST, AND CERTAINLY THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW PORTION OF THE ACT TO ENCOMPASS CABLE TELEVISION WILL ADD TO THE COMPLEXITY OF THE TASK. FRANKLY, I HAVE SOME RESERVATIONS AS TO ANY DETAILED LEGISLATIVE PROVISION FOR THE CABLE INDUSTRY AT THIS TIME. I BELIEVE THE INDUSTRY NEEDS MORE TIME IN WHICH TO DEVELOP IN AREAS OTHER THAN SIGNAL CARRIAGE BEFORE SPECIFIC LEGISLATIVE CONTROLS ARE DETERMINED. FOR EXAMPLE, I AM CONCERNED THAT LEGISLATION MAY PROVIDE FOR A SEPARATION POLICY, THUS ESTABLISHING ARTIFICIAL RESTRICTIONS BETWEEN



- 7 -

PROGRAMMING ON THE ONE HAND AND HARDWARE  
CONTROL AND OPERATION ON THE OTHER. I THINK  
IT WOULD BE UNFORTUNATE FOR CABLE SYSTEMS  
TO BECOME SADDLED WITH A COMMON CARRIER OR  
PSUEDO-COMMON CARRIER LABEL BEFORE THE  
NEED HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED. I WOULD PREFER  
TO SEE LEGISLATION THAT IS ABBREVIATED AND  
GENERAL IN NATURE, ESTABLISHING BASIC JURISDIC-  
TION, LICENSING AUTHORITY AND FORFEITURE PROVISIONS.

HAVING MENTIONED THE FIGHTING WORD  
"FORFEITURE," I THINK I HAD BETTER DWELL ON  
THIS ASPECT FOR A MOMENT. EVEN THOUGH I MAY  
RAISE SOME HACKLES, IT IS MY HONEST BELIEF  
THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD HAVE AUTHORITY TO  
LEVY FORFEITURES AGAINST CABLE SYSTEMS AS AN  
ENFORCEMENT TOOL. I AM FAMILIAR WITH THE

-10-

HORROR STORIES AND THE SCARE ARTICLES CONCERNING THE MATTER, AND FRANKLY, I AM NOT IMPRESSED BY THEM. FROM THE COMMISSION'S STANDPOINT WE ARE SEEKING FORFEITURE AUTHORITY AS AN ENFORCEMENT TOOL FOR EGREGIOUS SITUATIONS, SUCH AS THE CABLE SYSTEM WHICH REFUSES TO COMPLY WITH THE CARRIAGE RULES OR TO PROVIDE REQUIRED NON-DUPLICATION PROTECTION. CERTAINLY THE COMMISSION NEEDS SOME DIRECT MEANS OF ASSURING THAT THE VERY FEW "BAD APPLE" OPERATORS COMPLY WITH THE RULES AS DO THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THE INDUSTRY. I CANNOT ACCEPT THE RED-HERRING ARGUMENT OF FORFEITURE OPPONENTS THAT NO FORFEITURE SHOULD BE LEVIED ON ANY CABLE RULE OF THIS COMMISSION UNTIL IT HAS BEEN TESTED AND AFFIRMED IN COURT. MUCH DUST HAS BEEN RAISED

OVER THE THREAT OF FORFEITURE IF A CABLE  
SYSTEM DOES NOT MEET TECHNICAL STANDARDS.  
I DO NOT FORESEE ANY INTENT OF THE COMMISSION  
TO UTILIZE FORFEITURE AS A CLUB TO BEAT EACH  
CABLE SYSTEM INTO TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE. IF  
AN OPERATOR CREATED INTERFERENCE AND DID  
NOT REMEDY THE SITUATION OR ENTERED INTO SOME  
OTHER TECHNICAL VIOLATION WHICH WAS EGREGIOUS,  
THEN I THINK FORFEITURE SHOULD APPLY, AND  
SHOULD BE SUPPORTED BY THE RESPONSIBLE  
MEMBERS OF YOUR INDUSTRY. IT MAY WELL BE  
THAT MANY OF THE CABLE OPERATORS FEEL THAT  
OUR TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS ARE STILL TOO  
DEMANDING. IF YOU HAVE VALID CONCERNS, LET  
US HEAR FROM YOU SO THAT WE MAY CONSIDER

THE MOST REASONABLE AND PRACTICAL APPROACH  
TO THE MATTER. NONE OF US FAVORS REGULATION  
JUST FOR REGULATION'S SAKE.

IF THE CABLE INDUSTRY IS TO FUNCTION  
IT MUST BE IN AN ORDERLY FASHION AND IN  
HARMONY WITH OTHER COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA  
WITH WHICH IT RELATES. THIS REQUIRES A DEGREE  
OF REGULATION, AND SUCH REGULATION MUST BE  
ENFORCEABLE. OUR SOLE MEANS OF ENFORCEMENT  
AT PRESENT IS THE PAPER EXERCISE OF A CEASE  
& DESIST ORDER, WHICH, AS YOU KNOW, IS LESS  
THAN EFFECTIVE. THE POWER TO ASSESS A  
FORFEITURE IS FASTER AND MORE DIRECT AND  
SHOULD BE OF LITTLE CONCERN TO THE RESPON-  
SIBLE CABLE OPERATOR.

I HAVE BEEN IMPRESSED OF LATE BY THE PRESENTATIONS OF A NUMBER OF CABLE OPERATORS EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER TRANSLATORS. I AM CONVINCED THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD EXAMINE THE FUTURE POTENTIAL OF TRANSLATORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE CABLE INDUSTRY. IF TRANSLATORS ARE TO BE PERMITTED TO IMPORT DISTANT SIGNALS VIA MICROWAVE OR OTHER MEANS, THEN I FORESEE POTENTIAL IMPACT ON SMALL MARKET STATIONS AND THE NEED TO CONSIDER NON-DUPLICATION AND EXCLUSIVITY PROTECTION. I AM ALSO CONCERNED WITH RESPECT TO THE RAMIFICATIONS OF TRANSLATORS ENGAGING IN ADDITIONAL COMMERCIAL SUBSTITUTION.



I THINK THE COMMISSION SHOULD GIVE MUCH CONSIDERATION TO INTERFERENCE PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM TRANSLATOR OUTPUT SIGNALS BEING ADJACENT OR CO-CHANNEL TO INCOMING SIGNALS TO A CABLE HEADEND. CERTAINLY THERE IS POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE HERE AND THE MATTER SHOULD BE EXAMINED CAREFULLY. AT LEAST SOME DEGREE OF PROTECTION MIGHT BE AFFORDED FROM POTENTIAL INTERFERENCE PROBLEMS IF TRANSLATORS WERE TO GIVE NOTICE TO CABLE SYSTEMS OF THEIR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS. THESE ARE MATTERS OF CONCERN TO ME AND I THINK THEY WILL BE OF CONCERN TO THE COMMISSION GENERALLY. I HOPE THAT IN 1977 WE WILL TAKE AN OVERALL LOOK AT THESE PROBLEMS AND SEEK TO ARRIVE AT AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION.

IN LIGHT OF THE POTENTIAL FOR  
DISTRIBUTION VIA SATELLITE, I FORESEE AN  
EXPANDING MARKET FOR FILM PRODUCTS. THIS  
IN TURN MAY RESULT IN EFFORTS TO OBTAIN  
ADDITIONAL EASING OF THE RESTRICTIONS ON  
AVAILABILITY OF PRODUCTS. WITH RESPECT TO ANY  
LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FILM PRODUCT  
FOR CABLE PRESENTATION, I'M BEGINNING TO FEEL  
MORE AND MORE THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH  
NOTHING MORE THAN AN ORDERING OF PRIORITIES  
IN THE MATTER OF OBTAINING FILM PRODUCTS AS  
BETWEEN PAY CABLE AND TELEVISION BROAD-  
CASTING. I WONDER IF PUBLIC INTEREST REQUIRES  
THIS COMMISSION TO DETERMINE THE ORDER OF  
PRIORITY IN THE SHOWING OF FILM PRODUCTS

TO THE VIEWING PUBLIC WHETHER THROUGH THEATERS, TV OR CABLE. THE COMMISSION'S PRIMARY CONCERN IN THIS AREA PROBABLY SHOULD BE TO GUARD AGAINST EXCLUSIVITY PROVISIONS THAT ARE UNREASONABLE AND WHICH WOULD RETAIN CONTROL OF EXHIBITION RIGHTS FOR AN INORDINATE TIME. PERHAPS THE NEW COMMISSION SHOULD AGAIN EXAMINE THE MATTER OF EXCLUSIVITY PROVISIONS IN FILM CONTRACTS DURING 1977 EVEN THOUGH THIS MAY THREATEN THE CURRENT ESTABLISHED PRACTICE.

I SHOULD BRIEFLY MENTION THAT THE FCC HAS SUSPENDED COLLECTION OF ALL FEES EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1ST AS THE RESULT OF FOUR DECISIONS BY THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS.

AS YOU KNOW, THE CABLE FEE WAS  
SUCCESSFULLY FOUGHT BY THE NCTA--IN 1974  
WHEN I WAS A BRAND NEW COMMISSIONER, THE  
NCTA RECEIVED A FAVORABLE RULING FROM THE  
SUPREME COURT THAT ANNUAL FEES PAID BY  
CABLE INDUSTRY WERE ILLEGAL--ALL ANNUAL  
FEES PAID FROM 1970 TO 1973 WERE REFUNDED.  
WITH THE RECENT SUSPENSION, FILING FEES ALSO  
WILL NO LONGER BE REQUIRED.

THE FCC STAFF IS ANALYZING THE  
DECISION AND WILL RECOMMEND A FURTHER COURSE  
OF ACTION. I BELIEVE WE MUST SEEK CONGRESSIONAL  
LEGISLATIVE GUIDANCE OR ASSISTANCE....I AM  
NOT PERSONALLY A STAUNCH PROPONENT OF FEES,  
BUT MUST ADMIT THAT A REASONABLE FEE SCHEDULE  
COULD BE AN EFFECTIVE WAY OF HAVING THE GOVERN-

MENT PAY ITS OWN WAY. IN THE MEANTIME,  
DON'T BELIEVE ANY RUMORS THAT THE FCC IS GOING  
OUT OF BUSINESS BECAUSE OF NO FEE COLLECTION.  
NO SUCH LUCK! THE FCC DIDN'T RECEIVE THE FEES--  
ALL FEES WERE FORWARDED TO THE TREASURY DEPT.

ANOTHER ITEM DOWN THE ROAD IN 1977,  
OR POSSIBLY LATER, WILL BE CONSIDERATION OF  
CABLE CARRIAGE OF RADIO BROADCAST SIGNALS.  
FRANKLY, I BELIEVE WE MUST CAREFULLY REVIEW  
ALL FACETS OF THIS ISSUE--A SUBSTANTIAL NEED  
FOR REMEDIAL ACTION SHOULD BE DEMONSTRATED  
BEFORE WE EMBARK ON ADDITIONAL OR NEW RE-  
GULATION. HOWEVER, I'VE HAD A PERSONAL EX-  
PERIENCE WITH A CABLE-RADIO SITUATION IN MY  
OLD HOME TOWN OF CALUMET, MICHIGAN. I'LL



RELATE IT TO YOU BECAUSE IT CONTAINS BOTH A  
POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CABLE STORY--AND THEN  
ASK YOU TO SUGGEST AN EQUITABLE AND REASONABLE  
SOLUTION. (RELATE RADIO-BASEBALL CARRIAGE BY  
CABLE BY COMPETING SPONSOR.)

POLE ATTACHMENTS ARE ANOTHER MATTER  
OF SUBSTANTIAL CONCERN TO THE COMMISSION  
AND MOST CERTAINLY TO YOUR INDUSTRY. I WOULD  
PRESUME THERE WILL AGAIN BE EFFORTS TO SEEK  
LEGISLATIVE HELP IN THE HALLS OF THE CONGRESS.  
MY PERSONAL OPINION IS THAT LEGISLATION IS THE  
ONLY PRACTICABLE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM.  
IF THE COMMISSION MUST ACCOMMODATE REGULATIONS,  
ADJUDICATIONS AND EXPERTISE IN THIS FIELD,  
THEN CONGRESS CERTAINLY WILL HAVE TO BITE THE

BULLET AND PROVIDE THE FUNDING FOR ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL. FRANKLY, I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT WE CAN EXPECT UNIFORM OR CONSISTENT STANDARDS IN POLE ATTACHMENT REGULATION FROM ALL OF THE VARIOUS STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS. THAT'S WHY I FAVOR FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE APPROACH.

THE FCC IS CONTINUING TO DELIBERATE THE CABLE BUREAU'S PROPOSAL FOR RE-DEFINING CABLE SYSTEMS FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES. THE TWO MAIN ISSUES ARE(1) DEFINING A SYSTEM ON A HEADEND OR ON A COMMUNITY BASIS--A REAL PROBLEM WHEN THE LOGICAL POPULATION AREA EXTENDS BEYOND THE FRANCHISE AREA, AND(2) THE MATV-MDS CABLE PARITY PROBLEM.

I HAVE BEEN WIDELY QUOTED (AND IT'S TRUE) THAT I DO NOT FAVOR CLASSIFYING MATV SYSTEMS AS CABLE SYSTEMS FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES. I BELIEVE CONDOMINIUM AND APARTMENT DWELLERS HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ERECT THEIR OWN ANTENNAS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING OR BUILDING CODES TO ENHANCE THEIR OWN TV RECEPTION. I WOULD CONSIDER IT UNCONSCIONABLE BUREAUCRATIC OPPRESSION AND LEGALLY QUESTIONABLE TO IMPOSE CABLE SYSTEMS REQUIREMENTS ON SUCH MATV'S. HOWEVER, I DO BELIEVE THAT CABLE SYSTEMS OPERATED FOR PROFIT BY CORPORATIONS, BUILDERS OR PEOPLE OTHER THAN OWNERS AND RENTERS, SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS A CABLE SYSTEM. ALSO, I OPPOSE EXCLUSIVE CONTRACTS OR CABLE LOCK-OUTS BY BUILDERS.

I WOULD LIKE TO COMPLIMENT THE  
CABLE INDUSTRY GENERALLY ON ITS VIGOROUS  
EFFORTS IN ADVANCING ITS VIEWS CONCERNING  
IMPENDING CABLE ACTIONS HERE IN THE COMMISSION--  
AND I AM SURE THE SAME SENTIMENT WOULD RE-  
SOUND ON THE HILL. SO FAR AS I AM CONCERNED,  
I HAVE LISTENED WITH INTEREST TO VARIOUS CABLE  
GROUPS WHO HAVE COME TO MY OFFICE TO PRESENT  
THEIR VIEWS AND ARGUMENTS. OBVIOUSLY NONE OF  
THEM HAS RECEIVED ANY COMMITMENTS OTHER THAN  
FULL CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE EQUITIES INVOLVED.  
BUT I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT ALL OF THESE GROUPS  
HAVE BEEN LISTENED TO AND THEIR COMMENTS  
ANALYZED IN DETAIL. I THINK THE CABLE INTERESTS  
HAVE SOUGHT AND RECEIVED MANY DEREGULATORY  
CHANGES IN THE RULES. HOWEVER, I WOULD AGAIN

SUGGEST--AND I THINK THIS MIGHT BE ECHOED BY  
OTHER COMMISSIONERS--THAT SOME CONSIDERATION  
BE GIVEN TO THE MANNER IN WHICH CABLE INTERESTS  
EXERT THEIR EFFORTS IN SUPPORTING OR OPPOSING  
ANY GIVEN POSITION. I WOULD MUCH RATHER RECEIVE  
TWO OR THREE REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS ADVANCING  
DETAILED VIEWS SUPPORTED BY FACTS AND FIGURES  
THAN A NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS COMING IN WITH  
EMOTIONAL PLEAS AND LITTLE FACTUAL DATA. SO,  
WHEN YOU COME TO SEE US, ORGANIZE WELL, PLAN  
YOUR CAMPAIGN, AND ASSEMBLE YOUR SUPPORTING  
MATERIAL WITH CARE. I, FOR ONE, WILL BE HAPPY  
TO RECEIVE YOU AND TO LISTEN TO YOUR ARGUMENTS.  
MY DOOR IS ALWAYS OPEN TO YOU.

IN MY COMMENTS TO YOU THIS MORNING,  
I HAVE EXPRESSED A FEW PERSONAL VIEWS OF



IMPENDING MATTERS INVOLVING THE CABLE  
INDUSTRY. I DO NOT INTEND THAT ANY OF MY  
COMMENTS BE TREATED AS FINAL COMMITMENTS  
OR PRE-JUDGMENTS OF ANY ISSUES. OBVIOUSLY,  
I HAVE TO KEEP MY OPTIONS OPEN. MY FINAL  
DETERMINATIONS WILL REST UPON COMPLETE PRE-  
SENTATIONS MADE BEFORE THE COMMISSION AND I  
WILL VOTE THESE ACCORDINGLY. TO THE EXTENT  
POSSIBLE I WANT TO PRECLUDE DRAWING ANY LINES  
FOR A BOTTOM FIGURE UNTIL WE HAVE THE  
NECESSARY FIGURES ABOVE THE LINE FIRST. IN  
SHORT, I WANT TO DETERMINE THE PROBLEMS  
BEFORE I COME UP WITH THE SOLUTIONS. IN THIS  
WAY WE MINIMIZE BUREAUCRATIC TEMPTATION TO  
ENACT REGULATORY SOLUTIONS THAT MUST GO

SEARCHING FOR PROBLEMS TO JUSTIFY THEIR

EXISTENCE....AND WE CAN ALL HAVE A HAPPIER

PRODUCTIVE 1977 AND BEST SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST.