

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

October, 14, 1992

OCT. 19, 1992

OCT 19 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
OFFICE of Secretary  
Att'n: DOCKET No. 92-90  
19119 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MAIL BRANCH

To Whom It May Concern:

I have heard that there is an act called "Telephone Consumer Protections Act of 1991" with a Docet No. 92-90 that is floating around possibly waiting to be passed. I have a big concern about a law like this being passed. I have worked as a telemarketer in the past, and have dealt with the consumer on the telephone. It is a difficult, but valuable job. Telemarketers provide bona fide leads to the companies that are employing them. Without these leads two things could happen:

1. The company suffers because they don't have as many leads, Real estate companies in particular.
2. The telemarketer is out of a job.

Research this Docket further, and you will see it is not to the best interest of the American public. If the people complaining are those receiving the phone calls, is it justified reason to put people OUT OF WORK just because they feel a slight inconvenience? How would you ( or they) like to be out of work because someone was inconvenienced by their job and strategies of their job??

Think about it, and DON'T ALLOW THIS BILL TO BE PASSED!!

Thank you,

  
Julia Maree  
2714 Mariquita Street  
Long Beach, CA 90804

ORIGINAL

FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

October, 14, 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
OFFICE of Secretary  
Att'n: DOCKET No. 92-90  
19119 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991.  
Docket No. 92-90

To Whom It May Concern:


My daughter is employed as a telemarketer for a large real estate company. She makes excellent money for the hours that she works. She is able to take weekends off, have flexible hours in the afternoon/early evenings, and still have the time she needs for her two young children (my grandchildren!). Without her income, their family would most certainly suffer.

It seems ridiculous to think that you would even consider limiting the freedom of being able to call into people's homes. As a homeowner, I am not offended by calls to me. If it is not something I am not interested in, I simply tell the caller I am not interested, or hang up. It is MY choice to hang up. I would not even consider asking these people to stop making their calls. I understand it is their JOB!

On the other side of the coin, I have bought things by phone when the salesperson was selling a product I was in need of. My daughter is able to help people make decisions about selling their homes, and this keeps her employed.

This letter is long enough. I urge you to take a strong hard look at this DOCKET No. 92-90 and do whatever is needed to ensure that it is not passed, so that folks like my daughter do not loose their much needed jobs.

Thank you,



DOLORES MARTIN  
homeowner  
6232 Elm Avenue  
Cypress, CA 90630



"each office independently owned and operated."

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

October 9, 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Docket No. 92-90

Attn: Office of the Secretary

This letter is to let you know how critical cold calling is for us in the real estate industry.

This part of our business is vital to our success and if we are restricted from this activity we feel that it is an infringement on our rights as independent contractors.

It is our sincere hope that we can continue to do business and provide our professional level of service through telephone communications.

Sincerely,

RE/MAX Canyon Creek Realty Inc.

**RE/MAX® Canyon Creek Realty, Inc.**

22232 17th Avenue S.E. #207  
Bothell, WA 98021 • (206) 481-8888

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MAIL BRANCH

October 7, 1992

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20554  
Attn: Docket No. 92-90

Re: Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991

Dear Sirs:

It has come to my attention that the Federal Communications Commission is drafting a regulation to restrict person-to-person solicitations to residential homes. I am writing to let you know how important "cold calling" is to my business.

"Cold calling" is my way to reach the general public and let them know, adverse to what they are reading and hearing from the news media, that Real Estate is still one of the best investments they can make today. It is also a means to let the people know the market activity in their neighborhood, thereby continuing to keep real estate active, which definitely stimulates the economy.

We, in the Real Estate field, are very courteous in our calling. "Cold calling" is one of the most important aspects of our business. It would be devastating if this regulation were to pass.

Please give this careful consideration.

Sincerely,

*Julie Fox*  
*21 All Service, Realtors*

A MEMBER OF THE BEARS FINANCIAL NETWORK



PREMIER, INC.  
RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992 ORIGINAL FILE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

23 WEST CENTER STREET  
HEBER CITY, UT 84032  
BUS. (801) 654-5300  
BUS. (800) 825-8889

92-90 / 10-12-92

Please let it be known that it is extremely important that Real Estate Agents be permitted to do Cold Calls — This is approximately 75% of all of our business —

We cannot let a regulation to restrict person-to-person solicitations to residential homes pass —

Sincerely  
Anne Washer

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

000C2Es10H7.3163C66F

October, 14, 1992

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Att'n: DOCKET No. 92-90  
19119 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

Dear Staff,

Please express my concern to whoever needs to know regarding  
Docket No. 92-90 - TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF  
1991.

I am opposed to this bill passing, as my mom's job is  
dependent telephone solicitations into people's homes.  
If she can't make her daily phone calls, she would not have  
a job. I don't want our family to be jobless, as it would  
cut down on our living, and from the way the economy is,  
jobs are difficult to get.

My mom says she enjoys her telemarketing job, as it gives  
her the freedom to work afternoons and evenings, and still  
have time for the family. Please take families like ours  
into consideration before making drastic changes in existing  
laws.

Thank you,

*Spencer Myers*

Spencer Myers  
1541 Stanley Way  
Escondido, CA 92027  
(619) 741-8584

East County Office  
2916 Jamacha Road  
El Cajon, CA 92019  
(619) 670-6011

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

OCT 19 1992

 **McMillin Realty**  
A CORKY McMILLIN COMPANY

October 7, 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Docket No. 92-90, Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991

Dear Mr. Secretary,


I am a real estate professional in the city of San Diego, state of California, and I am writing you this letter to give you some insight on the importance of "Cold-Calling" or person-to-person solicitations and the impact it would have on my business and in our industry if this particular type of prospecting was stopped or restricted.

As a real estate professional I depend on telephone prospecting to make my business prosperous. It is a very important and productive way to prospect for new clients, which makes up 35% of my business. I have spent many dollars in educating myself on this subject and feel very strongly on how this system of prospecting gives direct and immediate results. I know that most other people in my profession feel the way I do.

My family and I depend on my business and I cannot let them down. I do not, and will not support any legislation that will directly hurt my business. I also cannot support anyone or group that is responsible or in favor of this regulation.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Sincerely,



McMillin Realty

MEMBER

PHH Homequity Relocation Service

San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Carlsbad Board of REALTORS®, Coronado Board of REALTORS®, East San Diego Board of REALTORS®  
La Jolla Real Estate Brokers Association, Point Loma/Ocean Beach Realty Association, San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Rancho-Temecula-Murrieta Board of REALTORS®  
Multiple Listing Service, California Association of Realtors, National Association of Realtors



"each office independently owned and operated."

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

ORIGINAL  
FILE

October 9, 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Docket No. 92-90

Attn: Office of the Secretary

This letter is to let you know how critical cold calling is for us in the real estate industry.

This part of our business is vital to our success and if we are restricted from this activity we feel that it is an infringement on our rights as independent contractors.

It is our sincere hope that we can continue to do business and provide our professional level of service through telephone communications.

Sincerely,

RE/MAX Canyon Creek Realty Inc.

**RE/MAX® Canyon Creek Realty, Inc.**

22232 17th Avenue S.E. #207  
Bothell, WA 98021 • (206) 481-8888

# John M. Grubb

REALTORS

RECEIVED  
OCT 19 1992  
ORIGINAL FILE  
MAIL BRANCH

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
1119 M. ST. N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
20534

10/14/92

RE: DOCKET # 92-90

DEAR SECRETARY,

AS THE RECIPIENT OF  
NUMEROUS TELEPHONE SOLICITATIONS  
AND AS AN OCCASSIONAL TELEPHONE  
"COLD CALLER", I DO NOT BELIEVE  
THE HOMEOWNER NEEDS FURTHER  
PROTECTION FROM TELEPHONE  
MESSAGES. WITH VOICE MAIL,  
ANSWERING SERVICES AND  
WORKING COUPLES THE CALL  
IS NOT PERSON TO PERSON  
IN OVER 60% OF CALL MADE.  
THE UNLISTED NUMBER IS  
ALWAYS AN ANSWER. THIS IS  
ANOTHER AREA WHERE A  
GOVERNMENT EDICT IS NOT  
NECESSARY.

SINCERELY,  
John M. Grubb  
V.P. / MGR.

- DANVILLE  
Tassajara Crossing  
3408 Camino Tassajara Rd.  
Danville, CA 94506  
☎ (510) 736-7000  
Fax (510) 736-0132
- DANVILLE  
Old Town  
550 Hartz Avenue  
Danville, CA 94526  
☎ (510) 837-1451  
Fax (510) 837-3813
- ORINDA  
93 Moraga Way  
Orinda, CA 94563  
☎ (510) 254-6033  
Fax (510) 254-7738
- PLEASANTON  
Bernal Center Plaza  
6654 Koll Center Pkwy. #355  
Pleasanton, CA 94566  
☎ (510) 426-8800  
Fax (510) 462-9037
- WALNUT CREEK  
1301 Ygnacio Valley Road  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
- RESIDENTIAL  
☎ (510) 933-7100  
Fax (510) 933-0130
- COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT  
☎ (510) 933-9220  
Fax (510) 933-0130
- NATIONAL RELOCATION CENTER  
☎ (510) 947-0511  
or 1 (800) 445-2200  
Fax (510) 935-0133
- ADMINISTRATION  
☎ (510) 933-9550  
Fax (510) 935-0133



RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY



Realtors Since 1903

ORIGINAL  
FILE

Mentor Office

8804 Mentor Avenue

Mentor, Ohio 44060

(216) 951-9494, 255-6731

Office of Secretary  
Federal Communications Comm.  
Att: Delet No. 92-90  
1919 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

10-16-92  
RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

Please! SAVE my livelihood!  
Do NOT pass Delet No. 92-90, telephone  
Consumer Protection Act of 1991.  
I am on all commission and can't  
imagine having telephone calls to search  
for new business to be considered illegal.  
Keep FREE enterprise alive + well  
in America - Down w/ socialism + gov.  
interference - that means you!

Talking in Ohio

*Joe Cipriani*



Office Locations Serving All Of Northern Ohio



RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

Date: October 16, 1992

ORIGINAL  
FILE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Attn: Docket No. 92-90  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED  
OCT 19 1992  
MAIL BRANCH

Re: Docket No. 92-90; Telephone Consumer Protection  
Act of 1991

Dear Secretary:

The opportunity to solicit person to person among residential homes is essential to my business. Please do not restrict my right to do so in any way.

Certainly, restricting my business and the business of 100,000 other realtors would not help our overall economic situation. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,

*Thelma Santos*  
THELMA SANTOS

Re/Max of Princeton  
600 Alexander Rd.  
Princeton, N. J. 08540

A MEMBER OF THE SEARS FINANCIAL NETWORK

**COLDWELL  
BANKER**

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

LEISURE  
REAL ESTATE

P.O. BOX 1059  
3293 MAIN STREET  
MAMMOTH LAKES, CA 93546  
BUS. (619) 934-2562  
BUS. (800) 266-6966  
FAX (619) 924-0250

October 12, 1992

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Attn: Docket No. 92-90  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Docket No: 92-90  
Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991


To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my concerns with respect to the proposed regulation of person-to-person solicitations into residential homes.

As a real estate agent, I believe that telephone solicitations are vital to marketing "For Sale" properties and in gaining new business contacts.

I respectfully request that Docket No. 92-90 not be put into effect.

Very truly yours,



Donna Tofal  
Vice President

DT:lrg





*Above  
the  
Crowd!*<sup>®</sup>

**ORIGINAL**  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

October 14, 1992

Office Of The Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Docket No. 92-90; Telephone Consumer Protection  
Act of 1991

Dear Secretary:

The opportunity to solicit person to person among residential homes is essential to my business. Please do not restrict my right to do so in any way.

Restricting my business and the business of 100,000 other real estate agents clearly would not help our overall economic situation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda Darkes  
Broker/Sales Representative



**RE/MAX** of princeton  
600 alexander road  
princeton, new jersey 08540  
phone: (609) 452-1887  
an independent member broker



"each office independently owned and operated."

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

ORIGINAL  
FILE

October 9, 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Docket No. 92-90

Attn: Office of the Secretary

This letter is to let you know how critical cold calling is for us in the real estate industry.

This part of our business is vital to our success and if we are restricted from this activity we feel that it is an infringement on our rights as independent contractors.

It is our sincere hope that we can continue to do business and provide our professional level of service through telephone communications.

Sincerely,

RE/MAX Canyon Creek Realty Inc.

**RE/MAX® Canyon Creek Realty, Inc.**

22232 17th Avenue S.E. #207  
Bothell, WA 98021 • (206) 481-8888

East County Office  
2916 Jamacha Road  
El Cajon, CA 92019  
(619) 670-6011

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL  
FILE

OCT 19 1992

October 7, 1992

MAIL BRANCH

RECEIVED  **McMillin Realty**  
MCMILLIN COMPANY

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Docket No. 92-90, Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991

Dear Mr. Secretary,

I am a real estate professional in the city of San Diego, state of California, and I am writing you this letter to give you some insight on the importance of "Cold-Calling" or person-to-person solicitations and the impact it would have on my business and in our industry if this particular type of prospecting was stopped or restricted.

As a real estate professional I depend on telephone prospecting to make my business prosperous. It is a very important and productive way to prospect for new clients, which makes up 35% of my business. I have spent many dollars in educating myself on this subject and feel very strongly on how this system of prospecting gives direct and immediate results. I know that most other people in my profession feel the way I do.

My family and I depend on my business and I cannot let them down. I do not, and will not support any legislation that will directly hurt my business. I also cannot support anyone or group that is responsible or in favor of this regulation.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Sincerely,

*Kathryn E. Padilla*

**McMillin Realty**

MEMBER

PHH Homeequity Relocation Service

San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Carlsbad Board of REALTORS®, Coronado Board of REALTORS®, East San Diego Board of REALTORS®  
La Jolla Real Estate Brokers Association, Point Loma/Ocean Beach Realty Association, San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Rancho-Temecula-Murrieta Board of REALTORS®  
Multiple Listing Service, California Association of Realtors, National Association of Realtors



"each office independently owned and operated."

ORIGINAL FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

October 9, 1992

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Docket No. 92-90

Attn: Office of the Secretary

This letter is to let you know how critical cold calling is for us in the real estate industry.

This part of our business is vital to our success and if we are restricted from this activity we feel that it is an infringement on our rights as independent contractors.

It is our sincere hope that we can continue to do business and provide our professional level of service through telephone communications.

Sincerely,

*Janet R. McCracken*

RE/MAX Canyon Creek Realty Inc.

**RE/MAX<sup>®</sup> Canyon Creek Realty, Inc.**

22232 17th Avenue S.E. #207  
Bothell, WA 98021 • (206) 481-8888



*Above  
the  
Crowd!*<sup>®</sup>

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

ORIGINAL  
FILE

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OCTOBER 5, 1991

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

RE: DOCKET # 92-90 TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

I AM ONE OF THE THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY WHO ARE IN THE SALES BUSINESS. THERE IS AN OLD PROVERB THAT SAYS NOTHING HAPPENS UNTIL SOMEONE SELLS SOMETHING. BELIEVE IT OR NOT SALES PEOPLE MAKE THE ECONOMY GO!!

IT IS CRITICAL FOR OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY AS WELL AS THE PERSONAL ECONOMICS OF THOUSANDS OF FAMILIES IN THIS GREAT LAND FOR US TO BE ABLE TO FREELY USE THE TELEPHONE IN OUR BUSINESS. TO RESTRICT OUR USE OF THE TELEPHONE WOULD PUT A NOOSE AROUND THE NECK OF BUSINESSES OF ALL TYPES. THIS IS THE LAST THING OUR ECONOMY NEEDS RIGHT NOW, NOT TO MENTION THE TRESPASSING ON AN INDIVIDUALS RIGHTS AND PERSONAL FREEDOMS. ONE OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO PICK UP THE PHONE AND CALL ANYONE THEY WANT WITHOUT GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. IF SOMEONE DOESN'T WANT TO TALK THEY CAN EASILY HANG UP. PLUS WHO'S TO KNOW WHAT SERVICE OR PRODUCT SOMEONE MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN, IN ADVANCE WITH OUT AN INQUIRY. PLEASE DROP THIS ATTEMPT TO REGULATE THIS AREA OF OUR BUSINESS AND PERSONAL LIVES. SOME PEOPLE ( MANY PEOPLE ) OBVIOUSLY DO NOT MIND AND DO BUY FROM AND DO BUSINESS WITH PEOPLE WHO CONTACT THEM BY PHONE.

THANK YOU FOR YOU CONSIDERATION AND PLEASE RESPOND TO ME IN WRITING REGARDING THE STATUS AND OUTCOME OF THIS SITUATION.

SINCERELY,

*Ron Moscoso*

RON MOSCOSO



**RE/MAX** mission  
39560 stevenson place #117  
fremont, ca 94539  
office: (415) 794-8800



ORIGINAL  
FILE

# ERA® ACHIEVERS REAL ESTATE

October 14, 1992

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Attn: Docket No. 92-90  
1919 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Please note that we are totally against the Docket No.92-90,  
Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991. As you are aware,  
the Real Estate Industry is in dire straights now and this  
regulation could bury us.

Crime is high and people are hesitant to open their doors.  
Telephone solicitation is an extremely important tool if we  
are to survive. Please put your efforts into regulations to  
improve our economy, not destroy it.

Cordially,

Real Estate Agent/Broker

East County Office  
2916 Jamacha Road  
El Cajon, CA 92019  
(619) 670-6011

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL  
FILE

October 7, 1992

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

 **McMillin Realty**  
A CORRY-MCMILLIN COMPANY

MAIL BRANCH

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Docket No. 92-90, Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991

Dear Mr. Secretary,

I am a real estate professional in the city of San Diego, state of California, and I am writing you this letter to give you some insight on the importance of "Cold-Calling" or person-to-person solicitations and the impact it would have on my business and in our industry if this particular type of prospecting was stopped or restricted.

As a real estate professional I depend on telephone prospecting to make my business prosperous. It is a very important and productive way to prospect for new clients, which makes up 35% of my business. I have spent many dollars in educating myself on this subject and feel very strongly on how this system of prospecting gives direct and immediate results. I know that most other people in my profession feel the way I do.

My family and I depend on my business and I cannot let them down. I do not, and will not support any legislation that will directly hurt my business. I also cannot support anyone or group that is responsible or in favor of this regulation.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Sincerely,



McMillin Realty

MEMBER

FHH Homequity Relocation Service

San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Carlsbad Board of REALTORS®, Coronado Board of REALTORS®, East San Diego Board of REALTORS®,  
La Jolla Real Estate Brokers Association, Point Loma/Ocean Beach Realty Association, San Diego Board of REALTORS®, Rancho-Temecula-Murrieta Board of REALTORS®,  
Multiple Listing Service, California Association of Realtors, National Association of Realtors



*Above  
the  
Crowd!*

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL STATION

ORIGINAL  
FILE

*Office of the Secretary:*

*Oct 16, 1992.*

*Cold calling is a part of our  
lively hood & is a must  
in the real estate industry.  
I am referring to docket  
No. 92-90, Telephone Consumer  
Protection Act of 1991.*

*Please don't allow this to  
happen.*

*Sincerely,  
Irene Amb.*



**RE/MAX** Realty Plus  
2359 U.S. 27 South  
Sebring, Florida 33870  
Phone: (813) 385-0077  
Fax: (813) 385-5897

Each Office Independently Owned and Operated



ORIGINAL  
FILE

LEGAL DEPARTMENT

RANDALL D. FISHER  
General Counsel

JOHN B. GLICKSMAN  
ATHENA JAMESSON

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAL BUNCH

October 14, 1992

Ms. Donna R. Searcy, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Radnor Cablevision, Inc.  
Adelphia Cablevision Associates of Radnor, L.P.  
TVRO Earth Station E3820 (Radnor, PA)

Dear Ms. Searcy:

Pursuant to FCC Public Notice Report No. DS-1097 (DA 91-763, Rel. June 21, 1991), please be advised that Adelphia Cablevision Associates of Radnor, L.P. is now the cable television system operator of the above-referenced TVRO earth station registration formerly operated by Radnor Cablevision, Inc. Any correspondence regarding this registration(s) should now be sent to:

ATTN: Legal Department  
Adelphia Cablevision Associates of Radnor, L.P.  
5 West Third Street  
Coudersport, PA 16915

with copies to:

Matthew D. Emmer, Esq.  
Fleischman and Walsh  
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Donna R. Searcy  
October 14, 1992  
Page 2

Should any questions arise concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned directly.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John B. Glicksman".

John B. Glicksman  
Assistant General Counsel

JBG/JDT:jdt



**Jack Associates**  
P. O. Box 8  
Milton, Vermont 05468  
(802) 893-2415

1161 Williston Road  
South Burlington, Vermont 05403  
(802) 658-5555

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

Ref: Docket #92-90  
Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991

To Whom it May Concern:

I have recently been made aware that the FCC is in the process of drafting legislation to restrict telephone sales calls to residential homes.

I feel very strongly that this legislation is completely misdirected. As you know, the real estate industry is currently going through a difficult period. Drafting legislation to further hinder the industry's stability, let alone its growth, will adversely affect not only the hundreds of thousands of agents in the business nationwide, but it will also effect the economy of this country since the housing industry is inexorably linked to the nation's economic recovery.

Person to person solicitations are an intregal part of selling residential real estate and must and should remain an accepted method of reaching the people. *I am therefore voicing my OPPOSITION to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991.*

Sincerely,  
CENTURY 21 Jack Associates

REALTOR



Each Office Is Independently Owned And Operated



*Above  
the  
Crowd!*®

**ORIGINAL  
FILE**

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

OCTOBER 14, 1992

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
FCC  
1919 M STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20554

RE: DOCKET NO. 92-90

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DEAR SIRs,

THIS LETTER IS TO STATE MY STRONG OBJECTIONS TO THE "TELEPHONE CONSUMER ACT OF 1991". "COLD" CALLING IS IMPORTANT TO MY BUSINESS AND THE RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY IN GENERAL. PASSING A REGULATION LIKE THIS WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO ME AND I URGE YOU TO STOP THIS ACTION FROM PASSING.

RESPECTFULLY,

DONNA DAYE  
BROKER

**RE/MAX** preferred properties  
111 center park dr., ste. 100  
knoxville, tennessee 37922  
(615) 694-8100

ORIGINAL  
FILE

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1992

MAIL BRANCH

October 9, 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY


Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Attn: Docket No. 92-90  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

It is critical to me and my fellow real estate sales people that we be allowed to continue with tele-marketing. This means of communication with the public is our only source of creating new business and stimulating the real estate industry in this already depressed economy.

I thank you for your attention regarding the importance of this matter.

Sincerely,



Kathie Burch  
Broker Associate

