

93010814

92-266

Monday Jan 25th.

RECEIVED

JAN 26 1993

193  
Mr. J. Krieger, MD

57519 Beconsfield

FCC MAIL RECEIVED

Washington, Mich.

FEB - 8 1993

48094

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

92-266-0171

Re: cable TV re-reg.

to concern vacation and  
 There are writing in long hand.  
 Why the cable lines (alone) were  
 not constructed on the basis  
 of bids AND OWNED by  
the municipalities is beyond  
 me. They could be financed  
 through municipal bonds.  
 They should now be purchased  
 by the municipalities at a  
 determined price (a sort  
 of nationalization).

The TV programming service  
 from satellite should be  
 negotiated separately by bids  
 for 2, 3, 4, 5 years or  
 whatever.

This is the ONLY way

That there will control of  
costs.

A national act will have  
to be enacted ~~for~~ this  
"Nationalization".

Is there a better way?

Frank J. Hughes, MD.

Being owned by the  
municipality would force  
availability to ALL stations  
to be carried since it  
involves public money.

92-266

January 25, 1993

FCC  
1919 M St NW  
Washington, DC 20554

9301080 RECEIVED RECEIVED

FEB - 8 1993 JAN 28 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION MAIL ROOM  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Subject: Comments on Cable TV Rates

I travel between my summer home in Baltimore County, Maryland, where I have a satellite dish and receiver, and my condo in Dade County, Florida, where Condo regulations do not permit me to own a dish. My area in Florida is served by Storer Cable whose rates I consider excessively high. There is no effective local competition to Storer, and I do without cable TV in Florida.

In Maryland I have the privilege of purchasing the right to decode scrambled satellite signals from my local cable company or from a packaging company. In either case my rates would be higher than if I contracted with the cable company to deliver the unscrambled signals to my home.

My suggestions for change to remove these obstructions to progress and serve the consumer better are as follows:

The days when cable companies required exclusive franchises are over. Allow free competition. Do not permit States, Counties, or Cities to restrict any area to a single franchisee. Where there is no competition regulate rates to be no higher than a comparable political division where there is competition. You might even consider a solution like that of the phone company where there is a regulated charge for the hook-up and access to the lines and the consumer may then purchase his programs from any supplier he chooses including the local cable company if he finds their rates competitive.

In the case of the consumer who invests in his own dish and receiver and requires no service except from the producer of the program he wishes to receive ~~he~~ he should not be charged the same price as the consumer who contracts with the cable company to deliver his programs. The dish owner should be permitted to buy his signals from the program producer or from a packaging company at a rate close to that paid by the cable company plus billing or administrative charges. Any cable company refusing to carry the signals of a program producer unless the producer scrambles his signal should be considered in violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act. There needs to be competition here, too.

*Stanley Goldberger*  
Stanley Goldberger  
2950 NE 201 Ter. E-321, Miami, FL 33180  
3618 Forest Garden Ave., Baltimore, MD 21207

MAILED  
100  
100

JAN 28 4 05 PM '93

RECEIVED