

"Tyranny of Small Decisions: Market Failures, Imperfections, and the Limits of Economics," *Kyklos*, Volume 19, 1966.

"Mergers in the Petroleum Industry and Problems of the Independent Refiner," U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, *Economic Concentration*, Part II, Washington, 1965, pp. 562-609.

"The Depletion Allowance in the Context of Cartelization," *The American Economic Review*, Volume 54, 1964, pp. 286-314.

"Efficiency in the Use of Natural Resources: Discussion," *The American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, Volume 54, May 1964, pp. 221-226.

"Market Power and Economic Growth: Guides to Public Policy," *Antitrust Bulletin*, Volume 8, May-June 1962, p. 531.

"Agricultural Aid and Economic Development: The Case of Israel," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 76, November 1962, pp. 568-591.

"The Role of Patents," in J.P. Miller, ed., *Competition, Cartels and Their Regulation* (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam), Chapter 8, pp. 308-346.

"The Chemical Industry," Walter Adams (ed.) *The Structure of the American Industry*, First, Second and Third Editions, New York, MacMillan, 1948, 1954 and 1961.

"Economic Issues in Regulating the Field Price of Natural Gas," *The American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, Volume 50, May 1960, pp. 506-517.

"Pricing Objectives in Large Companies: Comment," *The American Economic Review*, Volume 49, September 1959, pp. 670-678.

"Selected Papers: A.E.A. Competition: Discussion," *The American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, Volume 48, May 1958, pp. 600-602.

"Economic and Legal Approaches to Antitrust: An Attempt to Clarify the Issues," *Antitrust Bulletin*, Volume 2, January 1957, pp. 267-279.

"Report on Antitrust Policy: Discussion," *The American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, Volume 46, May 1956, pp. 496-507.

"My Antitrust Philosophy: Evidence of Schizophrenia or Shattering Transformation?" *Antitrust Bulletin*, Volume 1, November 1955, p. 355.

"Regulation of Crude Oil Production in the United States and Lessons for Italy," *Banca Nazionale Del Lavoro Monthly Review*, Volume 8, June 1955, pp. 67-79.

"A Rejoinder" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *Indiana Law Journal*, Volume 29, Spring 1954, pp. 371-375.

"Legal and Economic Appraisal of the 'New' Sherman and Clayton Acts," *Yale Law Journal*, Volume 63, January 1954, pp. 293-347.

"Standards for Antitrust Policy," *Harvard Law Review*, Volume 67, November 1953, pp. 28-54. Also reprinted in Homewood-Irwin, *Readings in Industrial Organization and Public Policy* (American Economic Association, 1958), pp. 352-375.

"A Reply" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 61, October 1953, pp. 441-446.

"The Integration and Dissolution of the A & P Company" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *Indiana Law Journal*, Volume 29, Fall 1953, pp. 1-27.

"Big Business in a Competitive Society" (with A.D.H. Kaplan), *Fortune*, Volume 47, Supp., February 1953.

"Leadership and Conflict in the Pricing of Gasoline" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *Yale Law Journal*, Volume 61, June-July 1952, pp. 818-855.

"Price Discrimination in Law and Economics" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology (Essays in Honor of Harry Gunnison Brown)*, Volume 11, April 1952, pp. 281-313.

"Antitrust Law and the Big Buyer: Another Look at the A & P Case" (with Joel B. Dirlam), *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 60, April 1952, pp. 118-132.

"Investment Criteria in Development Programs," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 65, February 1951, pp. 38-61.

"The Burden of Import Duties, A Comment," *The American Economic Review*, Volume 38, December 1948, pp. 857-867.

"Patent Policy: Discussion," *The American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, Volume 38, May 1948, pp. 245-260.

"The British Balance of Payments, and Problems of Domestic Policy," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 61, May 1947, pp. 368-396.

"Palestine: A Problem in Economic Evaluation," *The American Economic Review*, Volume 34, September 1944, pp. 538-560.

"Fundamental Deficiencies of American Patent Law," *The American Economic Review*, Volume 30, September 1940, pp. 475-491.

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY:

Aviation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on international aviation policy, May 9, 1991.

Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on airline concentration at hub airports, September 22, 1988.

Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on airline safety and re-regulation, November 4, 1987.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, on competition and deregulation of the telecommunications industry, July 15, 1987.

Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on competitive issues in the airline industry, March 25, 1987.

Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, on the Administration's proposed amendments to Section 7 of the Clayton Act, February 26, 1986.

Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on Computerized Reservation Systems, March 19, 1985.

Joint Economic Committee, United States Senate, Hearing on the Economic Issues of a Changing Telecommunications Industry, October 3, 1983.

House Subcommittee on Aviation on "Competitive Problems Raised by Computerized Reservation Systems," June 22, 1983.

House Committee on the Judiciary, on H.R. 1878, "The Shipping Act of 1983," May 19, 1983.

House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on "Coal Slurry Pipelines," April 13, 1983.

House Committee on the Judiciary, on H.J. Res. 350, A Plan to Balance the Federal Budget, August 4, 1982.

Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 1215, the Malt Beverage Competition Act, June 21, 1982.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, "Development, Operation and Implementation of the United States International Aviation Policy," December 9, 1981.

Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress on "Trucking Regulation," November 17, 1981.

Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, House Committee on the Judiciary, "Mergers," August 26, 1981.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, on S. 898, "The Telecommunications Act of 1981," June 11, 1981.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, "Telecommunications Regulation," May 20, 1981.

Subcommittee on Health, Senate Committee on Finance, on "The Health Incentives Reform Act," March 19, 1980.

House Budget Committee Inflation Task Force, on the "Treatment of Housing Costs in the Consumer Price Index," January 24, 1980.

Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, on "The Chrysler Loan Guarantee Act," November 15, 1979.



Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, on "Trucking Deregulation," October 4, 1979.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, on "Trucking Deregulation," June 26, 1979.

Subcommittee on the Legislative Process, House Rules Committee, on "Sunset Legislation," May 23, 1979.

Testimony on food prices and inflation, before:

a) House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition; and Subcommittee on Department Investigations, Oversight and Research, Committee on Agriculture, April 4, 1979.

b) Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, April 6, 1979.

Testimony on hospital cost containment legislation, before:

a) Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and Subcommittee on Health, House Ways and Means Committee, March 12, 1979.

b) Health Subcommittee, Senate Finance Committee, March 13, 1979.

Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, on "Environmental Regulation and Inflation," February 27, 1979.

Testimony on authorization and appropriations for the Council on Wage and Price Stability, before:

a) Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, February 6, 1979.

b) Senate Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs, February 7, 1979.

c) Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, February 9, 1979.

d) Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, House Committee on Appropriations, May 24, 1979.

e) House Appropriations Committee, February 6, 1980.

f) Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, March 17, 1980.

g) Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, House Committee on Appropriations, March 31, 1980.

h) Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, April 21, 1980.

i) Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, Senate Committee on Appropriations, April 23, 1980.

j) Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, House Banking Committee, May 6, 1980.

House Committee on Ways and Means, on "Real Wage Insurance," January 30, 1979.

Testimony on the President's anti-inflation program, before:

a) Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, House Committee on Banking, Currency, and Housing, November 22, 1978.

b) Subcommittee on Economic Growth and Stabilization, Joint Economic Committee, December 6, 1978.

c) House Committee on the Budget, January 30, 1979.

- d) Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Services, and General Government, House Committee on Appropriations, February 14, 1979.
- e) Senate Budget Committee, March 7, 1979.
- f) Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs, House Committee on Government Operations, June 28, 1979.
- g) Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, October 10, 1979.
- h) Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, October 11, 1979.

Subcommittee on Aviation, Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, on S. 3363, "The International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1978," August 23, 1978.

National Commission for the Review of Antitrust Laws and Procedures, on "Economic Regulation and Antitrust Exemptions and Immunities," July 26, 1978.

Senate Commerce Committee, on S. 3064, "Airline Noise Legislation," June 14, 1978.

Testimony on CAB appropriations, before:

- a) House Subcommittee on Appropriations, February 28, 1978.
- b) Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, March 2, 1978.

Testimony on United States international aviation negotiations, before:

- a) Subcommittee on Aviation, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, September 29, 1977
- b) Aviation Subcommittee, House Public Works and Transportation Committee, on H.R. 11145, March 6, 1978.

House Budget Committee Task Force on Tax Expenditures, Government Organization, and Regulation, on "Airline Regulation," July 14, 1977.

Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Oversight Hearings on Antitrust Enforcement, on "Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws," May 4, 1977.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Review, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, on "The Effects of the Clean Water Act on the Electric Utility Industry," April 19, 1977.

Subcommittee on Communications, Senate Committee on Commerce, on "The Communications Act of 1934 Revisited," March 21, 1977.

Subcommittee on Communications, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on "The Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976," H.R. 12323, September 30, 1976.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on H.R. 12461, the Dingell-Moss Bill, to Prescribe Certain Rules for Federal, State and Local Agencies Regulating Electric Rates, April 7, 1976.

House Subcommittee on Communications, on "Domestic Common Carrier Regulation," November 18, 1975.

Senate Committee on Finance, on H.R. 6860, "The Energy Conservation and Conversion Act of 1975," July 18, 1975.

Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Senate Judiciary Committee, on "Regulation of the Airlines Industry," February 6, 1975.

Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on "Financial Problems of the Electric Utility Industry," August 8, 1974.

Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress on "Market Power in Relation to Economic Growth," August 1962.

Senate Subcommittee on Patents, on natural rubber cartels, May 23, 1942.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, 1958-62

In the matters of:

Area Rate Proceeding (Southern Louisiana Area), Docket Nos. AR61-2, et al.

Area Rate Proceeding (Permian Basin Area), Docket Nos. AR61-1, et al.

Omnibus, Docket Nos. G-9277, et al.

Atlantic Refining Company (Catco), Docket Nos. G-11024, et al.

Sohio Petroleum Company, et al., Docket Nos. G-8488, et al.

Gulf Oil Corporation, Docket Nos. G-9520, et al.

Amerada Petroleum Corporation, et al., Docket Nos. G-9385, et al.

Union Producing Company, Docket Nos. G-18354, et al.

Phillips Petroleum Company, Docket Nos. G-1148, et al.

Tidewater Oil Company, Docket Nos. G-13310, et al.

MISCELLANEOUS TESTIMONY:

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of Southwestern Bell in support of request for out-of-region waiver from the interLATA MFJ restrictions (with William E. Taylor), filed May 12, 1994.

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama Southern Division on behalf of BelSouth Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed June 3, 1994.

Reply Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Michigan (Eastern Division) on behalf of Ameritech Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed May 16, 1994.

Reply Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Maine on behalf of NYNEX Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed May 6, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey in proceeding involving the issue of opening the intraLATA toll market to competition, filed April 7, 1994; Rebuttal Testimony filed April 25, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of Massachusetts Electric Company before the Federal Energy Commission on wholesale wheeling and the problem of stranded investment. FERC Docket No. ER94-129-000, filed March 14, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland, Case No. 8584, on the regulatory principles applicable to determining an efficient price for MFS-I's interconnection with C&P's network (with William E. Taylor), filed November 19, 1993; Rebuttal Testimony filed January 10, 1994; Surrebuttal Testimony filed January 24, 1994.

Affidavit to the Federal Communications Commission with respect to Interstate Long Distance Competition and AT&T's Motion for Reclassification as a Nondominant Carrier (with William E. Taylor), filed November 12, 1993.

Affidavit to the High Court of New Zealand on behalf of New Zealand Rail Limited involving wharfage charges by Port Marlborough, September 27, 1993.

Testimony before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission On Behalf of a Group of Independent Refiner/Shippers on the proposed Revision to Oil Pipeline Regulations under the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Docket No. RM93-11-000, August 12, 1993.

Affidavit to the High Court of New Zealand on behalf of Air New Zealand, Ltd., and others in a proceeding involving landing charges by Wellington International Airport, Ltd., June 25, 1993.

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in the matter of *The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Virginia v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 92-1751-A, June 5, 1993 and before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Amendments of Parts 32, 36, 61, 64 and 69 of the Commission's Rules to Establish and Implement Regulatory Procedures for Video Dial Tone Service*, Petition for Rulemaking RM 8221, June 7, 1993.

Testimony before Denver County District Court, Denver, Colorado, on behalf of Metropolitan Denver Water Authority re City of Denver water rates, May 17, 1993.

"Review of Regulatory Framework: Telecom Public Notice CRTC 92-78," on behalf of AGT (Alberta Government Telephone Company), Alberta Canada, April 13, 1993.

"Major Elements of a Competitive Telecommunications Policy," on behalf of AGT (Alberta Government Telephone Company), Alberta, Canada, February 15, 1993

Testimony before the State of New York Public Service Commission in the Petition of Rochester Telephone Corporation for Approval of Proposed Restructuring Plan (Panel on Public Policy Issues with Robert W. Crandall), Case No. 93-C- , February 3, 1993.

Testimony on behalf of the Municipal Electric Association evaluating the soundness of Ontario Hydro's Demand Side Management program, December 1992.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services*, GEN Docket No. 90-314, ET Docket No. 92-100, November 6, 1992.

Testimony on behalf of New Zealand Telecom in an antitrust proceeding before the High Court of New Zealand involving terms of interconnection with Clear, a competitive provider of local transport, April 27, 1992.

Testimony on behalf of AMR Corporation and American Airlines, Inc., against UAL Corporation, United Airlines, Inc., UAL Acquisition, Inc., Air Wis Services, Inc., and Air Wisconsin, Inc., 91 CIV. 7773 (KMW), analyzing United Airlines' acquisition of Air Wisconsin's 50 O'Hare jet slots, March 2, 1991. Supplemental and Second Supplemental Testimonies, March 10 and 15, 1992.

Testimony before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of Illinois Power Company, Docket No. P91-0001, on certification of a competing natural gas pipeline, February 24, 1992.

Rebuttal Testimony before the Florida Public Service Commission, Tampa Electric Co. Docket No. 910883EI, on electric utility company responsibilities for demand side management, November 20, 1991.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Expanded Interconnection Between Local Telephone Facilities*, CC Docket No. 91-141 ENF-87-14, August 5, 1991.

Statement on behalf of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in US/UK Arbitration Concerning Heathrow Airport User Charges, April 1991. Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Statements, June and July 1991; testimony before the International Court, The Hague, July 1991.

"The Treatment of New Services Under Price Cap Regulation," on behalf of BellSouth, Federal Communications Commission, June 10, 1991.

Testimony on behalf of Fireman's Fund Insurance Company before the Insurance Commissioner of the State of California re proposed action to repeal and adopt regulations concerning property and casualty insurance rates, February 20, 1991.

Testimony before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of Conoco, Inc. Kaneb Pipeline Operating Partnership, L.P., and Kerr-McGee Refining Corporation (Williams Pipeline), February 4, 1991.

Affidavit to the U.S. District Court for District of Columbia on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, re MFJ restrictions on Bell Operating Companies' ability to offer information services, January 8, 1991.

Oral testimony before the Puerto Rican Legislature on privatization and future regulation of the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, June 20, 1990.

Testimony on behalf of Central Telephone Company of Florida before the Public Service Commission, June 12, 1990.

Testimony on behalf of Fireman's Fund Insurance Company on Proposition 103 Rate Regulation Hearings, February 5, 1990.

Testimony before Denver County District Court, Denver, Colorado, on behalf of Southgate Water District vs. Denver Water Authority on conduit extension charges, May 25, 1989.

"Efficient Pricing of Congested Airport Facilities," A Report to the Department of Transport, Great Britain, April 1989.

Testimony on behalf of ETSI Pipeline Project v. Burlington Northern Inc., et al, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division, Civil Action No. B-84-979-CA, February 23, 1989.

Reply Verified Statement on behalf of Concerned Shippers, In the Matter of Railroad Cost Recovery Procedures--Productivity Adjustment; Ex Parte No. 290 (Sub-No. 4), January 17, 1989.

Testimony on behalf of California Coalition for Trucking Deregulation before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, In the Matter of the Regulation of General Freight Transportation by Truck, Case No. I-88-08-046, October 27, 1988.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of the State of New York on the application to construct the Empire State gas pipeline, Case No. 88-T-132, October 1988.

Testimony before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell South on adjustment factor for local exchange companies under rate cap regulation, In the Matter of Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers (CC Docket 87-313), July 1988.

Affidavit on behalf of Massachusetts Port Authority in a proceeding on the proposed structure of landing fees for Logan Airport, Boston, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, June 1988.

Affidavit on behalf of Financial Interchange Inc. in an antitrust arbitration proceeding on the legality of jointly set interchange fees of an electronic funds transfer network, April 1988.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission in Coal Trading Corporation, et al. v. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al. (Docket No. 38301S) on the computation of rail stand-alone costs, April 1988.

Testimony on behalf of Public Service Electric & Gas Company, New Jersey on the used and useful doctrine in the context of utility performance standards, April 1988.

Testimony on behalf of the U.S. Postal Service on the pricing of Express Mail, March 28, 1988.

Testimony on behalf of Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers Case No. 9934 on the criteria for deciding whether a nuclear plant should be completed, February 8, 1988.

Testimony and Rebuttal Testimony before the Iowa State Utilities Board Department of Commerce on behalf of Northwestern Bell on the regulatory treatment of depreciation reserve deficiencies, October 1987 and November 1987.

Testimony before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control on behalf of the Connecticut Cable Television Association on regulating cable television rates, November 13, 1987.

Testimony before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell South In the Matter of Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers (CC Docket 87-313) October 1987 and Reply Testimony, November 1987.

Reply Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of McCarty Farms et. al. and Montana Department of Commerce, on the stand-alone cost constraint on railroad rates to captive shippers, October 2, 1987.

Testimony before the New York State Public Service Commission on behalf of New York Telephone Company on assessing the competitiveness of telecommunications markets, April 1987.

Testimony before the New Jersey Senate Energy and Environment Committee on behalf of Public Service Electric and Gas Company on draft bill, No. 2801, the "Electricity Market Pricing Act of 1986," January 26, 1987.

Testimony before Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of Interstate Natural Gas Association of America on "Competitive Implications of Natural Gas Pipeline Marketing Affiliates," December 29, 1986.

Testimony before the New York State Public Service Commission on behalf of the Owners Committee on Electric Rates, Inc., on rent-inclusion and submetering, November 19, 1986.

Testimony before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company on standard for deciding whether Braidwood Unit 2 should be cancelled, August 4, 1986.

Verified Statement on Standards for Railroad Revenue Adequacy, on Interstate Commerce Commission's Ex Parte No. 393, Sub-No.1, July 1986.

Supplemental Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 38783, Omaha Public Power District v. Burlington Northern Railroad Company on behalf of Omaha Public Power District, April 1986.

Statement to Federal Communications Commission on New England Telephone Company's Proposed Interstate Access Tariff Restructure, January 30, 1986.

Testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Oregon on inverted rate structures on behalf of the Pacific Power & Light company, January 1986.

Rebuttal Testimony before the California Public Utilities Commission on San Onofre nuclear plants on behalf of Southern California Edison Company, January 1986 and En Banc Proceeding, February 1986.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony before the Arizona Corporation Commission on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company on economic and regulatory principles applicable to entry of nuclear plants into rate base, December 1985, March 1986, December 1986 and March 1987.

Testimony before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma on economic principles applicable to access charges, Cause No. 29321 on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, September 1985.

Testimony before the California Public Utilities Commission on regulatory principles applicable to prudence determinations on behalf Southern California Edison Company, August 1985.

Testimony before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma on development of intrastate access charges, Cause No. 28309 on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, May 1985.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 38783 on behalf of Omaha Public Power District, on the grouping of captive shippers for purposes of applying a stand-alone cost test of contested rail rates, November 1984.

Testimony before the House Public Policy and Veterans Affairs Committee of the Indiana General Assembly on behalf of the Indiana Telephone Association, October 25, 1984.

Testimony before the Iowa State Commerce Commission, Docket No. INU-84-6, Investigation into competition in communications services and facilities, October 18, 1984.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony on current cash support for construction and the reorientation of regulatory policy before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, in the matter of Central Maine Power Company's proposed increase in rates, Docket No. 84-120, August 1984 and February 1985.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony for Illinois Power Company on rate base treatment of construction work in progress, before Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 84-0480, August 1984 and April 1985.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 39687, on behalf of Platte River Power Authority, on the proper definition of the cost of capital for purposes of applying a stand-alone cost test of contested rail rates, July 1984.

Verified Statement and Surrebuttal Verified Statement Before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance Docket No. 30300 on behalf of the Water Transport Association, in opposition to the application of CSX Corporation to acquire American Commercial Barge Lines, Inc., February 14, 1984 and April 19, 1984.

Direct and rebuttal testimony, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Trans Alaska Pipeline System, Dockets Nos. OR 78-1-014 and OR 78-1-016 (Phase I Remand) November 1, 1983 and December 23, 1983.

Verified Statement, Interstate Commerce Commission, on the stand alone test for rail rates to captive shippers, on behalf of Utility Fuels, Inc., Docket No. 39002, October 3, 1983.

Testimony on telephone rate structures before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission for Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company, May 27, 1983; the California Public Utilities Commission, for Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, August 18, 1983; the Missouri Public Service Commission, September 8, 1983; and Texas Public Service Commission, September 19, 1983, for Southwestern Bell Company.

Testimony before the Utility Diversification Committee of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, September 2, 1982.

Testimony before the Ad Hoc Committee on Utility Diversification, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, May 6, 1982.

Testimony before Motor Carrier Ratemaking Study Commission, Orlando, Florida, April 2, 1982.

Testimony before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control on methods of regulating rates for basic television cable service, March 9, 1982.

Testimony before the Committee of Energy and Public Utilities, The General Assembly of the State of Connecticut on regulation of cable television, March 1, 1982.

Testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, for Pacific Power & Light Company on methods of allocating aggregate revenue requirements, September 24, 1981.

Verified Statement, Interstate Commerce Commission, Ex Parte No. 347 (Sub-No. 1), "Coal Rate Guidelines-Nationwide," September 1981.

Testimony for the Department of Justice in the U.S. v. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) et al. Civil Suit 40212, filed July 28, 1964.

6/94

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the matter of)	
)	
Price Caps Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers)	CC Docket 94-1
)	

DECLARATION OF MELVYN A. FUSS

I, Melvyn A. Fuss, declare the following:

1. Introduction

1 My name is Melvyn A. Fuss. I am Professor of Economics at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, where I have taught since 1972. I have also taught economics at Harvard University and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I was Chairman of the Department of Economics at Toronto during the period 1985-90, and Associate Chairman during 1984-85. I am a Research Associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

2 I obtained a B.Sc. degree in mathematics and physics and a M.A. degree in economics from the University of Toronto. I received a Ph.D. degree in economics from the University of California, Berkeley.

3 My research activities have been oriented primarily toward the specification and estimation of production and cost functions and the measurement of productivity, including applications to the telecommunications sector. I have authored or edited four books and

monographs in these areas. Articles of mine in these areas of research have appeared in leading academic journals.

4 I have appeared several times as an expert witness on telecommunications productivity (and its relation to the price caps X-factor) in proceedings before The Canadian Radio, Television and Telecommunications Commission. I recently appeared before the Department of Public Utility Control of the State of Connecticut as an expert witness on Southern New England Telephone's productivity growth rate and related matters such as the input price growth rate differential. Attached to this declaration is a copy of my vitae.

5 The primary purpose of this declaration is to evaluate the tentative conclusion in Appendix F of the FCC's Performance Review Order that input price changes for local exchange carriers differ from those of the U.S. economy, and that this differential should be added to the productivity effect in the FCC's price caps formula. My main conclusion is that the inference drawn from the analysis in Appendix F is incorrect. I do not believe that the evidence in Appendix F supports the conclusion that an input price differential term should be added to the productivity term in the calculation of the X-factor.

6 I have also reviewed Christensen's simplified TFP measurement methodology currently being proposed by the United States Telephone Association. First, I strongly endorse the use of direct TFP measurement in the calculation of the productivity effect in the FCC's price caps formula. The methodology of Christensen's original study would be a more accurate way to measure the local exchange carriers' TFP than the simplified version. But that methodology requires proprietary data, and thus is odds with what I

perceive to be a requirement of the FCC that the calculations be based entirely on publically available data. The Christensen methodology seems to me to be a reasonable way of dealing with the requirement that all data used be available publically. I cannot think of any compromises that I would have handled differently. The sensitivity analysis contained in the Christensen paper demonstrates that the simplified TFP calculation remains economically meaningful and therefore useful and appropriate in establishing the productivity effect.

7 I now return to the question of the validity of the tentative assertion contained in Appendix F. In this declaration I accept, for the purpose of analysis, the assumption of the authors of Appendix F (C. Anthony Bush and Mark Uretsky), that there is a need to subject to empirical test the idea that after 1984 there was a change in the input price growth rate differential. I ask the following question: Is the FCC's tentative assertion - that the input price growth rate differential observed in the post-1984 period is a continuing phenomenon - correct? My conclusion is that the FCC's tentative assertion is incorrect because Appendix F considered only one of two possible economic explanations for the post-divestiture price differential. A more complete analysis than that carried out in Appendix F demonstrates that, assuming an input price differential developed after 1984, the correct conclusion from the data considered in Appendix F is that the differential was a temporary phenomenon that ended in 1990. This conclusion remains true when a new data point (the 1993 input price differential) is added to the data set used in Appendix F.

8 In summary, my analysis of Appendix F demonstrates that the period 1984-89 was

a temporary departure from the long term relationship between the LEC's input price growth and the U.S. economy's input price growth; and that this long term relationship was resumed in the 1990's.

2. The Basic Issue

9 The X-factor offset in the FCC's price caps formula can be written in the form

$$X = [\text{TFP GROWTH (Local Exchange Carrier)} - \text{TFP GROWTH (U.S.)}] \quad (1)$$

10 The above formula is derived under the assumption that the expected growth rate of input prices for the LEC industry equals the expected growth rate of input prices for the US economy as a whole; i.e., the expected input price growth rate differential is zero. If the LEC industry's expected rate of growth of input prices is less than the expected rate of growth for the US economy, the X-factor offset in the price caps formula will exceed the TFP growth rate differential.

11 In its *First Report and Order in the Matter of Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers*, the FCC presented an analysis of two of its staff economists (contained in Appendix F of the *First Report and Order*) which argued that there was a statistically significant difference in input price growth rates in the post-divestiture period (1984-92) which should be incorporated in any price caps plan. The impact of this conclusion is quantitatively very important, resulting in an X-factor (using the data from Appendix F) which is more than double the offset calculated from equation (1). The FCC did however recognize that the conclusion of Appendix F was debatable, and called for further comment on the input price differential issue.

3. A Critical Analysis of Appendix F

(a). Introduction

12 Appendix F concluded that a statistically significant shift in the input price growth rate differential had occurred post-divestiture. The question which was left unanswered is whether that shift was temporary or permanent. In tentatively accepting the price differential add-on, the FCC assumed that the average input price differential which existed over the 1984-92 period was to be viewed as a continuing, permanent phenomenon and hence should be a component of any X-factor offset.

13 As I demonstrate below, the notion that any LEC-US input price growth rate differential is a continuing phenomenon is based on the acceptance of a specific economic hypothesis which I will call the permanent change hypothesis. The permanent change hypothesis requires that an increase in competition result in a permanent increase in the rate of technological progress.

14 A second, a priori equally plausible economic hypothesis, which I will call the temporary change hypothesis, leads to the opposite conclusion that the input price differential observed was a temporary phenomenon. The temporary change hypothesis requires that an increase in competition lead to reductions in monopoly profits earned by the LEC equipment suppliers until a more competitive profit rate is reached. The two hypotheses can be tested empirically one against the other using the data employed in Appendix F.

15 In section 3(b) I describe the two economic hypotheses in some detail. The results

of the empirical tests are presented in section 3(c).

(b). The Two Economic Hypotheses

16 The authors of Appendix F built their statistical analysis around the following argument advanced by one of the parties to the proceeding, Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Group. Ad Hoc argued that the increase in competition in the equipment-supplying industry post-divestiture led to an increase in the productivity growth rate in this industry due to increases in technological improvements spurred on by the onset of competition. These gains in turn, it argued, led to a lower rate of increase in equipment prices than had previously been the case. I will call this the permanent change hypothesis since Ad Hoc also argued that the increase in productivity growth post-divestiture would be a permanent phenomenon.

17 Ad Hoc (and Appendix F), however, did not consider an alternative explanation for the relative decline in equipment prices in the post-divestiture period - the erosion of monopoly profits in the equipment business. Prior to 1984, a small number of equipment manufacturers such as Western Electric, the manufacturing affiliate of AT&T, and Automatic Electric, the manufacturing affiliate of GTE, had a dominant, quasi-monopoly position in the telephone equipment manufacturing industry. After divestiture, the Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs) were free to purchase equipment from any supplier, but were prohibited from manufacturing equipment themselves. This aspect of the divestiture decision led to increased competition from both domestic producers and foreign producers such as Ericsson, Hitachi, Mitel, NEC, Northern Telecom, Siemens,

and others. This competition developed because the incumbent equipment manufacturers, which were not regulated, presumably had used their dominant positions in the pre-divestiture period to extract excess economic profits. Post-divestiture, these excess profits attracted the attention of rivals who were no longer foreclosed from the bulk of the market but were now able to compete on a more equal footing. The increased competition which developed post-divestiture significantly eroded the quasi-monopoly position of the incumbents and could be expected to reduce dramatically their profitability. The mechanism that would have been used by competitors to enter the industry and/or expand market share is price competition, and this has the effect of both competing away excess profits and lowering the rate of increase in the LECs' purchase prices of equipment.

18 I will call this impact on equipment prices the temporary change hypothesis, since as explained below, the competitive impact would be a temporary phenomenon.

19 The two competing hypotheses have different implications for the relative time path of equipment purchase prices and hence the time path of the input price differential. The permanent change hypothesis implies that, relative to the pre-divestiture period, after 1984 equipment prices would decline and continue to decline throughout the post-divestiture period due to increased technical progress.¹ The important implication of this hypothesis for the calculation of the X-factor is that any significant input price differential observed post-divestiture would become a permanent phenomenon.

20 The temporary change hypothesis implies that, relative to the pre-divestiture period,

¹ This statement assumes all other things, such as general inflation and interest rates, are the same both pre- and post- divestiture.

we should observe a decline in equipment prices for several years while the competitive process eliminates the excess profits of the formally dominant firms. Once this process has run its course, equipment prices should resume a time path similar to that which existed prior to the shock caused by divestiture.

- 21 The implication of the temporary change hypothesis for the input price differential is that, post-divestiture, we should observe that LEC input prices are growing more slowly than input prices for the US economy for several years. After some period of time the previous equality of growth rates should be resumed. Figure 1 demonstrates the effect of the two hypotheses on the time path of the input price growth rate differential. The data point 19X represents the unknown year by which the process of competing away excess profits has been completed. This unknown year can be determined from the data, as I demonstrate in the technical appendix. Notice from figure 1 the main difference in the implications of the two competing hypotheses. In both cases LEC and US input growth rates diverge after 1984. In the case of the permanent change hypothesis, the divergence is of a continuing nature. In the case of the temporary change hypothesis, the growth rates come back together in 19X, so that considering the long term, the divergence is temporary in nature.

(c). The Empirical Results: Testing the Two Competing Hypotheses

- 22 The first step in the testing procedure is to determine the year 19X by which, according to the temporary change hypothesis, the process of competing away excess profits has been completed. As I demonstrate in the technical appendix, that year is 1990

for both the Christensen and NERA data sets utilized by the authors of Appendix F. The temporary change hypothesis can therefore be stated as follows: "According to the data, the process of competitive equipment price declines which competed away the excess profits of the formerly dominant incumbent equipment manufacturers occurred over the 1984-89 period. By the 1990 growth year, the growth rate of LEC input prices resumed their earlier long-term relationship with US input prices."

23 The second step of the testing procedure is to test the permanent change hypothesis against the temporary change hypothesis. In essence, the testing procedure reduces to asking the question: Which explains the data better - a continuing input price differential or one which ended after 1989?

24 The formal procedure for testing these two competing hypotheses is contained in the technical appendix. The hypotheses were tested for the Christensen and NERA data sets used in Appendix F (which involved data through 1992), and for these data sets with the addition of a 1993 data point. In all cases, at conventional significance levels, the permanent change hypothesis is rejected. In no case, at conventional significance levels, is the temporary change hypothesis rejected. The temporary change hypothesis dominates the permanent change hypothesis as a means of explaining the Christensen and NERA data sets used in Appendix F.

25 In other words, statistically one can reject the view that there is a permanent or ongoing difference between the growth rates of the LEC industry's input prices and those of the U.S. economy.

(4) The Permanent Change Hypothesis - Other Evidence

26 Beyond the statistical results discussed above, there is some other evidence which casts doubt on the existence of a significant ongoing input price growth rate differential.

27 The validity of the permanent change hypothesis depends on an improvement in productivity growth post-divestiture which can be attributed to an increase in technological progress. I know of only one study of the U.S. telephone equipment industry which compares productivity growth pre- and post- divestiture. This is a study by Steven Olley of New York University and Ariel Pakes of Yale University². In this study, which is based on Bureau of the Census data for individual equipment manufacturing plants, the authors estimated productivity growth over the 1974-87 period. They also analyzed the sources of any productivity growth rate differential which occurred post-divestiture. Olley and Pakes estimated that productivity growth did increase post-divestiture. However, the authors found that the source of the productivity growth increase was not an increase in average productivity per plant (as would occur if technological progress accelerated), but rather was due to a reallocation of output to the more productive plants. This latter effect is not consistent with the permanent change hypothesis, because it could not be a source of continuing productivity growth. Once the reallocation was completed (perhaps after several years) this source of productivity growth increase would dry up.

28 The conclusion Olley and Pakes reach, that there is no evidence for an **increase** in technological progress that can be dated from 1984, contradicts the assumption which

² "The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 3977, January 1992.

underlies the analysis in Appendix F.³

29 The phenomenon observed by Olley and Pakes is consistent with the temporary change hypothesis. As competition eroded price levels and profits, incumbent firms would be under pressure to produce output at lowest possible cost in an attempt to maintain profit margins, and thus would reallocate production to the most efficient plants, perhaps closing the least efficient plants.

30 Another piece of evidence which contradicts the permanent change hypothesis is the testimony I presented before the Department of Public Utility Control of the State of Connecticut.⁴ In that testimony I demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the growth rate of input prices for the Southern New England Telephone Company and the U.S. economy for the years 1989-94.⁵

³ As a qualification, Olley and Pakes note in their concluding remarks that since their study ends in 1987, their results do not address the question of the effect of divestiture on the scope and productivity of R&D activity - the main source of technological progress in the industry. The implication of this qualification is that if a longer time period is considered, a significant increase in the productivity growth rate due to a permanent improvement in technical change might be observed. There does not exist more recent data as disaggregated as the Olley-Pakes plant-level data set. However, the National Bureau of Economic Research, in a publically-available manufacturing productivity data base, provide total factor productivity (TFP) estimates based on aggregate industry data for a number of SIC 4-digit industries, including SIC 3661 (Telephone and Telegraph Apparatus). The average annual TFP growth rates for selected time periods are as follows:

Time Period	TFP Growth Rate
1960-84	1.7%
1977-84	2.2%
1984-91	1.9%

There does not appear to have been a sharp increase in the TFP growth rate in the telephone and telegraph apparatus industry post-divestiture. Assuming these growth rates are applicable to the more narrowly defined telephone equipment industry, a comparison of 1984-91 with the immediately seven preceding years results in no productivity growth impact on the price differential.

⁴ Docket No. 95-03-01, Request No. LFE053S, Attachment A, October 25, 1995, "Analysis of SNET's Input Price Differential 1989 to 1994".

⁵ The years 1989-94 correspond to the growth years 1990 through 1994.

(5). Conclusions

31 There are two possible explanations for the change in the LEC-US input price growth rate differential which developed post-divestiture in response to competitive pressures in the telecommunications equipment industry. One, the differential could have been due to a permanent increase in the rate of technological progress in the equipment industry which would have resulted in a continuing decline in the relative rate of increase in capital prices (the permanent change hypothesis). Two, the differential could have been due to a temporary decline in the rate of increase in equipment prices resulting from the erosion of the profitability of the formerly dominant equipment suppliers (the temporary change hypothesis). Appendix F considered only the first hypothesis, and hence incorrectly concluded that the divestiture effect was permanent. I have demonstrated that a more complete statistical analysis of the data leads to a rejection of the permanent change hypothesis in favour of the temporary change hypothesis. The conclusion to be drawn from my analysis of the Christensen and NERA data sets, within the framework established in Appendix F, is that the relative decline in LEC input prices was a phenomenon of the period 1984-89 and should not play a role in the calculation of the X-factor for LEC price cap plans.