

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Kane, Patrick <kon@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 7:07pm
Subject: modem tax

I am writing to express my displeasure with the proposed change in rate structure. I don't believe that it is fair for the majority of the burden to be placed on so few.

96-262

SUNSHINE PERIOD RECEIVED

From: McLemore, Harry D. <ryjoe@pathway.net>
To: "James Quello" <jquello@fcc.gov>
Date: 5/7/97 8:03pm
Subject: Telephone rates

MAY -- 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I had just learned of the vote coming up to raise the telephone rates by as much as \$4 - \$6 per line on businesses, and \$3.50 on residentials that have multilines. The Boro of Jamestown - Jamestown, Pa of which I am Mayor, has 3 phones and a Fax line and this is going to be rather expensive. I feel this is an unfair taxation without any representation, and no official notices that we could even voice our opinions. There are many businesses here in this small community that will also suffer as they use Faxes and Computers in the process of their work. This bill will place an un-needed financial burden on all tax payers for the benefit of a few. This government is supposed to represent the majority not the minority. It seems this is being pushed thru just to appease Clintons idea of computers in the schools, and its going to really hurt the services that provide connections to the internet for private concerns, citizens, and businesses.....I sincerely wish you would vote against this bill and give it more study. People cannot continually be asked to pay...pay...pay. Their income is limited.

96262

Harry McLemore - Mayor - Borough of Jamestown, Pa. ryjoe@pathway.net

SUNSHINE PERIOD RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

From: Jasinto <Lighthouse@kellnet.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 8:08pm

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear Commissioner Chong;

Why am I a minority small business owner being punished by this under-researched, unfair and biased MODEM TAX.

As a minority I don't want to have to tell employees that they have no place here because of the FCC commissioners Quello, Ness and Chong. Please spare me this unnecessary pain.

Sincerely;

Jesse Jasinto

96262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 1997

From: "John R. Cox" <john@vis-arts.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 8:38pm
Subject: new "modem" tax

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-262

Hello,

Although I strongly agree that schools and libraries need internet access, it appears that the proposed new "tax" is far out of line in it's reach. There just simply aren't THAT many schools and libraries that would require the economic measures outlined in the new "modem tax" proposal. Yes - they need it. I'm all for it. But this is CRAZY!

Sincerely,

John R Cox

--

Visit "VisArts Design" Web Services <http://www.vis-arts.com>

"In space, no one can hear you giggle." <http://gax.base.org>

Member: HTML Writers Guild

Member: Microsoft Site Builders Network - Level 2

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: "Jeff Phillips" <JeffP@Earthling.net>
To: A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNESS,RCHONG,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/96 5:06pm
Subject: ****"Universal Access" Phone tariff***

I live in a rural area, where the internet is only available in the next town. This would be a long distance call to access the internet, except our phone company is nice enough to and an adjacent town calling plan wich lets me call that town as if it were local for a \$15 per month fee. Then I pay the ISP in the other town \$14.95 for service. Due to the \$29.95 per month price for me to access the internet, I have regetfully put off getting a modem line. People always complain that my phone line is busy.

96-262

Finally, I was about to get a modem line. I called the phone company and found out that they charge \$12.16 for a basic phonline. Unfortuantly they listed off tons of governmental charges, tarriffs and taxes! They said that there are two \$3.50 tarriffs per month, one for Federal, the other for State. They said one of them is for some dumb long distance thing. I said that I didn't want any longdistance service because I would be only dialing into my ISP in the next town. They said that the government requires the tariffs weather the customer benifits from it or not. They then listed off another 3% federal tax and a 6% state tax!!!

After the taxes and tariffs, new line would be \$20.88 with taxes, plus the \$15 for the adjacent town calling plan so that I do not have to pay for every single minute I am on the internet. I then have to pay my isp \$14.95 for service. THAT TOTALS \$50.83 A MONTH!!!!!! THATS WAY TO HIGH OF A PRICE!!!!!! I would only get 24kbps due to static on the lines out here in the country! I don't think it is worth \$50.83 per month!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Today I went to C|net radio on www.news.com only to find out that you people want to add another 2 or 3 dollar tariff to my bill!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

WHAT IS IT WITH YOU PEOPLE!?!?!?! I don't feel it is kind of you to raise my bill for internet access on a line from \$12.18 that the phone company wants to around \$55.00!!!!!! That is 5 TIMES THE PRICE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I hear that the new tariff is for the rural area schools to help them get on the internet. I see how it costs rural area schools (such as the local one wich is www.kingston.k12.mi.us) more than the city schools to get connected.

I feel that if you want rural area schools to have the same prices for internet access as the city schools, then the city shoolds that pay for internet should have to pay a tariff to let the rural ones on!

The people SHOULDN'T BE TARIFFED FOR THE SHOOLS!!!

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Lucich, Sr., Raymond <rlucich@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/8/97 3:22pm
Subject: NO RAISE PHONE CHARGES

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Raymond Lucich, Sr. wrote:

>
> Rarchelle Chong:
>
> I'm opposed to the raise in our phone rate for the second line in
> my house.
>
> Please no raise
>
> Raymond C. Lucich
> Sr.

96 262

SUNSHINE PERIOD RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: "Warren E. Downs" <warren@telmarcorp.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/8/97 12:26pm
Subject: Universal Service Plan

Please vote no on the Universal Service Plan for phone rates. If a tax is needed, it should not single out ISPs and modem users, but should be distributed equally. Furthermore, not enough study on the subject has been done yet.

96-262

Thanks,
Warren

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Autumn Ellison <aellison@southern.edu>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 12:13pm
Subject: "modem tax"

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to the proposed tax on internet phone lines and certain companies. I ask that more investigation be invested in the matter before a final decision is made. Please consider the ramifications involved. Don't make the knowledge of the internet more of a rich man's privilege. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Autumn Ellison

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO, SNESS, RCHONG)

96-267

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: John B. Gullo <jbgullo@juno.com>
To: A7.A7(JQUELLO, SNESS, RCHONG, rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 10:07am
Subject: Additional Line Fee

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am against an additional line fee for consumers who have more than one telephone line.

John B. Gullo

96-262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Todd Goodman <tgoodman@iag.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 8:53am
Subject: Increased Charges for access to the internet

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Please do not raise the communication fees for the public. One of the things that has made the internet so popular is the lower prices and simple ability to access it.

Thanks,

Todd

96262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: "Steven Newman, Esq." <snewman@cmyst.com>
To: "rhundt@fcc.gov" <rhundt@fcc.gov>
Date: 5/8/97 8:32am
Subject: "Modem Tax"

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Please do not pass the new tax on second phone lines (dubbed the modem tax). It is ridiculous to require a small slice of people to pay for a new tax. If a new tax is to be paid, it should be spread across the population equally. One of the reasons we left Britain was taxation without representation.

96262

- > 1) The FCC will implement a sweeping new tax before
- > studying the alternatives (e.g., Net Day, access through
- > existing state Internet networks).
- >
- > 2) The tax is structured to specifically punish Internet
- > and online services and their subscribers. If the tax is
- > necessary, it should be applied to all consumers and all
- > businesses.
- >
- > 3) There has been insufficient study of the subject. There
- > is little or no data to support the need for the tax, or to
- > indicate whether the current proposal will be enough to do
- > the job.

I urge you not to pass it.

Thank you.

Steven Newman

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: "Clarence U. Dunbebin" <74617.1647@CompuServe.COM>
To: Reed Hundt <rhundt@fcc.gov>
Date: 5/8/97 7:42am
Subject: New regulations to tax phone lines

RECEIVED
MAY 8 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am a superintendent of schools for the second largest church education system in the USA. We are vitally interested in having our students learning about technology and how to use it as part of their learning hardware.

We are moving our schools--large and small--toward fulfilling our dreams for the 21st century, and I don't see that it is necessary to tax telephone lines to achieve that dream. We want our students to be able to use Internet, the other on-line learning sources, and e-mail, etc. BOTH at school and at home.

96762

A tax on a second line at home can break the link we want established with the home and the school. Especially is this true if the tax is in the \$3-4 range per month. If industry wants to do it, they can reduce the rates to schools as part of their partnership with education.

If public schools want to, they can reassign their priorities and provide the services, as well. It is wrong to tax people and organizations for this kind of project. A tax is the easiest course to take but it is not the most productive course to take. Set the guidelines and use some of President Johnson's "jawboning" skills to accomplish your goals or President Clinton's goals.

Telephone lines are necessities and should not be taxed!

Clarence Dunbebin
Associate Superintendent of Schools
Potomac Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Staunton, VA 24401

CC: Rachelle Chong <rchong@fcc.gov>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Michael <michael98@prodigy.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/8/97 6:47am
Subject: modem line tax

RECEIVED
MAY 8 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am canceling my extra phone line tomorrow. I will feel the pain but I cannot support government policies that shortsightedly harm people interested in new technology and our future. My opinion of the current FCC administrators and the FCC and government in general has taken a major hit here. I will be looking for ways to fight you politically until this particularly un-American policy is stopped.

96262

Michael DeVore

Michael98@prodigy.net

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96267

From: <argo@ix.netcom.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/8/97 6:12am
Subject: VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.

SIR AND/OR MADAME,

NO MORE TAXATION ON THOSE WHO ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE TAXED IN THE FIRST PLACE, IN FAVOR OF THOSE WHO ARE REQUIRED. WE SOVERIEGNS ARE TIRED OF THESE CONTINUOUS "PONZIE SCHEMES" WHICH CONTINUALLY DIMINISH OUR RIGHTS TO WHAT BELONGS TO US (WE THE PEOPLE) . WE DIDN'T HIRE YOU TO REPRESENT ANY OF THESE SPECIAL INTERESTS. YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO BE PROTECTING OUR INTERESTS IN THE USE AND CONTROL OF OUR AIRWAYS. SINCE WHEN ARE WE SUPPOSED TO BE REQUIRED TO CONTINUALLY SUBSIDIZE THOSE ENTITIES WHO FOREVER MISUSE THE FUNDS THEY ARE ALREADY PROVIDED TO HANDLE THEIR SUPPOSED NEEDS? YOUR JOB IS NOT TO APPROPRIATE OUR PROPERTY FOR SUCH USE OR MISUSE OF YOUR SELF-ASSIGNED DUTIES.

EVERY DAY MORE AND MORE SOVEREIGNS ARE BEGINNING TO QUESTION THE ACTIONS OF ELECTED PERSONS AND BUEREAUCRATS IN THE HANDLING OF THEIR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, WITH THE POSSIBLE CANCELATION OF THEIR POSITIONS AND PENSIONS THRU THE ELECTIVE PROCESS.

VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.
VOTE NO ON ANY INCREASE OF TELEPHONE LINE FEES.

Mr. Sam Sussman

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Basile, Peter J. <geegem@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 2:54am
Subject: Re: modem tax

peter basile wrote:

>

Dear Mr Reed Hunt

You people just can't seem to keep the present system running smoothly can you. You people at the FCC just can't wait to create another abortion such as the break-up of ATT which was supposed to be beneficial to consumers. Since that my phones have never been higher why can't just leave well enough alone. The school in town I live in presently subscribes to on line services which are paid for out of my taxes. We don't have a library except at the school. HEALTH CARE FACILITIES CAN SURELY PAY ANY CHARGES THAT MAY BE INCURRED I don't need to be paying an extra \$42.00 per year in taxes to fund this. You people are going to try and slide this by.

This country was founded on the premise that we would not allow TAXATION WITHOUT PROPER REPRESENTATION.

>

> PETER BASILE
> 12 COCHRAN DRIVE
> NEW CASTLE, PA. 16105
> 14126580136

CC: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO)

96267

From: "edvalson.joy" <edvalson.joy@mci2000.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/8/97 2:00am
Subject: Internet Tax

SUNSHINE PERIOD
RECEIVED
MAY 8 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I have to give you my opinion as a working professional and as a Mother of 3 children. The internet is a new medium that has stimulated my children to go and seek knowledge where before it wasn't so readily available. This is a time in their educational process that they need access to the information obtained on the internet. If the tax is implemented there would be a limit to the time that they could spend online. what a shame when the children are initiating learning. Are we really interested in our children's education in this country?? I pay my fair share and then some in taxes, and you want to tax me again. I pay for the children to go to private school so that they have opportunities that are not offered in public school, and now an alternative medium like the internet is going to be taxed? I think another long hard look will certainly change your mind.

96262

Sincerely,
Joy L Edvalson RN MSN FNP CETN

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <manning@top.net>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 12:57am
Subject: Where is v.18 support?

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

There is no computer modem with v.18 support at any major computer store. USRobotics claimed to have everything on their modems which is not true. If there is v.18 on every modem then it will provide more accessibility for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing citizens. From my understanding, there are some slow modem with TTY support, it cost around 300 dollars. I feel it is unreasonable price when TTY (5 bits - 55 bps) is about 1000 times slower than the fastest modem for the regular phone (56k). Would you please investigate why there is "no" mass-production modem with v.18 support. Thank you.

QC-262

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO,RCHONG,SNESS)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Randal Leval <rleval@mauigateway.com>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/8/97 12:44am
Subject: raise phone rates

Dear Mr. Chairman and Commissioners,

I just learned that the Federal Communications Commission is scheduled to pass new regulations on May 8 which will result in higher telephone line charges for those who use the Internet. I urge you to reject this regulation.

96-262

If a telephone tax is needed, internet users should not be discriminated against as such. The tax burden should be accessed to all telephone users.

Thank You,

Randal A. Leval
275 S. Alu Road
Wailuku, HI 96793
EMAIL: rleval@mauigateway.com

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNESS,RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Robert Eis, Jr. <reis@sedona.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("rhunot")
Date: 5/7/97 11:38pm

RECEIVED
MAY 8 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I would like to express my OPPOSITION to the "Modem Tax" that is being considered on May 8th. There is no need for such a tax. We the tax payers are over taxed the way it is, and there is no need for the FCC to create another tax that isn't approved by the taxpayers.

96-262

Robert Eis, Jr.
WA0W
130 Pinto Lane
Sedona, AZ 86351
Phone 520-284-3807

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO, SNESS, RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <TPeter9711@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESSE,JQUELLO,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 11:34pm
Subject: Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the FCC:

Please register my disappointment that you would consider a tax on the productive members of society that have taken the time and effort to learn and use the internet.

96262

Please realize that the redistribution of income from the productive to the "needy" through the federal government is a tremendous strain on the prosperity of the United States of America. If you want to raise the standard of living of the least fortunate among us, then let the most productive members do what they do best - create wealth. It has been well documented since the writing of The Wealth of Nations that no country ever has, nor ever will, taxed its way to freedom or prosperity. This country was founded on the principals of individual freedom and responsibility. Please remember that this is what has given us growth and prosperity - NOT THE NEW DEAL!

Rather than adding another failed socialization scheme you should be looking for ways to end the socialized school system that has given us lower test scores from year to year. Rather than looking for funds to take from the private sector to give to the socialized sector, you should be pointing out that Robin Hood was immoral.

Thank you for logging my resentment of the proposition that you can take from one group to give to another in the name of fair play.

Tim Peterson

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Ryan Fusco <fusco@prodigy.net>
To: C1.C1(RHUNT),A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNES,RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 11:08pm
Subject: RE: Modem tax

Dear Sir(s),

I am writing to you in oppisition of the modem tax that is to be voted on may 8 1997. I feel that this is unfair and unnessessery and unfair please to not vote for the modem tax. it will punish college students such as myself money is tight and a modem tax will make it not possible for me and other college students to use this powerful the internet for school purposes. Thank you for your time and consederation.

Thank you,

Ryan Fusco

96-262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <carlj@erienet.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 10:39pm
Subject: [Fwd: "Modem Tax"]

Subject: "Modem Tax"
Date: Wed, 07 May 1997 22:37:00 -0400
From: carlj@erienet.net
To: rhundt@fcc.gov

96-262

Please review/rethink BEFORE you vote.
Please study any and all alternative to this "TAX"
Please do not punish ISP's and online services by "TAXING" only them.
Is this "TAX" needed?
Will this proposal be enough to do the job?
Please do not force my ISP to trickle down their increased charges to me, I live on a fixed income and rely upon the internet and my ISP for socialization.

Thank you,

Carl J. Jasinto
carlj@erienet.net

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Roberta Cirocco <cirocco@laker.net>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 10:35pm
Subject: access charges

I hope the number of responses received by the FCC on this matter prove to be a strong indication of the need to keep the rates down in this initial phase of making the Internet more accessible. This can be the true democratic forum. Please vote no on this issue. Roberta Cirocco
3690 Inverrary Drive #1Y Lauderhill FL 33319 cirocco@laker.net

96-262

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO, SNESS, RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

96262

MAY - 8 1997

From: <tmcb@onecom.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 9:54pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Terrence L. McBane (tmcb@onecom.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Chong:

Last July 1996 my wife and I did what most Americans only dream of, we started our own business. We operate an Internet Service (ONE Communications "http://www.onecom.com") which provides access to the World Wide Web, we design Web sites and development content, and offer training classes on Internet related topics. Seeing an opportunity in our community, we wanted to offer quality Internet Access to the World Wide Web. As with all new start businesses you have obstacles and hurdles along the way. Most of those are due to financial reasons, and starting a business such as ours requires up front capital expenditures and additional operating funds to survive. The largest portion of our monthly operating cost , nearly two-thirds, goes to the Telephone company (Sprint).

Today we were deeply saddened by the FCC's ruling on CC DOCKET NOS. 96-262; 94-1; 91-213; 95-72. Although the fundamental structure of this ruling benefits consumers by lowering the cost of Long Distance phone charges, it also burdens individuals & businesses with two or more phone lines. These surcharges per line will cut away the only profit margins we have. The Telephone companies will gain billions of dollars in additional revenue directly from ISP's. These same Telephone companies several years ago fought against the Internet claiming it was crushing the infrastructure and obstructing voice phone services, today they are Internet Service Providers. They offer Internet Access just as I do, the only difference is they won't have to pay themselves these additional surcharges per line. They have gained a huge advantage today, and many of the privately owned ISP's like ours will go out of business. The Telco's have the money to continue operating forever and soon the Internet as we know it will also be completely controlled by them.

What has the Internet done for us and other users? It has created a level playing field for rich and poor, small businesses and large corporations - all have the same access to information and learning tools that do not exist anywhere else in our society. The Internet is growing rapidly largely because of inexpensive and predictable flat-rate pricing for unlimited access. This legislation will slow the growth of smaller ISP's who will have to over sell their services to stay competitive and pay the bills. Ultimately, these charges will be passed to consumers and businesses. If this happens those who benefit most from these emerging technologies, the poor and small business owners, will be cut off because they won't be able to afford to connect. Please do not allow phone companies to gouge consumers and small business and thus limit access and competitiveness in the name of unwarranted profits. They have monopolized these and other services to long, let others enjoy the opportunity of business success.

Sincerely,

Terry McBane "tmcb@onecom.com"
COO, ONE Communication Services, Inc.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1997

96-267

From: <tmcb@onecom.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 9:47pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Terrence L. McBane (tmcb@onecom.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Chong:

Last July 1996 my wife and I did what most Americans only dream of, we started our own business. We operate an Internet Service (ONE Communications "http://www.onecom.com") which provides access to the World Wide Web, we design Web sites and development content, and offer training classes on Internet related topics. Seeing an opportunity in our community, we wanted to offer quality Internet Access to the World Wide Web. As with all new start businesses you have obstacles and hurdles along the way. Most of those are due to financial reasons, and starting a business such as ours requires up front capital expenditures and additional operating funds to survive. The largest portion of our monthly operating cost , nearly two-thirds, goes to the Telephone company (Sprint).

Today we were deeply saddened by the FCC's ruling on CC DOCKET NOS 96-262; 94-1; 91-213; 95-72. Although the fundamental structure of this ruling benefits consumers by lowering the cost of Long Distance phone charges, it also burdens individuals & businesses with two or more phone lines. These surcharges per line will cut away the only profit margins we have. The Telephone companies will gain billions of dollars in additional revenue directly from ISP's. These same Telephone companies several years ago fought against the Internet claiming it was crushing the infrastructure and obstructing voice phone services, today they are Internet Service Providers. They offer Internet Access just as I do, the only difference is they won't have to pay themselves these additional surcharges per line. They have gained a huge advantage today, and many of the privately owned ISP's like ours will go out of business. The Telco's have the money to continue operating forever and soon th!

e Internet as we know it will also be completely controlled by them.

What has the Internet done for us and other users? It has created a level playing field for rich and poor, small businesses and large corporations - all have the same access to information and learning tools that do not exist anywhere else in our society. The Internet is growing rapidly largely because of inexpensive and predictable flat-rate pricing for unlimited access. This legislation will slow the growth of smaller ISP's who will have to over sell their services to stay competitive and pay the bills. Ultimately, these charges will be passed to consumers and businesses. If this happens those who benefit most from these emerging technologies, the poor and small business owners, will be cut off because they won't be able to afford to connect. Please do not allow phone companies to gouge consumers and small business and thus limit access and competitiveness in the name of unwarranted profits. They have monopolized these and other services to long, let others enjoy the opportunity of business success.

Sincerely,

Terry McBane "tmcb@onecom.com"
COO, ONE Communication Services, Inc.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0