

Post-It™ Fax Note	7671	Date	1/10/00	# of pages	▶ 1
To	FATIE McBRIDE		From	LAWRENCE KELLY	
Co./Dept.			Co.		
Phone #			Phone #	[REDACTED]	
Fax #	202 326 3395		Fax #	SAME	

Ms. McBride:

1/10/99

A "Public Workshop" suggestion:

Congress (or perhaps an FTC rule?) could simply prescribe a special, very distinctive commercial ring, required of all telemarketers. The "callee" (imposee) could then decide to receive or ignore the call. This would avoid telemarketers' "1st amendment" arguments, and would also call the bluff of marketers' claim that "Many people 'want' our calls".

(The ring should be prescribed in length as well as in character, so that the "commercial ring" will not sound more than reasonably briefly.)

Lawrence M. Kelly

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Lawrence Kelly

cc Ms. Harrington

Postscript: Aside from the appealing simplicity, and the self-executing effectiveness, of this approach, might I add that the suggestion would seem to compare eminently favorably to other "umbrella" suggestions being bruited, such as "Employ new technology" (unnecessary expense to and education of the consumer, unearned windfall profit to the complicit phone companies, and most unlikely that a key target, senior citizens, would understand or utilize such gizmos); and "Sue the beggars" (Just who are the beggars in a given case?; and how many citizens are going to take a day off to go to small claims court?; and just what supporting paperwork support is necessary? and how do you serve someone calling from N. Dakota? and etc. -- and as to an endless raft of "public" suits by the FTC, the FTC certainly has better things to do (to sue)?). This all suggests that the ring is the thing? --LMK

Post-It™ Fax Note	7671	Date	1/10/00	# of pages	▶ 1
To	FATIE McBRIDE		From	LAWRENCE KELLY	