

The supplemental comments I would like to make are:

The argument I have made that to exclude the two systems is to thwart the spirit of Section 255, I fear may not weigh heavily enough to permit the FCC to rule favorably. It fear that the Telecommunications Act may not specifically cover the end users of such systems, only manufacturers and providers of telecommunications services.

If this narrow view is taken then truly the spirit of Section 255 is ignored.

I urge for a broad view of what constitutes "providers of telecommunication services". I think there is good reason and logic to consider users of telecommunication equipment as "providers of ----- services" when they use the two systems I mention above. They are in essence providing "directory assistance" just the same in many ways as the actual providers who are usually considered carriers. In addition this "telecommunication service" is making possible the completion of telecommunications.

Very truly yours Leo A. LaPointe

49 Highland Terrace

Worthington, Ohio 43085

614-888-0921

The following comments were inadvertently omitted in my immediately preceding comments just a few minutes ago.

The opinion expressed below relates to the FCC's request for comments re "enhanced services" as to its tentative conclusion to consider it has no authority in this area.

I am referring to interactive voice menus and voice mail as the two systems that should definitely not be considered as outside the scope of the FCC. There may be others. I regret any confusion I may have caused by omitting the foregoing information. Thank you.

The supplemental comments I would like to make are:

The argument I have made that to exclude the two systems is to thwart the spirit of Section 255, I fear may not weigh heavily enough to permit the FCC to rule favorably. It fear that the Telecommunications Act may not specifically cover the end users of such systems, only manufacturers and providers of telecommunications services.

If this narrow view is taken then truly the spirit of Section 255 is ignored.

I urge for a broad view of what constitutes "providers of telecommunication services". I think there is good reason and logic to consider users of telecommunication equipment as "providers of ----- services" when they use the two systems I mention above. They are in essence providing "directory assistance" just the same in many ways as the actual providers who are usually considered carriers. In addition th