

to controlling interference. There is no basis for proceeding against an offender until the Commission has discovered the interference, either through its Field Engineering Bureau or on the complaint of some user of radio equipment.

We received approximately 40,000 interferences complaints during fiscal year 1967. Several thousand of these complaints were attributable to the types of radiation devices we have been discussing; that is, high-powered electronic heaters, diathermy machines, welders, electronic garage-door openers, and low-powered walkie-talkies. Investigation, detection, and suppression of these devices has been accomplished at the expense of other important enforcement duties, and, if recent trends continue, the cost of detection and enforcement in this area is expected to exceed that of last year. Passage of the legislation will enable us to utilize our personnel more efficiently and will tend to minimize what would otherwise be an urgent need for increased manpower for their purposes.

New kinds of radio devices are continually being invented and we are presently requested to make special provisions in our rules to permit the use of such new devices. We are concerned about the widespread distribution of these devices, which may number in the thousands or millions, to the general public. In the absence of authority to make the manufacturer responsible for compliance with our interference specifications, we are reluctant to sanction the use of such devices due to the difficulty of tracking down individual users of noncomplying devices. Given the authority under this legislation, we would be able to provide for greater use of radio with assurance as to adequate control of interference potential.

Many manufacturers have cooperated generously in assuming responsibility to minimize interference problems. This cooperation is purely voluntary and has been most helpful. However, the responsible manufacturer who cooperates in holding down excessive radiation is at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the marginal manufacturer who cuts corners to save a few dollars in this vital area. Legislation such as that before us today appears necessary to solve the problem effectively.

We recognize, of course, that equipment designed to prevent radiation costs more than improperly designed equipment. But in most instances, we believe that the additional costs to manufacturers stemming from this legislation would be small, in view of mass production techniques. Moreover, the proposed legislation would avoid subsequent and far greater additional expense to users in those instances where it is even possible to modify the device to bring it into compliance with the rules.

Let me now turn to a brief analysis of the details of these bills. Each consists of three subsections in a new section 302. Subsection 302(a) describes the radiating devices which would be subject to our authority as those " * * * which in their operation are capable of emitting radio frequency energy by radiation, conduction, or other means in sufficient degree to produce harmful interference to radio communications."

The Commission would have authority under this subsection to prescribe rules for such devices applicable to their "manufacture, import, sale, offer for sale, shipment, or use." Subsection 302(b) prohibits the use, import, shipment, manufacture, sale, or offering for