

The industry, of course, was most concerned about this. They were talking about what comes next—the ice box and so on? I have this type of concern, too, and I have sponsored this legislation at the Commission, only because I could see no other way out of it, but we can work with the manufacturers and we have, and they are now, as I understand it, supporting this.

Mr. BROWN. Again, my basic question is: Are we assured by technical people, the people who are on the fringe of these scientific developments in the area of communications, that this bill will not give the FCC authority to hold back technical progress in some areas because of the state of the art in technical progress in existing areas?

Mr. LEE. You are getting a little technical for me. Let me field that to Mr. Dixon of our chief engineer's office.

Mr. DIXON. My work at the Commission puts me on the fringe of technical developments and it is our purpose to encourage technical developments and our concern about the present situation is that technical developments which result in a multitude of new devices, at least by the thousands or millions for the public use, those are people who have no idea of their interference potential, and yet our present rules apply to each individual and not to the producer of the devices.

So, if we were assured of adequate control at the source of manufacture, then we could, with greater assurance, give permission for new devices. It would make this possible. As it stands, our control over these mass-produced interfering devices is not very good because of the individual approach we have to make.

Mr. LEE. I would think, Congressman Brown, under these standards that we have, that the sale, for example, of garage-door openers, I would expect it to greatly increase. There must be numbers of people who do not want to have them because they have heard about these problems that they have, and whenever one is under the same set of ground rules, knowing that they can buy a piece of equipment that will work and will not interfere, I think it should help.

Mr. BROWN. Well, with the chairman's permission, just one other question. And I want you to understand that I am still not sure you have zeroed in on my concern. When you talk about garage-door openers, you talk about perhaps an unnecessary, luxury item that doesn't have much public sympathy, versus transportation or communication in the air transportation field, but let's think for a minute about the possibility of reducing this walkie-talkie down to the Dick Tracy type, which is a radio that would allow all of us to have our individual telephone numbers and be able to be contacted any place in the world at any time from any other place, or about some of the other fringe areas of scientific developments.

I don't mind controlling garage-door openers so that they don't cause airplanes to crash, but I am a little concerned about the possibility that we might be holding back some technical development in the field of communications or health or something else, because of a rather parochial interest of a radio or television broadcaster or some other existing type of communications. And that's why I'm concerned that this may be just a piece of patchwork on the 1934 Communications Act, because I for one do not feel competent in the field of technical development and would like to hear a lot more testimony on where technical development might be taking us in the future with reference to all kinds of communications.