

Exploding The Phone



www.explodingthephone.com Bibliographic Cover Sheet

Title Hush-a-Phone Hits Back at AT&T

Publication New York Times

Date 1951-03-24

Abstract Hush-a-phone filed an objection to the FCCs decision to uphold

AT&T's ban on Hush-a-Phone.

Keywords Hush-a-Phone

The following pages may contain copyrighted material. We believe that our use of this material for non-commercial educational and research purposes constitutes "fair use" under Section 107 of U.S. Copyright Law. If you wish to use this material for purposes that go beyond "fair use," you must obtain permission from the copyright owner, if any. While it will make us slightly sad to do so, we will nonetheless comply with requests from copyright owners who want their material removed from our web site.

HUSH-A-PHONE HITS BACK AT A. T. & T.

Corporation Files Answer to F.C.C.'s Decision Sustaining Prohibition of Device

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

WASHINGTON, March 23-Objections to a recent initial decision by the Federal Communications Commission that the American Telephone and Telegraph Company was within its rights in prohibiting use of the hush-a-phone as a "foreign attachment" to its instruments were filed with the F. C. C. today by the makers of the device. The Hush-A-Phone Corporation,

New York, and its president, Harry C. Tuttle, argued that the apparatus was beneficial in its results, and should be permitted for public use. The A. T. & T. is expected to submit a reply soon, and then the F. C. C. will take the dispute under consideration again and give a final ruling. New hearings may be held on the controversy. In February, the F. C. C. upheld the telephone company, and found that unrestricted use of the device

might mean a lowering of the quality of telephone service. The corporation and Mr. Tuttle, however, declared in the new objections that scientific tests proved that hush-a-phone "actually causes a net increase in transmission efficiency" of the telephone circuit. They asserted that the A. T. and T. and its affiliates were "public utility monopolies unlawfully

interfering with the natural and inherent rights of a subscriber." They added that since 1921, 125,-796 hush-a-phone sets had been sold through 1949, with "substantial" use of the patented device in New York, Washington and else-The hush-a-phone is a cup-like device which snaps on a telephone transmitter to counteract, the makers say, office noise, and produce "privacy."

The objections and request for a reconsideration will act as a stay until the F. C. C. has studied the matter and issued its final word. In connection with the controversy, Jack Werner, head of the

F. C. C. Common Carrier Bureau, said that telephone companies should be required to adopt a rule governing "foreign attachments." He suggested that instead of the telephone companies having discretion regarding such devices, the rule should provide for discontin-uance of service to a customer

using an unauthorized attachment. He urged changing the present regulations, to read: "In case any such unauthorized attachment or connection is made, upon failure of the customer to

comply with this regulation, the telephone company will remove or disconnect the same; or will suspend the service during the continuance of said attachment or

service."

Ehe New York Eimes

connection; or will terminate the