

-19-

of programs." Instead of diversity, it is argued, Hartford has shown that most of the programming will be that which appeals to a mass audience--films and sports. Therefore, since it will not provide the diversity promised STV should not be authorized.

55. This argument overlooks the context in which the quoted statement was made. Therefore we quote in full paragraphs 48, 49, and 51 of the First Report:

48. Insofar as a judgment can be made on the present record the Commission believes that in some respects the claims of proponents and opponents alike are not free from exaggeration. Proponents, for example, have tended to stress the capacity of subscription television to bring to the public new kinds of programming hitherto unavailable or available on a very limited basis. In support of this argument proponents refer to the incentive to the advertiser to concentrate his support on programs of wide general interest. They allege that subscriber financed broadcasts could and would provide a wider choice to members of the public interested in the fine arts, operas, educational and informative material and other similar kinds of programs.

49. As against this picture of greatly enhanced variety of programs, the opponents insist that the incentive to offer programs of the widest popular appeal would be if anything greater in subscription television. Time availabilities, it is claimed, which could yield substantially greater returns for programs of wider popular appeal would not be sacrificed to any appreciable extent for the transmission of programs which may be expected to attract such smaller audiences.

* * * * *

51. It is not possible, however, without a demonstration of the service in operation, to determine reliably where the practical realities lie -- in the glowing prospects pictured by proponents, with the alarms raised by the opponents, or somewhere between these extremes.

Comments of proponents filed in 1955, and paragraph 50 of the First Report not quoted here, make it clear that proponents not only stated that STV would provide wider diversity, but that it might offer sports events not shown on free TV, as well as movies.

56. In view of the foregoing, it may be seen that we expressed an inability to determine where the realities of the matter lay without help from trial operations. We now have the results of the Hartford trial, as well as some information concerning Etobicoke. It would appear, at least at present, that the reality is that the major part of the programming, as opponents had