

Mr. ADAMS. That would not be my characterization, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. BROWN. Between detailed and superficial is what we are discussing.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, superficial is a sort of vituperative epithet. Let me give you an example.

Mr. BROWN. Limited?

Mr. ADAMS. More limited in quantity. What a commercial television network does a minority of its time a noncommercial broadcasting enterprise can do all the time because it is not dependent on large audiences.

Mr. BROWN. You are spending 25 percent of your time on public affairs broadcasting?

Mr. ADAMS. Approximately that. Those are the programs produced by NBC News. In addition to that percent, there is some programming in the cultural field. The "Bell Telephone Hour" is an example.

Mr. BROWN. You said something about the disadvantage of pay TV being that if the public could not pay for a program they would not see it, or if an artist chose not to be on the subscription TV the public would not be able to see him. Now, if the artist chose or the movie owner or rights holder chose not to sell it on commercial TV there is nothing on commercial TV, is there?

Mr. ADAMS. That is true, but the experience has been that commercial television programming has broadened its program scope very broadly over the past 5 years. Let us take movies as an example. Motion picture films of fairly recent vintage, that is 2 or 3 years old, and major productions are now regularly on commercial television.

Mr. BROWN. Why?

Mr. ADAMS. Because there is a substantial audience for them when shown on television.

Mr. BROWN. That is not the reason you put them on. You put them on because somebody pays for them.

Mr. ADAMS. Somebody pays for them only because there is a substantial audience watching them.

Mr. BROWN. Should not that substantial audience have an opportunity to watch without commercial interruption?

Mr. ADAMS. That is a question for your judgment. If that substantial audience that now watches them with commercials should have them available without commercials and would be charged \$1 or \$2 per day television broadcast there would be an awful lot of people who now watch a motion picture on free television who would be economically precluded from watching it on pay television and free television could not get it.

Mr. BROWN. The thing I am trying to work out in my own mind is that if somebody pays for it commercially and puts it on commercial television that is good for them. If the Federal Government finances it, puts it on public broadcasting, that is good for people. But if somebody wants to put it on subscription TV and people want to pay to watch it, that is not good for them. Now, I don't understand that. What is the logic behind this?

Mr. ADAMS. The difference we make is that to the degree it is put on and people have to pay for the individual program, the program is removed from the public airwaves where everybody can watch it.

Mr. BROWN. Necessarily?