

Mr. BROWN. That is no longer their problem.

Mr. BROYHILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Rooney.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Dingell, I want to thank you for your excellent presentation this morning.

I have one question about the Hartford experiment. I understand this has been going on for 5 years. If it is such a dismal failure, why would they not have gotten out of business 5 years ago?

Mr. DINGELL. I think this is a question that the Commission should ask.

It is my understanding, if you read on page 7, I summarize very generally the experience that has occurred with regard to the Hartford "experiment." I point out how there has been a notorious failure by subscribers to subscribe. There has been a notorious failure in terms of production of new and special types of programing that they had looked for. The fare has been entirely sports and movies which have only been slightly newer and not at all different in kind than is available with regular free TV. Indeed, that programing was for the same mass audience to which the networks play.

I believe that statistical information is available to show, and I think the committee could well direct its attention to the fact that programing and financial fiasco was kept alive only by generous subsidies from the firms which conducted the so-called test.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Dingell, don't you feel that if this is going to have any effect on the taxpaying public that it would be good in effect because it would provide the networks with a little competition, thereby giving the American public better programing?

Mr. DINGELL. I have been as critical as anyone of the networks and I believe all of my colleagues on the Commerce Committee recall that it has been a rare day when the networks and I have traveled the same path. But I do feel very strongly that if subscription television was going to offer anything new this committee probably should support it if it were going to meet the other tests of the public interest.

The problem here is that the Hartford test has already proven conclusively that subscription television does not offer new programing, does not offer quality programing, does not put any appreciable number of ballets or operas or public-interest programs, debates and forums on the air.

What STV will give is simply programing for the mass audience because that is the most economically viewable and maximizes the financial returns of the entrepreneur. In other words, he will get the most money back from mass audiences, and he will program to earn the most money, not from the standpoint of the highest quality.

So, I think the matter has been tried and found wanting. I don't think we will get quality programing from STV.

Mr. ROONEY. I will yield to the chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Dingell, I would like to point out that although I think it is a mistake for the FCC to get into the business of programing, in the order they pointed out that the pay TV would have to put 10 per cent of their air time into so-called ballet, public service type of things.

Mr. DINGELL. I really question whether or not they have the authority to do that. That is my problem. I don't see that under the Federal