

would have to come back to this Congress for legislation on the matter. If, on the other hand, the Court should say that the Commission did have jurisdiction in this thing and this was a proper service, this could only happen at the earliest, I would say, a year from now if the Commission should act next week on this matter.

In the meantime, this service could hardly have gotten started, even in one city. There would be every opportunity for this Congress and for this committee, if they wanted to intervene, to take the matter up and to either suggest amendments to the act that would provide a proper regulation as to whatever proper regulation Congress thought necessary or even prohibit it altogether if it should be determined in actual use of the system that it was against the public interest.

But I do not see, really, how this can happen if we are talking about the public interest. If this is not something that the public really wants, it is going to fall on its face. You gentlemen don't have to do a thing about it nor does the FCC. This will be completely aborted unless the public really wants it.

Now, if the public really wants it to any large extent, isn't that the argument that the public should have it provided that it can be regulated so that it keeps in its proper place in the spectrum of communication?

I think it would be a tragedy if this service should be killed off before it really gets a chance because to do that you have to say, "Well, we are satisfied with the service that the commercial television now provides. We are not worried about all the unlighted UHF stations and the other stations that are struggling for an audience, that are struggling for revenue and who, many of them, are marginal stations."

This communications business was not built that way. This business was built on innovation and change and growth. It would be a real tragedy if now for the protection of one service we stop growth in this area.

Let me say that the technology, the technological revolution that is going on in the laboratories and in the background of this business make me doubly positive that you should not adopt a restrictive attitude in regulating it.

Our engineers and research people showed us a year ago a wall display using a laser. They had found a way of converting the signal from an ordinary TV set coming in off the air through transducers to sound waves which were then made to impinge on a laser beam as it went through a tube. By some very complicated circuitry they were able to interact the sound with the colength light of the laser so here was a beautiful picture—it happened to be a red and black picture because it was a ruby laser that we were using. This portends we could have the possibility of wall television projected with one or two lasers that would give you a new dimension in this thing, that would stimulate the public's interest in having home entertainment of the kind that they have never had before. This is just only one of the things that is in the offing.

We are working with solid state devices that I am sure are going to enable us to get away from the limitations of this monstrosity of a cathode ray picture tube which means really what you have to do is to put the picture on the inside of a light bulb. The limitations on the size and structure and shape of that light bulb, of course, are very serious.