

Conn., as well as the operations by wire in suburban Etobicoke, Toronto, Canada—fail to support, and in large measure contradict, the basic conclusions and recommendations advanced by the Subscription Television Committee.

I note that the chairman of the FCC committee filed a caveat stating that his agreement that the report be submitted to the full Commission did not imply his endorsement.

Indeed, Commissioner Wadsworth, at the outset of the argument before the FCC last week, made clear his concern about the validity of some of the fourth report's basic premises.

A decade ago, our House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, completed its extensive hearings and report on the major problems of achieving a truly nationwide and competitive system of television broadcasting, compatible with the avowed objectives of the Communications Act of 1934.

The vital issues before the subcommittee in these hearings have been a matter of particular and continuing concern to me for an even longer period.

In this context, I was impelled in 1957 and again in 1960, to convey to the then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, my evaluation of the added burdens and dangers which the introduction of experimental subscription television would create for the traditionally free television system authorized by Congress.

In this connection also, I introduced legislation designed, as is the bill now before the subcommittee, to prohibit toll television charges for home receivers.

On Tuesday, October 10, 1967, my good friend Otto Preminger, the movie maker, testified here in support of pay TV. According to the newspapers, his appearance was both entertaining and informative.

I have long admired Otto Preminger, particularly his ability to make and distribute successfully the movies that have earned him well-deserved fame.

Do not be misled, however, by his geniality and by his enthusiasm. You know, and I know, why Otto Preminger appeared before this committee. He was not here to advance the forces of free enterprise. Otto Preminger was here because he wants to sell his movies. He has his own ax to grind.

He is very successful in selling movies through movie theaters. Now he wants to move the movie box office to the living rooms of the United States.

Why does he want to do this? It is because he knows he can make more money from his movies with the box office in 55 million living rooms than he can through negotiation with the networks.

Otto Preminger says that the television setup we now have is not "free." It is "Madison Avenue propaganda," he says. That may very well be but I ask you, gentlemen, did the people have to pay \$2 to turn on the television set in their living room to look at the World Series? Did the viewers of the ABC network pay \$2 or more to turn on their living room television set to see Otto Preminger's movie, "The Man With the Golden Arm"?

ABC paid Otto Preminger \$650,000 for "The Man With the Golden Arm." This was after a successful showing in the theaters of the United States. If 20 million people paid \$2 each to see it in their living