

Mr. BROTZMAN. Would you read that again rather slowly because I am trying to follow this and I am getting a little confused frankly.

Mr. ANELLO. Paragraph 261 of the Commission's proposed fourth Report and Order. It has two sentences. It is a long paragraph and I don't believe the last two sentences are taken out of context.

"This means that if for a period of 2 years baseball games of the week were regularly broadcast by free TV in a community during the regular season and away games were not, STV could then show the latter"—meaning the away games—"but not the former. The same would be true for professional football."

I suggest that if it is true in that way, the reverse would be equally true, that if the away games were telecast and not the home games, then the home games would be available for subscription television.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT T. WASILEWSKI, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, READ BY DOUGLAS ANELLO, COUNSEL

Mr. ANELLO (reading). Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Broadcasters is a nonprofit organization of radio and television broadcasters whose membership included as of October 4, 1967, 2,180 AM stations, 1116 FM broadcast stations, 514 television stations, and all of the national radio and television networks.

We very much appreciate your courtesy in inviting us here today to present the views of the association on subscription television.

The NAB stands firm in its belief that the public interest would not be served by permitting the use of the airwaves or exploitation of free programs by wired systems to bring pay television programs into the home. The American people receive free the best television in the world. Our television stations and networks offer the American people more programs and a wider choice of programming than is available anywhere.

This has been accomplished in the traditional American pattern of free and open competition. We have succeeded or failed, as in any other free enterprise, but never either in success or failure has our industry levied 1 cent on the American people to see or hear our broadcast performances. The only thing required of the American listener or viewer is that he have a receiving set.

Pay television would now take this investment in receivers by the people as its takeoff point. It would convert a free highway into a toll road. It would require the public to pay for what they now view for free.

If pay television proposed the use of sets other than those existing in the American home so that the public could truly have a freedom of choice, it would be new but pay television proposes to use the result of an investment by the public over the years of more than \$30 billion. Its proponents realize that the roadway is already there—the receiver used for free reception by an audience created by free television. I submit this is not progress; rather, the antithesis of progress.

The use of the airwaves for pay-TV purposes is diametrically opposed in concept to the present system of broadcasting. Its basic premise is that if you want to see, put a coin in the box. Its justification is based on the fallacious promise that through the revenues