

A.	There is No Evidence from Which to Conclude that Pay-TV Would Facilitate the Growth of New Television Stations	23
1.	The Recent Growth in the Number of UHF Stations and Applications Suggests that the UHF Problem Was More a Lack of Receivers than Programming	23
2.	The Pay-TV System Which Proponents Allege Will Assist in the Development of New Stations is a Successful System, the System of Their Projections, and Not The Failure that They Produced in Hartford	24
B.	The Deleterious Effects of a Successful Pay-TV System on Free Television Cannot Be Measured by the Statistics of Failure	26
1.	The Extent of Audience Siphoning is Dependent Upon the Number of Subscribers and the Quality of Programs	26
2.	The Time Pre-Empted by Pay-TV is Prime Time	27
3.	The Experience in Hartford Does Not Provide a Basis for Evaluating the Extent to Which a Successful Pay-TV System Would Siphon Talent and Programs from Free TV	28
C.	Conclusion	29
V.	JURISDICTIONAL AND RELATED QUESTIONS	30
A.	The Commission Does Not Have Jurisdiction to Authorize a Permanent Pay-Television System	30
B.	The Commission Should Not Act Without Guidance from Congress	36
VI.	THE COMMISSION SHOULD DEFER ACTION UPON AUTHORIZATION OF A PAY-TV SYSTEM UNTIL THE IMPACT OF CATV UPON THE PRESENT SYSTEM IS KNOWN	41
A.	The Extent of CATV Development	43
B.	CATV as a Form of Pay-TV	45
C.	CATV as an Adjunct to Free TV	49
D.	Summary	51