

The proponents postulate a minimum penetration of ten percent to and including 50%. To determine the impact of Pay-TV on free TV in the Hartford market, the subscriber potential must be assumed to range between 80,000 and 400,000. If programming were available in a quality and quantity to attract a group of this size how many would watch a particular program? Would the average viewing time be two or ten hours per week? These are the questions which must be answered to determine the audience siphoning effect of a successful Pay-TV system and these are the questions that Hartford doesn't even purport to answer. The 82.6% that constituted the audience for the Liston-Clay fight would have had a disastrous impact on free television on the night in question if the subscriber group had been between 80,000 and 400,000 rather than less than 5,000.

2. The Time Pre-Empted By Pay-TV Is Prime Time

The next assertion is that Pay-TV would not pre-empt any significant amount of time now utilized by advertising sponsors. In this connection, it is urged that the average time utilized in Hartford was 30 hours per week, that assuming 30-40 hours a week of Pay-TV there would still be ample time in multiple station markets for advertising.

Conveniently overlooked is the fact that the 30 to 40 hours in question are the prime listening hours. Also overlooked is the fact that the proponents do not propose to be limited to multiple station markets.

The 30 to 40 hour limitation derives, we are told, from the limited amount of "box-office" programming available and limitations inherent in the family recreational budget. The latter is a convenient limitation since it is incapable of measurement. The former, the availability of programming, was a limitation in Hartford but not quite in the context suggested by the proponents. Good programming required money that the proponents were unwilling to spend. Moreover, they specifically committed themselves not to present programming to the exclusion of