

I don't have the time or money or inclination for the former. But let me ask another question. Is the technology developing in the broadcast industry to such an extent that it will permit more television channels on the spectrum or is that a frozen commodity that is unlikely to change? This is a scientific question.

Mr. LINDOW. I am not an engineer but I do have a little understanding of this matter. I believe the short answer to it is this: There has been suggested from time to time ways in which the bandwidth could be adjusted in order to provide more spectrum space. I haven't yet heard of or seen anybody who has come up with a way in which this could be done and still be sure that we have the same type of high-quality reception we have.

And, No. 2, to overcome the problem of the existing number of sets running into the many, many millions in the hands of the American public without making them obsolete overnight were you to change that. That is the short answer to your question, sir.

Mr. MACDONALD. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. LINDOW. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Mr. MACDONALD. Without objection the statement of Harry L. Graham, legislative representative of the National Grange, will be included in the record at this point.

(Mr. Graham's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Grange appreciates the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished subcommittee today to express our opposition to proposals for paid TV, and to discuss our reasons for this position.

One of the problems concerning all rural America throughout our history has been that of communications. This is an area in which the Grange has had a consistent interest, beginning with our successful attempts to provide rural free delivery service. We have supported the organization of mutual telephone companies, and later on cooperative telephone services under the REA, and other public and semi-public cooperative endeavors to improve rural communications.

You will remember that we appeared before you concerning CATV. We are not opposed to CATV or to paid TV per se so much as we are concerned that the results of both of these will be the further diminution of the TV coverage which is available to vast sections of sparsely populated rural America. We opposed CATV in the smaller towns because we believed it would siphon off the revenue necessary to keep free television continually beamed into the rural areas. It is with this same thought in mind that we come before you today hoping that this subcommittee, in its judgment, will not approve paid television as a means of mass communications in the United States.

We do not believe that paid TV offers any attractive alternative to free television. In fact, the opposite might be true. Paid television could become so much of a commercial enterprise that it could further deteriorate the quality of TV programs. Paid television would undoubtedly cure some of the problems created by an over-emphasis and increasing frequency of television commercials, but the quality of the programs could very well suffer as a result of this, and we would get a steady diet of "Grade B" movies with considerably less of the kind of news and special events coverage that we have at the present time.

The exception to this would probably be more sports coverage. The prize fights now available to paid TV audiences in movies with giant screens would be available to those on the subscriber list. However, considering the quality of this so-called "sports", especially in recent years, this does not offer much attraction to us. On the other hand, at the present time, free television is bringing us most of the sports spectacles of general interest to the public, including the Olympics,