

the economics of the present system will not support their programming; or, in the case of Georgia Tech and University of Georgia, their football games cannot be shown on television because of NCAA restrictions.

I believe there would be a substantial demand to see Georgia Tech's and the University of Georgia's football games on subscription television and that the schools would find it in their interest to make them available, and that this could be done with the approval of the NCAA, and within the framework of the Commission's proposed rule.

We have an excellent repertory theater in Atlanta whose productions we could show on subscription television in prime time several times a month. As you know and I know, the network-affiliated stations in Atlanta are never going to devote their prime time to this type of programming. These three stations seek and must find an audience in the Atlanta market each night of more than 400,000 people. We will be able to show the productions of our repertory theater on a basis that is profitable both to them and to us if only 10,000 people are willing to pay \$1 for the privilege, and I am confident that there are at least that many people in Atlanta who will do just that.

Now remember, I have only been talking about what we might do in Atlanta with 80,000 subscribers. If subscription television is permitted to develop throughout the country and a 10-percent penetration of subscribers is attained, the potential box office approaches 6 million people. Then the range of programming that might be offered runs the gamut of your imagination, and the very existence of this large box office will necessarily encourage the development of new talent in the creative arts.

The smash Broadway musical comedy can be brought to the homes of viewers across the country in its first year, whereas, now, people in Atlanta—and in every other city except New York, for that matter—do not have the opportunity to see a road show performance for more than 3 years after a big hit opens on Broadway; and it is 5 or more years before they can see the filmed version, and 10 to 20 years before they have the opportunity to see the filmed version on "free" television and, I might add, with 21 commercial interruptions.

Do you realize that when "My Fair Lady" opened in New York it played to standing-room-only audiences for 3 years and during all that time only 600,000 people in this entire country had the opportunity to see it? And at scalpers' prices I suspect the average viewer paid \$25 for the privilege. If we had had nationwide subscription television, and a 10-percent subscriber penetration, and if only 20 percent of the subscribers tuned in, more than twice as many people throughout the country—at less than 10 percent of the price—would have had the opportunity to see that lovely work of art in one night than were able to see it in 3 years on Broadway.

To me, the case for subscription television seems so overwhelming it is difficult to understand why the Commission has not authorized it long before this. Everyone, including its opponents, recognizes the great benefits that might be derived from subscription television. But the opponents say that these benefits are outweighed by many alleged detriments, so that the net effect of subscription television is contrary to the public interest.