

**COMING SOON**

**NEW**

**POWER  
200 kw**

**NEW**

**COVERAGE  
709,648 Sets**

**NEW**

**CHANNEL  
To 10 from 11**

Authorized changes will be made this spring, pinpointing your persistent salesman in the prosperous Southern New England Market.



**WJAR-TV  
CHANNEL 11  
PROVIDENCE**

Represented Nationally by  
**WEED TELEVISION**

Broadcasters (WGBI), the *Scranton Times* (WQAN) and Meco Realty Co. Meco and WQAN are each 50% owner of Electric City Telecasting Co., competitor for uhf Ch. 16 with WARM there. If the transfer were approved, the Ch. 16 bid would be dropped.

In a memorandum opinion and order, FCC concurrently approved a protest by WARM and ordered Meco Realty and WQAN to elect within 15 days which of the two applications—MCL Telecasting or Electric City Telecasting—they wished to prosecute.

FCC also announced it has received several inquiries concerning the specification of ERP for TV stations in cases where the maximum radiation from the antenna is not in the horizontal plane—i.e., titled beam antennas. Questions have arisen as to whether the station authorization will specify the power in the horizontal plane or in the vertical plane in which the maximum radiation occurs and whether such a station would be limited to the maximum authorized powers in the rules in other than the horizontal plane.

FCC noted Sec. 3.685(e) of its TV rules defines a directional antenna and describes the purposes for which such an antenna will be authorized. An antenna designed for changing the position of the major radiation lobe from the horizontal plane to any other vertical plane is considered a directional antenna for the purposes of licensed power and power limitations,

FCC advised. Thus, an antenna designed for "beam tilting" would not be considered an omni-directional antenna in respect to these matters even though the horizontal radiation pattern is not directional. As a result, such stations would be licensed for the power in the horizontal plane and would be limited to the maximum powers authorized in Sec. 3.614(b) in any vertical plane, the Commission explained.

FCC finalized its notice of proposed rule-making of Jan. 30 and assigned uhf Ch. 18 to Burnsville, N. C. [B•T, Feb. 2], and finalized its proposals of Feb. 6 [B•T, Feb. 9] to make the following assignment changes in order to remove deficient channel spacings in the uhf band:

City	Channel No.	
	Delete	Add
Anniston, Ala.	37—	70+
Conway, Ark.	49+	62
Paragould, Ark.	44	58—
Delano, Calif.	33+	37+
Pekin, Ill.	49+	69+
Bedford, Ind.	39	68
Grinnell, Iowa	46+	71
Mayfield, Ky.	49—	63
Hammond, La.	51+	57
Lawrence, Mass.	38+	72
Rolla, Mo.	31	46
Salisbury, N. C.	53+	80
Springfield, Ohio	46+	76
Bradford, Pa.	48+	70—
Tullahoma, Tenn.	65+	68—
Austin, Texas	*30—	*70—
Greenville, Texas	62	69—

\* Noncommercial, educational channel.

## JOHNSON LETTER TO TOBEY EVOKES SENTIMENTS FOR QUICK COLOR ACTION

Probe to find out whether or not "powerful interests" are delaying the coming of color TV, the Colorado Senator urges. In turn, interested parties in the controversy affirm their desire for resolution of the question as soon as possible.

CHARGES made by Sen. Edwin C. Johnson (D-Col.) that powerful interests were conspiring to delay color TV brought these developments last week:

1. Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff said that upon completion of field tests of the National Television System Committee's standards, RCA would petition the FCC to establish the compatible system commercially.

2. CBS spokesmen refrained from commenting on the Johnson charges, but referred to the company's year end statement. This called for the industry to settle the color issue this year.

3. Dr. W. R. G. Baker, GE vice president and general manager of its Electronics Division and chairman of NTSC, declined to comment. But Arthur V. Loughran, Hazeltine Electronics engineering executive and vice chairman of NTSC, said NTSC has attained "this highly desirable objective."

4. Sen. Charles W. Tobey (R-N. H.), chairman of the Senate Interstate & Foreign Commerce Committee, was waiting for word from the FCC and from Dr. Baker. He wrote to both late in February and asked for a status report on color TV. This was shortly after the Senate voted \$75,000 to the Commerce Committee for an investigation of color TV, educational TV and monopoly in broadcasting, among other things [B•T, Feb. 9].

### Johnson's Views

Essence of Sen. Johnson's charges, made public in a letter to Sen. Tobey, was that there was a conspiracy to retard color TV until the market was saturated with black-and-white sets.

Basis for his charges was, he said, the conflicting stories reporting the status of color TV. He urged Sen. Tobey to press an immediate

investigation of whether "powerful interests" were seeking to delay the advent of color TV. To this Sen. Tobey agreed.

Sen. Johnson recounted briefly the history of color TV to the Supreme Court decision in 1951 upholding the FCC's choice of the CBS system. He then referred to the establishment of NTSC to develop a compatible system.

Interspersing his letter with quotations attributed to industry engineers and spokesmen on the readiness of color TV over the last few years, he ended his letter to Sen. Tobey caustically with the following:

It is a little less than three years since the Federal Communications Commission, the arm of Congress mandated to act in the public interest, adopted the standards for color television and stated that it was here and that it should be made available to the public. Why isn't it? Is this delay in manufacturing color television receivers deliberate? Are the standards adopted by the Commission unsound? If so, in what manner? Have new standards been developed? If so, why are they not submitted to the FCC?

He has no preference for any system, Sen. Johnson said, although he repeated he thought a compatible system is most desirable.

Sen. Johnson said he understood a tri-color tube was available at a cost of \$60 when put into mass production, compared to the \$450 and \$500 figures he said he had heard the first black and white tubes cost.

Long sought, color television got its first big impetus shortly after the war, when CBS asked the FCC to establish commercial standards. After hearings in 1946 and 1947, the Commission ruled that polychrome TV was not yet feasible.

The subject was interjected into the allocations proceedings—during which all TV application processing was frozen for three-and-half years—by Comrs. Robert F. Jones and Frieda