that it will be viable. Nor was such proof made when the Commission made allocations for UHF in 1952, when it reserved channels for educational TV in 1952, or in other situations. The Hartford trial, they state, provided useful information on which to make projections. Citing American Airlines, Inc. v. Civil Aeronautics Board, 192 F. 2d 417 (C.A.D.C. 1951), they argue that the Commission, in encouraging and developing new broadcast service in the public interest, should consider not only present facts but estimates of the future. Along the same line, in response to the argument that the 10% penetration figure is too optimistic, Telemeter states in its reply comments that one of the opponents of STV (NAB) misjudged the future of commercial television when it was beginning, but that service grew from 8500 TV homes to 94% of all homes in the nation.

69. Conclusions. We agree with the views of Zenith and Teco expressed in the preceding paragraph. We observe that the results of a single trial cannot be projected into the future to indicate with complete accuracy the nature of a new service. However, a trial can, and the Hartford trial did, supply us with information that does afford a projective basis with some attachment to reality as opposed to mere conjecture that existed before. We recognize that there are some weaknesses in the assumptions underlying the Hartford business projections, but do not consider them as overriding. For example, the estimated $65 figure for program revenue per year per subscriber is slightly higher than the Hartford experience. However, in making the projections Zenith and Teco stated that it only approximates the average program expenditure of the Hartford subscriber. They also pointed out that with nation-wide STV more, and in some respects better, program product might be available and it is not unreasonable to expect that subscribers might spend more on programs because of this. In any event, even if the $65 figure were shaved by a few dollars to make it correspond exactly to the average Hartford expenditure, it would only result in a relatively minor change in the projections.

70. Nor, for example, do we gainsay the validity of the fact that the projections assumed a revenue of about $105 per year per subscriber for STV alone, whereas the average family spends only $27.67 per year on all spectator admissions. However, the fact remains that the average subscriber at Hartford did spend close to $65 per year for programs and, with discounts, did pay a weekly decoder rental fee. To say that the average family spends $27.67 is not to say that no families spend more than that amount, for it is the nature of an average that many lie above it and many below. Unfortunately, we have not been told what percentage of American families spend far above the average. Nor do we have information about the possibility that expenditures for STV might come out of a non-recreational part of the budget as has apparently been the case with amounts paid for purchase of television sets.

71. Concerning the argument that the estimate of payments of $300,000 to $400,000 per year for use of station time for broadcasting of STV programs is too low, we would point out that even in the largest markets some TV stations charge rates comparable to those of the larger radio stations in the area. This indicates that the figure of $300,000 to $400,000 is not unreasonable.