

-62-

183. As to the last-mentioned subject--limitation of STV to a single system in any one community--Acorn says that it favors STV broadcasting by more than one station in a community, and for that reason urges that only a single technical system be permitted in one community so that all subscribers may receive the programs of all STV stations there. Munn and Chase, on the other hand, believe that STV should be limited to one station per market (because of the limited number of box-office programs) and say that this view carries with it the requirement of having only one system to a community, although they see no reason for not having multiple systems nationally in non-overlapping markets. Trigg-Vaughn opposes limitation of one system to a community simply for the sake of confining all STV operation in the market to a single system, on the ground that this would be contrary to the public interest. However, it would apparently favor the adoption of appropriate limitations if having different kinds of STV service in a community would cause loss of the public's investment in receiving equipment or cause incompatibility with such equipment.

184. Conclusions. We have carefully considered the comments of filing parties and the views of the Chief Engineer of the Commission and here decide that it is in the public interest that multiple technical systems of STV be permitted. Many of the negative aspects of having multiple systems that are mentioned by the Chief Engineer are nullified by the fact that we are limiting STV to a single station within a community. Thus there is no problem of inconvenience and expense to the public caused by having two decoders attached to one receiving set for the purposes of receiving two STV operations in the community. While there may be viewers within the range of STV operations in more than one community, we do not believe these situations will be so numerous that, in the overall, significant inconvenience will be caused. Because of the foregoing, the argument that multiple systems might tend to restrict competition by dividing STV audiences between two STV stations falls. Our rule requiring that decoders be leased rather than sold (see Issue 11 below) protects those subscribers who move from one community with STV service to another STV community. To the argument that one system may be better than another and that with multiple systems use of one or another may be based on the efforts of salesmanship rather than technical quality, we reply that by establishing standards which multiple systems must meet, we assure that they will be able to transmit satisfactory pictures and sound. Moreover, as to the matter of decoders costing less with a single system as compared to manufacturing fewer of each kind with multiple systems, we believe that competition between systems may well serve to stimulate better methods of production that will tend toward lower costs. We agree that, under the rules which we adopt, if two or more applicants within a community apply for STV authorizations, a comparative consideration in a hearing may be necessary to determine the relative merits of the technical systems, but this fact does not deter us in view of the advantages to the public of the action which we here take.

185. Many of the arguments made by those favoring multiple systems we find to be of a makeshift nature and lacking in merit. Thus, for example, while we can sympathize with the argument that many entrepreneurs who have