

-73-

(as did paragraph 39 of the Further Notice) that additional rules concerning equipment and technical operating requirements would be announced at a later date. (This, of course, was contingent on the establishment of a nation-wide STV service.)

212. No comments were received on whether to adopt the proposed Section 73.644. After having considered that proposal, we are of the opinion that the type approval portion thereof should be deleted. Type acceptance is generally used throughout the radio services in the absence of an urgent need for type approval. No such urgent need appears evident here. Section 73.644 adopted herein is modified accordingly.

213. As stated previously, we have decided that multiple technical systems should be permitted (paras. 184-185). We are today, simultaneously with the adoption of the instant document, adopting a further notice of proposed rule making in this proceeding which invites comments on proposed rules for STV equipment and system performance capability. These proposed rules would establish standards with which any STV system proposed to be used by an STV applicant would have to comply. We do not presently foresee the need for special technical operating requirements for STV, and in the absence of such requirements the operating requirements for conventional television operation will apply. Should any parties believe that special rules on the subject are necessary for STV, their suggestions and comments will be welcome.

(9) Whether, and to what extent, the Commission should regulate the charges, terms and conditions pursuant to which subscription television service will be offered to the public.

214. Zenith and Teco support proposed Section 73.643(b) of Appendix C which would require that charges, terms, and conditions of STV service to subscribers be applied uniformly, although providing that subscribers may be divided into reasonable classifications, approved by the Commission, with different sets of terms and conditions applied to subscribers in different classifications. However, beyond that, they believe that the actual decoder installation, decoder rental, or per-program charges should not be regulated by the Commission. Trigg-Vaughn has a similar view. Among other reasons for this position, Zenith-Teco state that STV will be in competition with other forms of box-office entertainment, and prices would best be controlled by competition in the market place. Telemeter, along the same vein, holds that STV should have the same freedom in pricing as other box-office entrepreneurs enjoy.

215. Acorn states that there should be no rate regulation initially because the competition between free TV and STV should keep the STV charges reasonable. Kaiser says that it is too early to decide whether to regulate rates, and Teleglobe holds that it is premature to regulate charges, terms, and conditions because there should be as little regulation of STV as possible in the beginning. Trigg-Vaughn argues that no need for rate regulation has been shown and that regulation would place an artificial restriction in that area. If experience shows the existence of abuses, it is argued by Zenith-Teco and others, the Commission may take appropriate action.