

-81-

235. In addition, although we do not adopt a rule on the subject, we shall, as with applications for new free TV stations, follow the policy of requiring STV applicants to demonstrate financial ability to continue operations for a period of one year. This will apply not only to applicants for new stations wishing to provide STV service, but also to applicants for STV operations over existing stations. In addition to the usual reasons for requiring such a financial showing in the case of applications for free TV stations, the requirement will here have the added function of protecting subscribers in the following way: It appears from the Hartford trial that in addition to weekly or monthly decoder rental fees, subscribers may be charged an installation fee (in the case of Hartford, \$10.00). By assuring against early cessation of service, this investment of the subscriber is given some measure of protection. This requirement, as suggested, will run to the station applicant and not to franchise holders, although it may involve inquiry into financial status of the latter if station applicant and franchise holder are commonly owned.

(13) Whether means should be provided to insure that subscription television service will be available to all eligible stations on a non-discriminatory basis.

236. Telemeter suggests that, assuming that the Commission establishes a class of eligible stations, STV should be made available to all stations within that class, subject to the ability of the station to work out satisfactory terms with appropriate parties, such as the franchise holder. It further states, assuming that STV is permitted over more than one station in a community, that just as a network may make an exclusive affiliation arrangement with a station in a market, an STV operator should be permitted to negotiate with a station on an exclusive franchise basis if it wishes to do so.

237. ABC believes that STV should be made available to all eligible stations on a non-discriminatory basis, but thinks that at this time a policy statement on the matter is all that is required. If for any reason discriminatory practices should occur in the future, the Commission could regulate them. Zenith and Teco state that no problem could arise in this regard until more than one station is authorized to carry on STV operations in a community. Because they believe it unlikely that in the foreseeable future there would be more than one station applying for STV authorization in the same community, they think it the better course to defer action on the matter until an occasion arises in which a second station applies for STV authorization in a community. By that time, they say, there will be more experience with STV and thus a better basis for dealing with the problem which will exist.

238. Conclusions. We have already determined that all UHF and VHF television broadcast stations are eligible to conduct STV operations. However, since we today adopt rules limiting STV operations to one station in a community, possible discriminatory problems with regard to making technical equipment available to all stations in a community are moot. Of course, possible problems on a national scale are conceivable. For example, a party