

In any event, the contention is without merit. This is a trial authorization. The information obtained will assist the Commission in determining whether rates should be regulated, and, if so, what kind of regulation would be required and whether additional legislation might be desirable (see First Report, 23 F.C.C. 531, 533). Petitioners' assertion, made for the first time here, that the Commission was required to answer these questions in advance of the trial authorization would put the cart before the horse. Moreover, the absence of such a determination in no way threatens the public interest. Should the rates charged for the trial service prove objectionable at any time, the Commission, which has required the licensee to retain control over maximum charges (30 F.C.C. 311-312) and has itself retained the power to revoke or modify the authorization upon notice and hearing (*id.* at 321-322), is amply prepared to act.

The short answer to petitioners' contention that the Commission erred in failing to determine its power to regulate the rates charged when and if permanent operations are authorized, is that the trial authorization being contested in this case nowhere presents that question. It will be time enough to consider this issue when the information to be obtained by the trial operation is available and when the question whether to authorize a permanent operation is before the Commission.

---

urge that the Commission had erred by failing to consider whether it could or should regulate rates (Brief for Appellants, pp. 20-21, 22-23; Reply Brief for Appellants, pp. 2-6).