

Broadcasting Corporation. I believe that the proper acceptance of the ETV station can bring a new dimension to both the commercial and ETV stations.

Network and locally originated news has matured and, in my opinion, performs a very, very good job. I see no reason why ETV stations under the Public Broadcasting Act should compete in the area of regularly scheduled hard news. The ETV station can perform a worthwhile service in analyzing the news, panel shows and editorials in depth.

I recognize, of course, that there is no such proscription in the enabling legislation and as a matter of fact, the Carnegie Report which is the catalyst of the Public Broadcasting Act makes much of the contribution that they may make in the area of live news. On reflection, I merely indicate my concern with such programming *not* because I would not trust the integrity of the PBC broadcaster but rather because I believe live news may carry the appearance of bias from a government sponsored corporation. Unhappily, human nature is such that bias is defined as that with which one disagrees.

As I read the debate on the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, however, I am struck with the legislative intent of not creating competition to the existing broadcast structure but rather to provide a new and exciting choice to the discriminating audience.

With the Board of Directors appointed by the President and the use of Government funds, it is difficult indeed to look at ETV as a completely non-government function.

Actually, in this area of financing ETV broadcasting, I believe that significant financial contributions from commercial stations may result in substantial benefits to all parties, including the public. I have considered various proposals for government and private support, including the excise tax of 2-5% on new TV set sales and charitable contributions by commercial broadcasters, private industry and various foundations.

I feel that industry support of ETV should properly be considered a business expense of the commercial broadcaster. I have from time to time attempted to create a dialogue on an idea I have had. I might as well try it on you. All broadcast stations are licensed to serve in the public interest. This has been interpreted as including a concern with the type of programming that a proposed station intends to "air" to "serve the needs of the community."

The concern of the Commission with programming vis-a-vis a prohibition against censorship has been a complex administrative problem. It seems to be resolving itself into a deep concern with the expertise of the licensee in the programming area. The Commission concern is to insure that the licensee is indeed an "expert" in the needs of the community and how these needs are being served by competing media. When analysis shows him a void that he can fill by his programming schedule, he files his proposal with his application. The Commission properly quizzes its licensees as to what they have done to make themselves "expert" and having reached affirmative judgment, largely relies on the programming proposals submitted by the applicant. Thus, it becomes the licensee's "promise" against which is measured his "performance" at renewal time at a later date. One caveat. It would be unrealistic for the commission to bind the licensee to his precise promise for a three-year license period. New media enters the market, the effect of which the licensee analyzes to determine what, if any, programming changes he should make to tailor his so-called "void." After notification to the Commission, this amends his original proposal. Thus we have, for example, stations which program all news, religion, ethnic, advertising and music. This presupposes that the licensee survey has shown the totality of other broadcasting media provides the community with well-rounded programming.

The basic problem with commercial broadcasting today is the intense competition for a small amount of broadcast time. There are only 18 hours at most in the full broadcast day. Actually, given our living habits, there are only three or three and a half hours—usually from 7:00 to 10:30 P.M.—when most adult human beings find it convenient to watch television. The broadcasting networks and broadcasting stations are in an enormous competition simply to deliver the largest possible audiences during this time segment. With the exception of the 7 o'clock news programs on some stations, the *general* public generally has no choice but to watch the mass appeal programs. At the risk of being inconsistent with my previous remarks, I might say that on Sunday night even the news programs are somewhat curtailed. Moreover, only a minute or two can usually be given on the news programs to, say, a major report on a very basic issue—a report to which even the small newspapers would give a thousand