

It is time to begin a serious dialog on the problems of political communications. I commend the beginning this subcommittee in making. The continued strength of our democratic institutions may depend on finding the answers.

Dean BARROW. Thank you, Mr. Alexander.

We are now at the point of a discussion of these two papers. I am sure I need not point out to the members of the panel that our reporter will have his problems in identifying statements with each spokesman, so if you will, let me identify you and perhaps that will be helpful to him.

I will follow the procedure of asking the person who gave the position paper to give the first brief reply to the comments upon the paper.

Dr. Stanton?

Dr. STANTON. Having heard of Mr. Alexander's remarks for the first time this morning, I am not able to make this as tight a comment as I would like to make it.

It seems to me, in the first place, that the survey of what has happened in the past in the two-contest situations and the three or more contest situations isn't the real test because it seems to me that if you started giving time under 315 to the two-candidate situations that in time you would encourage third, fourth, and fifth candidates to appear.

This has certainly been the history in the presidential campaigns where we, as you pointed out, have had a great deal of difficulty under section 315. I am not suggesting that what I am proposing this morning is the answer to this problem for all time. I do suggest, however, that an extended test is the best way, it seems to me, to see just how well this might work. We did it in 1960, and I think the evidence is pretty good.

You talked about one of the difficulties with the candidate and the station having to do with the question of a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. I believe that the history of the campaign of 1960 in the presidential debates would deny that we went at that on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That format wasn't developed in the office and then taken to the candidates with "Here it is. Take it or leave it."

We sat down with the candidates' representatives and worked out what appeared to all sides to be a fair and equitable use of the medium. This has certainly been the case in individual debates that have been held by individual stations in other campaigns.

So I think it is unfair to say that the broadcaster has taken a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. Moreover, I think that it is improper to say that there are stations who will not sell time because they don't want the political broadcast in the schedule because of the effect it might have on ratings. I think we are way beyond that situation in this country. This is talking pre-World War II kinds of talk, it seems to me.

Radio and television in this country have become so important to the fabric of our political life, and news broadcasts have become so important in the schedules of the stations because they are important to the people. So I think even in the quote that was read by Dean Barrow this morning in his opening remarks, and again I wish I had had a copy of it before I made my direct statement, in reading from the testimony in the *Great Lakes* case, if you look at that description of a well-rounded program schedule, the very last thing that is listed is news, and yet news today is the most important single program type in the program schedule.