

Back in the early days, news had a much less important position in the schedule. So I think the management of broadcasting stations today do not look upon the political broadcast or the news broadcast as something that they want to avoid. This is the way to be in the mainstream of your community.

You went on to say that perhaps one way to accommodate the situation would be to put these debates in news broadcasts. Unless you are going to suggest that news broadcasts be expanded in time, I don't see how to accommodate them, and I don't think it is proper to deny the public its regular flow of news during the political campaigns, to force the news down to a minimum in order to accommodate the debate. This seems to me to be an unwise approach to follow.

You raised some points about the costs of broadcasting. There is no question about that. That cost is a cost for the user as well as it is for the broadcaster. But I do believe that more time would be given, and there would be more dialog and more confrontation, and the public would be better off, if we tried to lift 315.

You mentioned in your final remarks, as I recall, some statistics having to do with the lack of turnout or the fact that there wasn't a significant increase in turnout in elections since there has been a high use of television by the public and by the politicians. I am not sure that you can make that correlation as clearly as I think you presented it.

It seems to me that there are many other factors that have to do with the turnout problem. These include our antiquated registration techniques, the fact that people are much more mobile today and, therefore, disenfranchised in many places; the voting hours are still very restrictive in terms of taking care of the voter; the whole suburban traffic problem in getting to voting booths and so forth—these are all problems that have a bearing on that.

I am not saying that they are exclusively the problems, but these are things that also bear on that. So I think we have to look at that statistic with a jaundiced eye, if you will, because I don't think that correlation is the final answer.

At any rate, as I said at the outset, I don't think I have all the answers here. All I am suggesting is that I think we can advance the whole cause and have another look if we were to take the approach of a 6-year test.

Dean BARROW. Do you want to respond immediately to this?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would respond very briefly to two or three points.

With respect to the format of the Great Debates in 1960, I am not denying that the candidates had a good deal to say about the format, but I am saying that the format was one of confrontation, and that the networks would not willingly have given the same time available for set speeches back-to-back if the candidates had preferred that procedure.

That is the point I was making about broadcasters putting the time availability on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

With respect to news and documentary broadcasts, I think there are many opportunities for the major candidates to appear. Because these broadcasts are newsworthy, I think they should be treated in a different way. Every time a public person goes on "Face the Nation" or "Meet the Press," it becomes an object of newsworthiness. The next morning what he says is in the newspapers. It is, in effect, manu-