

There is no government agency, or any other body, to tell him that he may not do so.

There is a long subject, and I hope we will approach it from many different aspects. But I think this is very fundamental.

The second question that he raised is since broadcast content in this sense is now regulated by the Government, may this not raise in some broadcasters the fear that if they present material unsympathetic to whatever administration is in power they may face the threat of reprisal from their regulator?

I have the contrary view. I have the view that the fairness doctrine is a protection to the broadcaster rather than a threat to the broadcaster; because if there is undue pressure from one agency of the government, as for example the White House or Congress or the city hall, the broadcaster may tell that candidate or politician that there is a doctrine for which he is responsible, the doctrine of fairness in the treatment, and that he cannot, in exercise of his public responsibility, treat only one side of the issue.

I would also urge that in terms of the history of the doctrine of fairness there has never been, in my understanding, any charge by broadcasters or others that this doctrine has been administered in any way which suggests that the broadcaster is required to present a view favorable to the administration.

It seems to me that what is confusing here is to regard the Government as being a monolithic body with monolithic interests. There are many different agencies of the Government which approach problems from many different points of view. Certainly the Commission, in my opinion, has never been the handmaid of a monolithic government designed to oppress or abuse the power which it has.

Third, does the requirement for an overall treatment of controversial issues make for wishy-washy, on-the-fence quality in broadcast journalism?

I would suggest the broadcasters should not demean themselves because I think they have done magnificently in covering of two of the most controversial issues faced, the Vietnam war and the race relations.

Certainly this doctrine has not hampered them in their treatment of these issues.

In terms of the fourth question, on the subject of comment and opinion, the fact that broadcasters have to allow for the presentation of responsible opposing viewpoints and the fact that the networks don't editorialize, I think their decision as to whether they editorialize or not is something obviously that the networks themselves should comment on.

As far as the fact that there is a requirement for the presentation of responsible viewpoints on the other side of editorials, I think this has in no way harmed the function of the broadcaster or limited his freedom in any way.

Broadcasters do editorialize and they do permit conflicting views because the interest which they serve is the interest of the public to hear the other side.

The public may judge the two sides quite differently. When a broadcaster presents an editorial, it is under the auspices of that institution and, if the broadcaster occupies a prominent part in the community,