

the editorial obviously has greater weight in the community than perhaps another group which opposes that point of view.

But, nevertheless, I don't see that any harm has come or any limitation on the freedom of the broadcaster.

Finally, the question of 315 which was raised by Mr. Stanton and Mr. Alexander and Mr. Lower. I think my own view is that the case has been made most strongly for the presidential election in the general campaign, and I think I quite agree with Dr. Stanton that this certainly is an area in which section 315 should be waived.

However, I think he has raised two other problems which should be discussed, and one which Mr. Alexander has already raised. It struck me as it did Mr. Alexander that what Mr. Stanton said in effect was that, if you want to use the medium effectively for broadcast purposes in campaigns, it should be done in a way in which there is confrontation, either in terms of back to back, or some method which would be, as I understood Mr. Stanton's point of view, essentially to prevent the broadcaster going directly on the air and making a set speech.

At least, that was the whole tenor of what I heard, that the candidate should be governed by what the broadcaster believes will stimulate the greatest interest in the community.

The second problem, and I think it is a more difficult problem, is the problem of what you do in primaries. I think a real distinction can be made between general elections and primaries, Mr. Stanton suggested that you could have fairness, but I would like to have him address himself to the question of what are the principles of fairness in a race for Congressman, a primary race, where there are eight or 10 candidates, where you don't have the criterion of party.

The only criterion you have would be the established candidate, the candidate who has occupied the office.

I think there are very thorny problems in the area of primaries.

Thank you.

Dean BARROW. I think we should hear some reply from those who might take issue with what Dr. Goldin has just said.

Mr. WASILEWSKI. I find this rather intriguing because I find I don't disagree so much with the panelists who have been on as I do with the moderator's opening statement, and Mr. Goldin's statement.

For example, I think Mr. Goldin said the fairness doctrine is a protector to the broadcaster, and I think that most broadcasters would find this a rather unique benefit that has not been referred to before, and would tend to say, "Don't do me any favors, please."

The point is that as Dr. Stanton pointed out, section 315 is not for the benefit of the broadcaster, nor necessarily for the benefit of the candidate.

The question should be whether it is or is not in the best interests of the public. The point that I would respond to in Dr. Goldin's statement would be this, that the same consideration should apply as far as the fairness doctrine is concerned.

I happen to believe that suspension of section 315 in the presidential race would be highly beneficial to the public at this time.

I really believe that section 315's repeal in the long run would be beneficial. And I also believe the fairness doctrine could be done away with as a practical matter and the public would benefit thereby as well.