

hearing complaints of election frauds—designating a person immediately to investigate the complaint who certifies whether a violation has occurred. The decision of this election fraud officer is appealable to the courts so as to insure review of arbitrary, unfair decisions.

Applying this type of procedure to radio-TV, we propose the appointment of (1) a local citizens' committee of three members in each community in the U.S. and (2) five-member citizens' regional advisory committees paralleling the geographical structure of the U.S. Courts of Appeals, the FCC's own geographical division. Both the local committees and regional advisory committees might be named by the FCC, or perhaps appointed by the President. The appointees would be drawn only from certain specified fields, such as the law, education, and communications, and would serve for specific term, perhaps no more than one three-year term (frequent rotation of officers and board would help in preventing bureaucratic decision-making). In fact, they might be picked from a pool of names provided by the legally-qualified political parties in the regions.

This plan envisages that individuals (or groups) who feel that they have been treated in a way which violates the fairness doctrine would take their complaint to the local Committee. The Committee would make a prompt investigation, including a hearing where necessary, and render a decision. Either the station or the complaining party could appeal the local decision to the regional Committee within a specified period of time, for example, ten days. The regional Committee's ruling in the case in the form of a written report, could be appealed to the FCC and the Commissioners would make the final decision. This procedure with focus on the local officers, would allow for speedy decision in some cases where *timely discussion* on an important public issue is essential. For example, if a city council is about to vote on a proposal to fluoridate the city's water supply, it would be essential to have the local committee act promptly on a complaint that a station has not met its obligation under the fairness doctrine.

At first glance this procedure seems to add new layers of administrative machinery and to involve the government further in programming. This is partially true because the local and regional committees are in many ways government officials. However, there are offsetting factors: They would not be part of the FCC structure or involved in the day-to-day myriad functions of that agency. Because their sole function would be to evaluate fairness doctrine complaints, and because they would operate away from Washington, the dangers of centralized bureaucracy—and the evils it brings—would be lessened. More importantly, knowledge of the local advisory committees and regional committees' availability would hopefully increase citizen interest in following the programming of the publicly-licensed stations and offer those persons (and their organizations) who feel that a station is not abiding by its publicly-licensed responsibility an avenue of redress. Better informed decisions should result as the local committees would come from the local community and know local issues and how they have been treated by stations. In short, creation of these committees could stimulate increased interest in balanced programming dealing with controversial issues, and offer a technique for achieving this kind of programming.

Dean BARROW. Mr. Frank, do you wish to respond?

Mr. FRANK. Yes; I think so, I must apologize to the committee for not being more convincing. First of all, there is one correction that I think ought to be made when I referred, in my written statement, to the point that I suggested we would all agree it would be unthinkable to apply this kind of regulation to newspapers.

I amended that, as I read it, to say that that might have applied until a half hour before I said it. Mrs. Pilpel seemed to interpret that as meaning that I no longer think it is unthinkable.

I still think it is unthinkable. I found out we would not all agree. The problem I have, since my training is not in law, is the problem that I have had all day. With all due humility, if I may associate myself with Dr. Stanton and Mr. Lower, those of us who are involved in putting on programs live in a different universe of words and ideas