

can somehow remedy any particular deficiency in the exposure of diverse viewpoints.

Mr. ROGERS. What is your remedy?

Mr. ROBINSON. To some extent we rely on the marketplace for these things.

Mr. ROGERS. On broadcasting you rely on the market to get a different point of view across?

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't know why that is so strange. We have already pointed out, I think, that there is potential for greater diversity here, subject, of course, to some limitations inherent in limited ownership. Mr. Adams expressed his concern with the fact that broadcasting licenses are being accumulated by perhaps a handful of corporations. But if this is so, it doesn't follow that the appropriate remedy is to invoke something like a fairness doctrine. More appropriately, we should limit multiple ownership of stations.

Mr. ROGERS. I think we are getting off of what I asked you. I am saying how would you assure that diverse points of view are given? You admit this is a goal.

Mr. ROBINSON. Over broadcasting alone?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. This is the only area the Government is in.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course, it is true that we have Government licensing here. But the point is, what follows from the fact of licensing? I don't know that it follows from the fact of licensing alone that we have to insure that in this particular license medium there is a diversity.

Mr. ROGERS. Then you don't agree that there should be diversity?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am saying that I don't think we can require in this medium alone diversity other than by trying to structure the marketplace, and by that I mean structure the broadcasting industry in such a way that the competitive interplay of various licensees will ultimately provide it.

Mr. ROGERS. Then you have no remedy to accomplish the goal of diversity of opinion, as I understand it.

Mr. ROBINSON. No. Indeed, it would be my position that any direct, positive effort is inappropriate and unlawful.

Mr. ROGERS. Then you are willing to let a broadcaster put out only one point of view; is that right?

Mr. ROBINSON. A broadcaster? Yes, sir.

Mr. KEITH. He apparently feels that various licensees wouldn't necessarily have the same point of view.

Mr. ROGERS. They conceivably could, too, so there would be no remedy to make sure the public could get a diverse point of view.

We just disagree basically.

Mr. PORTER. I might suggest to my friend the Congressman from Florida that maybe a partial answer to your question insofar as constitutional issues are concerned, if that is what we are talking about among other things, could be found in the case of *Hanigan v. Esquire* which involved the mail subsidy. It was withheld from the mail because the then Postmaster General did not think the publication met the esthetic standards and contributed to education and culture. The Supreme Court gave him very short shrift.

Mr. ROGERS. I don't think this goes to the same point at all, if the gentleman permits. This simply says an opposing view may be ex-