

lenged for any substantial reason whatever. The point has been made that he shouldn't have the right to reply.

I can't see where there can be anything wrong with that. Why should it be necessary for a citizen to go beg and say, "I think I should have a reply." I will admit in my area the TV stations have been very fair. In fact, they have been out searching for people to please put up the other side. So, I don't think that is the problem involved, but I can think of many instances wherein the stations might not give it to the person.

This, it seems to me, is a right to which he is really entitled to under this act. I think the Commission under all the chairmen, has been pretty fair about this.

They have been rather strict, and in fact, in some instances, a little overstrict, as to whether a person ought to be able to reply. But at least it has been some degree of fairness.

Can you find anything wrong with that?

Mr. CORPORON. I think that—

Mr. SPRINGER. You are a good company. You operated in my area until recently, in Decatur, Ill. I think you did a good job there.

I can't see, philosophically, putting aside the legal problems, that this is unfair.

Mr. CORPORON. I just think that in a free democratic society, this type of regulation, particularly where it relates to the news media, could be a dangerous procedure.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does this keep you from expressing yourself under, we will say, any of the amendments of the Constitution? You have the same right to express yourself. But aren't you guaranteeing someone you have discussed, let's say, which would fall within the rule of the Commission, the same right to answer? I think this is the greatest guarantee for free discussion there is, to be sure that the other other side is heard.

Mr. CORPORAN. I will draw a parallel with Congress. If you set up a Federal or congressional commission where Congress would act as the reviewer, it would be a ridiculous situation. You answer to your constituents. But, on the other hand, if a constituent comes to you and says he wants a bill put through to stop the shearing of sheep you would laugh him out of your office.

He has no right to ask you to present this point of view before Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't see any analogy between the two. I don't see the analogy between what you are talking about as a Member of the Congress and the right to be heard over public airways and to reply with what was said.

Dean BARROW. Mr. Alexander has a comment to your point, Congressman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like to say that there is an orderly procedure by which, if a Congressman is not fulfilling his responsibility to his constituency, either his party may not renominate him, or, in the general election, there is an orderly procedure by which he can be removed from office, and the election is administered by Government.

What you are arguing, it seems to me, is that there should be no orderly procedure through the FCC or through equal opportunity or Fairness Doctrines by which a broadcaster can be chastised. You are