

4<sup>th</sup> July 1996

Dear Sir /madam.

On Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> July (approx 11-12pm) I was watching C-Span and the Coverage of Gay & Lesbian marriage. I enjoy C. Span as it covers a debate on an issue - this is educational.

My objection to this program was that it was NOT a debate, rather an "informercial" for hate and intolerance, in a very deceptive package.

Firstly, the name of the group was "The Family Research Council", which to the vast majority of people would give the impression of an impartial, scientific and tolerant organization - it was not.

I waited for some time until questions were allowed from the "press". I was then appalled to realise that the "press" were obviously handpicked to reinforce the arguments of the Family Research Council. This was not coverage of an open forum, it was not democratic, it was a staged performance by people of intolerance.

As a gay man, I obviously do not agree with the sentiments of the Family Research Council but it is not their opinions that anger me. What angers me is C. Span's coverage or "informercial" on a meeting that was not a balanced debate.

Would you give coverage to the Klu Klux Klan or another

O. Same sex

INTERIOR DESIGN

LOS ANGELES, CA • 90048 •

anti black group? Would you give coverage to a  
"Clinton or Dole meets the press" if all the reporters <sup>audience</sup> were  
handpicked?

I believe that if C-Span is to give coverage to a  
discussion on any issue - it should be that - a  
discussion / debate by 2 opposing arguments. To be balanced  
opposing views cannot be on separate programs at  
different timeslots. At the very least if it is one and  
only one argument being given then it should be clearly  
stated and the time of the opposing argument should  
be shown on the screen throughout the broadcast.

I would appreciate it if I could hear your  
reasoning for this "informercial".

Thank - you