

Voice of the people

Wed. May 26 - 4:53 AM

Case for lack of balance

There is a case to be made that the May 21 story "Blowing money?" was not well-balanced. Without further information, it is difficult to judge the merits of these expenditures. In this regard, Dan O'Connor and Bill Eastabrooks make a legitimate point. In the interests of presenting a balanced story, should not The Chronicle Herald have interviewed an elected government member?

Given that commenters on The Herald's website employ pseudonyms, what's the problem with Mr. O'Connor submitting a comment? Why single his comments out as "anonymous?" He is a senior government staffer, but does that preclude him from voicing his opinion? And why is The Herald tracking down and questioning someone raising concerns about the objectivity of a story?

Furthermore, if the comments themselves were never posted, how is it that The Chronicle Herald can then selectively quote from them in a subsequent story? How can they be considered in the public domain if they never even appeared? And if there is a dispute about the fairness of a story's coverage, is there not a perception of a conflict of interest in having the same reporter who wrote the original story write a follow-up critical of the critique?

Christopher Majka, Halifax