

promise at Baltimore under which he would have been Vice President of the United States—not merely a place on the national ticket but the positive assurance of election, as the Bull Moose candidacy of former President Theodore Roosevelt had hopelessly divided the Republican ranks. Each time he declined in order to remain in the House.

Fourth. He was the first and only Speaker to establish and maintain caucus role. In January 1911—preliminary to the convening of the extra session, he issued a call for a Democratic caucus. It took the country by surprise. It was an innovation.

The newspapers uniformly derided the idea and called it Clark's crazy scheme. Their principle objection seemed to be that "It had never been done before." They predicted that no one would attend. But when he called the caucus to order, 2 days before the Congress convened, every Democratic Member of the House was in his seat except two who were ill. From that time on during the entire 8 years of his speakership, no important action was taken by the House until it had been officially submitted to the party as a whole and the party policy determined by a full and free discussion and vote in the caucus.

Fifth. With the single exception of Henry Clay, Clark is the only Speaker who himself developed the issue on which his party came to power. When he succeeded to the minority leadership of the House in 1908 the situation was desperate in the extreme. The crushing defeat of 1904 had left only one Democratic Governor outside the solid South. His party did not control a single branch of a single legislature north of the Mason & Dixon line. A scant two dozen Democratic Congressmen were returned to the House of Representatives from Northern and Western States following that disastrous campaign. To further complicate the difficulties of the situation, the Democratic Party in the House was torn and rent by internal schism and dissension. It was an extraordinary fact that for 16 years the Democratic minority had never voted as a unit on a single dominant question.

Confronted by this all but hopeless situation, Champ Clark rallied the shattered fragments of his party, placated the recalcitrants, fused hope into the discouraged, and disciplined his forces into a fighting minority which, in the spectacular battles of the 61st Congress, overthrew the autocracy of the Speaker, broke the iron ring that dominated the House, liberalized the rules, defeated the entrenched forces that had controlled legislation for more than a decade, and made possible the sweeping victories which gave his party a majority in the 62d Congress in 1910, and complete control of every branch of the Government in 1912.

Sixth. Again, Speaker Clark is the only Speaker in the last hundred years who has not sought to enlarge and enhance the power of the speakership. Originally the functions of the Speaker were limited to those of a presiding officer. Jefferson in interpreting the Constitution and establishing procedure in

the legislative branch of the new Government, as set forth in Jefferson's Manual, based his conception of congressional procedure on that of the English House of Commons in which the Speaker is merely a presiding officer—as he remains to this day. Originally the Vice President in the Senate and the Speaker in the House followed the British prototype. They made no effort to dominate their respective Houses or control legislation or extend their power and influence or otherwise manipulate the rules or encroach on the rights and authority reserved under the rules to other Members of Congress. In the Senate this situation still obtains. But beginning with Speaker Reed the Speaker and those cooperating with him began to reach out and mold the rules of the House to concentrate in the Speakership such arbitrary control as to render him a dictator, disenfranchising, to that extent, the membership of the House to a point where under Speaker Cannon the President of the United States himself had to come to the Speaker's room, hat in hand, and plead as a mendicant before he could secure even the consideration of a bill needed by his administration.

The Senators wisely refused to permit alienation of their authority by such rules and availed themselves of policy committees and conferences which assured equal and independent participation of all in legislative functions of the body.

But in the House self-centered men concentrated dictatorial powers in the speakership. The movement had its inception under Speaker Reed and flowered under Speaker Cannon. And from their time Speakers have sought to make themselves masters of the House. Speaker Clark fought determinedly, consistently, successfully to make the Speaker the servant of the House. He sought to encourage and enhance the individuality, independence, and legislative entity of every Member of the House and the constituency of the district which he represented. No caucus was adjourned until every man there had been given an opportunity to be heard and to present amendments or suggestions which he wished to offer. Sessions of the caucus frequently lasted until past midnight. It was truly a government by the rank and file of the membership of the House and not by the Speaker or any circle about the Speaker. It was the essence of Jeffersonian democracy.

Speaker Clark divested himself of all authority outside that of presiding officer and worked constantly for liberalization of the rules and the curtailment of the arbitrary powers of the speakership emphasizing the supremacy of the caucus as the final authority on all party policies and national issues.

His insistence on this democratic course spread to the Nation and his battle against the domination of the Speaker and his coterie drew to his support an alliance of Republicans as well as Democratic colleagues. The press took it up. Magazines began to feature it. It spread like a prairie fire through

the Nation and was the national campaign issue in the election of 1910.

Under the inspired leadership of Clark the rules were revised. The Speaker was deprived of all extraparliamentary power. Committees were elected by the House. Power of recognition was curtailed. The Speaker was made ineligible to membership on the Committee on Rules. The Calendar Wednesday rule and the Unanimous Consent Calendar were instituted and a Democratic caucus passed on all issues before consideration by the House. A united party presented a solid front and for the first time in 16 years swept to control of the House in that critical campaign and 2 years later took over every branch of the Government. No such rehabilitation of a helpless party; no such miraculous change in national sentiment is recorded in the political history of the Nation either before or since.

On this 7th day of March, on the 112th anniversary of his birth, we honor him in appreciation of those rare qualities which made him preeminently, incomparably the greatest of all Speakers, truly the servant of the House—never the master of the House.

Seventh. And let us not overlook the appeal of his statesmanship to the country. He came closer to the Presidency, without obtaining it than any man in American history. It was not a suddenly manipulated buildup. It was not an unforeseen stampede triggered by dramatic appeal to sentimentalism. It was the slow, steady growth through the years of the confidence and affection of the people for demonstrated capacity and integrity. Three men defeated him for the Presidency. No two of them could have accomplished it. It took all three—widely separated geographically for widely separated motives.

From the first ballot at Baltimore in the Democratic National Convention of 1912, he led the entire field for 29 ballots with a clear majority on nine ballots, then from ambush—with no opportunity to be heard, no chance to submit his cause—he was disinherited.

He comes down to us today as an illustrious archetype. His career is the glory of our democratic form of government. What he accomplished our children may hope to accomplish. What he achieved the humblest boy who walks the meanest street of the smallest hamlet in the remotest corner of the land may, under our free American institutions, aspire to achieve.

It was his pride, often voiced from public platform and from the Speaker's rostrum, that within the brief span of his life the example of the American Government had destroyed despotisms and established republics in every quarter of the globe; that with every other American citizen he had helped to make the blessings of liberty and democracy the common and universal birthright of all mankind.

On this 7th of March, in a critical international situation which he would have avoided, we look back to him with gratitude and appreciation.

I will be glad to answer any questions which anyone desires to ask on this subject at this time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Andrews	Hagan, Ga.	Pilcher
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Buckley	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Scranton
Chelf	Kearns	Shelley
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Smith, Miss.
Davis,	McIntire	Spence
James C.	Macdonald	Steed
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Moulder	Whitten
Forrester	Norrell	Wright
Gavin	O'Konski	Zelenko
Granahan	Osmer	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee may be permitted during the remainder of this session to held meetings while the House is in session.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my chairman in that request. It is the usual request and has been the custom for at least 28 years that I know of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be privileged to sit during the legislative sessions on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 552 calls up for debate and consideration House bill 132, the educational television bill. The open rule allows for 2 hours of debate.

At the outset I would like to commend the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for truly outstanding work on this bill. I would also like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], who first introduced the bill in 1957, and who has patiently and diligently worked on it through the years. I congratulate him on his great effort which brings the bill before the House for decision today.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage the States—through a program of matching grants—to take advantage of enormous opportunity and challenge of educational television.

This bill is intelligently and carefully written and, for a moderate cost, offers the Congress an opportunity to make a sound investment in the minds and future of our country's children as well as its adults.

But before discussing the specifics of the bill, I would like to sketch some of the background which will show the need for this type of legislation.

Beginning in 1952, the Federal Communications Commission first began making allocations on the broadcast spectrum for educational television stations.

As of July 29, 1961, the FCC had set aside 273 television channels for educational television. But during the last 9½ years, only 57 educational television stations have gone on the air, although 77 stations have been authorized.

In other words, only about 20 percent of the educational television allocations have actually been put into operation.

As my colleagues know, the demand for television channels is strong. And once all the allocations are made, there

is little that can be done. As a result of the comparatively small use of educational television channels available, there has been an increased demand to take these channels away from educational television and reallocate them to commercial enterprises.

As the committee report on this bill stated:

There is a grave danger that unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education.

I would like to point out that commercial stations have about 90 percent of the channel allocations. So this is not a question of depriving our valuable commercial media.

I should also like to quote one more paragraph of the committee report, with which I wholeheartedly agree:

The failure of educators to use reserved educational channels is not the result of lack of interest, desire, or planning on their part. One of the largest problems which faces the educators is the lack of funds to pay for the installation of educational television facilities. Experience has demonstrated that once educational television stations are built, State legislatures, local school systems, and community organizations have raised the necessary operating funds.

I am proud to say that my example is the great and truly outstanding record made in educational television by my own State of Alabama.

Alabama pioneered with the first and, so far to my knowledge, still the largest State educational TV network.

The network covers about 78 percent of the State's TV homes. The coverage is through channel 2 in Andalusia, channel 7 in Cheha State Park and channel 10 in Birmingham. Channel 26 in Montgomery will be connected to the State network before this spring.

Educational television has studios at Auburn University, the University of Alabama and in Birmingham. They are linked to the network by microwave.

More than 550 schools in Alabama have already purchased receiving sets. Most of these schools have made educational television an integral part of their program. And since 1955, educational television has been used for teaching shut-in children in Alabama. In all, more than 230,000 Alabama students receive some form of in-school educational television.

In addition to in-school telecasts, there are also after school programs for children. Other programs are designed for parent education and stress child growth and development and the importance of cooperation between home and school.

Of equal importance is the way educational television has opened a new frontier in adult education. Subjects covered include music, art and drama for cultural enrichment; vocational and agricultural programs aimed at improving earning power of our city and farm families and civic programs aimed at upgrading the awareness of our electorate.

The State legislature appropriates approximately \$225,000 a year for this program. With the help of this bill, Ala-

bama is looking forward to expanding its educational television service to include the entire State.

Now, to discuss briefly the specific provisions of this bill.

The bill provides for two programs, both of them operated by matching grants.

First, a total of \$520,000 is authorized for the States to survey the need for and to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities.

Second, a total of \$25 million is authorized for a program of constructing educational television facilities.

The maximum allowable to any State under the survey program is \$10,000. The limit to each State under the facility construction provision is \$1 million.

The survey grants would have to be matched dollar for dollar by the States. Construction grants are limited to 50 percent of the approved cost of the project.

The authorization for survey appropriations would be for 3 years, from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1965. Funds for construction of facilities would be authorized for 4 years, from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1966.

Those eligible for help under the bill are as follows:

First. An agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State or within a political subdivision thereof.

Second. The State educational television agency of a State.

Third. A college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues.

Fourth. A nonprofit community educational television organization.

Applications for both survey and construction grants must be first approved by the State educational television agency or officer before they can be forwarded to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner administers the Federal portion of the program.

In closing, I need not remind my colleagues at great length about the importance of education in the great twilight struggle between Western civilization and Communist tyranny.

This bill gives us an opportunity, at moderate cost, of pushing forward in a field where the investment yield is certain and the goals are unanimously accepted by the American people.

This bill specifically provides that none of its provisions shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employees of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system. In other words, the matter of the content of educational television programs of instruction is left in the hands of the States where it rightfully belongs.

I am happy that Alabama has forged ahead in making educational television programs available to its schoolchildren and to its adults. It is my hope that

the growth of educational television in Alabama, and in the Nation, will be greatly quickened by this bill.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 552.

(Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House this afternoon is not on the merits of educational television. I think anybody that has made an objective and a thorough study of educational television could only come to the conclusion that it is a very important medium; that it does serve a very helpful function in the field of education.

The issue this afternoon here, as I see it, is twofold. No. 1: Is this a rightful responsibility for the Federal Government to assume; in other words, should the Federal Government trespass further into the field of education or should this remain, as it has historically, the responsibility of the several States?

The other issue is more or less indirect. It reverts, I think, to a bill or an issue which we had before this same body a few weeks ago. We had a proposal which would authorize an increase of the national debt limit by the amount of \$2 billion. We were advised simultaneously that there would subsequently be a further request to extend it an additional \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the most eloquent, the most persuasive and the most highly respected Member, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], told the Committee on Rules that "a vote against raising the debt ceiling is not an economy vote; this is not the time to cast your economy votes. The time to cast an economy vote is when a new Federal authorization for additional Federal spending is being considered." That is a collateral issue here this afternoon.

With reference to this bill, this is not a new issue. It has been bouncing around the House of Representatives and before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and before the Rules Committee now for about 6 years. As you have already read in your report, and you were told by my colleague on the Rules Committee from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] this proposal has passed the other body several times. It has passed the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now on two separate occasions. It failed in the Rules Committee in the 86th Congress. It was passed out of both the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this year, and also the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, let us just look at this for a minute. Two years ago, in both the other body and in this body, we had a bill to authorize \$50 million for educational TV. That was considered to be a modest amount, and not an undue burden upon the Federal Treasurer. That was considered to be the minimum amount that could be authorized to generate, to accelerate, to initiate a program of educational television. Now, since that bill failed—the \$50 million

bill failed—in the 86th Congress and we now have more budgetary concern, shall I say, by the majority party in the last year in view of the bookkeeping responsibilities downtown, we are back today with a \$25 million bill that can only mean one thing in my opinion, and that is this: We did not get the \$50 million bill passed; so we will start it out with \$25 million and we can build on that in Congresses to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a reality that we had just as well face here this afternoon. If we authorize this program today, even though it is for \$25 million, and it is limited under the bill strictly to the procurement of broadcasting apparatuses—this does not include brick and mortar and it does not include the cost of operation—but we had just as well face up to the fact if we commit the resources of the Federal Government for educational TV even to a limited extent this afternoon, at the expiration of the time provided for under this bill, which is 1967, somebody is going to be back on this floor or back before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and they are going to say this; they are going to say: "Mr. Chairman, now in my State we have a facility that was just half constructed. We underestimated the cost of this facility. Now it is in the public interest that the Congress should appropriate more money so that this particular facility in my State and in my congressional district can be completed."

Mr. Speaker, we are also going to have this situation, if the bill passes: Although we are not committed to the cost of operation, Members will find in the hearings if they will read them—and I was on the Committee at the time the hearings were held—in some cases it costs as much as \$250,000 a year just to operate a television station after it is built.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only realistic to accept this afternoon that if we commit the Federal Government to the cost of construction, we are going to be asked in the not too distant future to also subsidize the cost of operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say again—I repeat—we are not voting on the issue of educational television. The issue before the House today is what is the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field as opposed to the traditional and rightful responsibility of the several States in the field of education.

I shall make only one further observation, Mr. Speaker. I should hope that the Members of the House, and later, members of the Committee of the Whole, will observe on page 16 that there is a rather broad authority under the bill as to who may qualify to apply for a television license, for a broadcasting license, to participate under this grant program. I shall not spell it out in detail, but I do want to call to your attention that it is not limited, as you might think. Members may be under the illusion that under this bill this authority is limited to an institution of higher learning, a college or university in your respective States or respective congressional district, but that is not the case. There is very broad authority in this bill as to

who may apply for a broadcasting license.

The argument has been made further that not very many of the channels that have been reserved for educational purposes were actually now broadcasting and therefore, the only way to preserve these channels for education would be to hurry up and pass this bill so they will have a Federal incentive to put the station on the air.

Mr. Speaker, without burdening you with too many figures I would like to cite four very short and understandable statistics. There are presently 1,954 commercial channels that have been identified, UHF and VHF. Of these channels only 740 have actually gone on the air. These are commercial channels; 1,954 identified on the spectrum and set aside for commercial broadcasting, and only 740 of those have gone on the air.

What is the story with respect to education? There have been reserved, VHF and UHF, 273 channels. How many of them have gone on the air without any Federal aid? There have been 57—maybe 59; the committee report says 57, but it is my understanding that 2 have gone on since then. So actually, Mr. Speaker, the percentages are not too different for educational channels that have actually gone on the air than for commercial channels that have gone on since the spectrum was divided and channels were assigned in 1952, just 10 years ago, by the Federal Communications Commission.

Do not labor under the illusion further that the broadcasters, under this bill, are going to be under the direct supervision of the Federal Communications Commission, because they are not. After their license has once been awarded generally they will only be subject to such supervision as they would be under this so-called Commissioner which is identified as an appointee of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On balance, therefore, I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of support for this bill. I would urge the Members of the House to consider the basic issue before us; whether the Federal Government is going to trespass further in the field of aid to education. I think that is what we must ask ourselves before we vote on this bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California who has been very active in the development of this legislation and is a ranking member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this bill that deprives the Federal Communications Commission of any of their regulatory authority over all licensees?

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The licensees, as many of the facilities as become licensed by virtue of the grants under this bill, would still be subject to all of the broad authority under the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as any other broadcasters. The gentleman is absolutely correct. But we

are not in commercial broadcasting now. We are in a very critical field, a very sensitive field of educational broadcasting.

As much as I fear regulated broadcasting, I think there is also a calculated risk as to what is to be declared in the interest of education that might flow out over these facilities and what might flow out in the way of indoctrination.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true that the FCC is charged in the regulatory authority with observing what is good and in the public interest? Is that not the criteria that they must use?

Mr. AVERY. Well, in a general sense, of course, it is, as the gentleman very well knows. There is no use going into this in detail. There are three or four prohibitions in the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Obscene language is not prohibited. There can be no lotteries, and as far as political broadcasts are concerned, facilities must be made available on an equal time basis. Censorship is forbidden. After the license has been granted the FCC, of course, has very little jurisdiction. I think that is the way it should be. In fact, there is a difference of opinion right now as to how far the commission should project themselves into the field of program control. I am glad the gentleman is bringing this up because I think the House should realize the full ramifications in this proposal in which the Federal Government is providing part of the construction cost for a broadcasting facility and there is virtually going to be no control over it. The question is going to rest almost entirely in the judgment of the licensee whether the program flowing out over the facility is going to be instructional or whether it is going to be indoctrinational. That is a hazard that we are facing, particularly, when the applicant is not limited to a college or a university facility.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill for matching grants to States for the construction of educational television facilities clearly prohibits the Federal Government from exercising any control over educational TV programs. This is as it should be. I never want to see the day when the Federal Government interferes with any phase of public or private education. That doesn't mean, however, that there should be no control over classroom TV.

State and local officials who inherit the task of selecting the content of educational television programs will have a very great responsibility to avoid one-sided indoctrination of a political nature which all too often commercial television networks feed their viewers under the guise of news. A blatant example of this reprehensible practice recently occurred on NBC-TV's popular "Today" program.

The moderator of this so-called news and entertainment show read a charge by the American Civil Liberties Union that "Operation Abolition," the Com-

mittee on Un-American Activities' film of the 1960 San Francisco riots, contains distortions. Although the ACLU represents strictly a very small minority viewpoint and has as a declared objective the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the moderator flatly endorsed the charge. Without any reference to reports by the House, the FBI or other sources which completely refute the ACLU's charge of "distortion" against the film, "Today's" moderator said:

We—I—agree with the statement of the American Civil Liberties Union.

I found the one-sided presentation's endorsement by an NBC spokesman on a news and entertainment show neither newsy nor entertaining.

This is the kind of practice which State and local education officials must keep out of the classrooms of the schools of America, if educational television is to have a constructive, rather than destructive, influence on our Nation's young people.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 132 with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is one of the most important bills that will come before this session of the Congress. It affects the future of our country, the development of our children and the opportunities which they may have. Let no one be mistaken about the importance of this legislation.

Here we have a great natural resource. Without it we would not have some of the important news media we have today; without it we would not have means of defense we have today. Believe me, much of the progress and many of the advances that have been made, I can assure my colleagues, are due primarily to the availability of adequate communications.

Many of you have heard me say that in my judgment one of the most valuable natural resources we have in this

country is the spectrum, and it is also one of the most wasted resources. For many years I have been trying to convince my colleagues and those interested in broadcasting of the importance of the efficient utilization of the spectrum. Because of conflicting views relating to the management of the spectrum, it is very difficult to get all forces together in order that the spectrum can be more efficiently utilized.

Just 5 years ago we tried through our committee to bring about unity of effort in the proper utilization of the spectrum; but, try as we would, it has been very difficult.

Our committee recognized the value in this portion of the spectrum reserved for educational television, and we bring to you by an overwhelming majority of the committee a bill which we recommend to you as being invaluable to the future of this country.

This bill was reported by our committee toward the close of the first session. Similar legislation was reported by our committee during the 86th Congress, and somewhat broader legislation passed the other body during the 85th, 86th, and again during the 87th Congress.

Now, let me tell you as briefly as possible what this legislation is about, and why it is even more important legislation today than it was last year and the year before.

We have in the United States 2,227 television channels. Of these channels, 1,551 are in the UHF band and 676 are in the VHF band. Today, we have 458 commercial VHF stations operating on the 676 VHF channels, but we have only 85 commercial UHF stations operating on the 1,551 UHF channels. While most all VHF channels in the larger communities of our Nation have been taken up, many UHF channels in these same communities are still unused.

Now, a big drive is on at the present time to get new commercial UHF stations to operate on the 1,466 UHF channels which are still unoccupied. In order to accomplish this the FCC has proposed all-channel receiver legislation which will assure that all TV receivers shipped in interstate commerce are capable of receiving both UHF and VHF signals. Our committee has been conducting hearings on this legislation all this week.

Now, if the drive to get new UHF television stations on the air succeeds—and I personally have little doubt that it will in a very few years—then there will be a great demand that television channels which are now reserved for nonprofit educational purposes be made available for commercial purposes.

At present 92 VHF channels and 181 UHF channels are reserved for nonprofit educational broadcasting. But over the 9-year period during which these reservations have been in force, only 41 educational VHF stations and only 16 educational UHF stations have been established. If this process cannot be speeded up, there is good reason to fear that these channels will be reassigned for commercial television and thus be lost permanently for nonprofit

educational purposes. The reason why the process of getting educational television stations on the air is so slow is lack of funds.

The bill before you attempts to address itself to this problem. First, the bill attempts to induce the States which have not already done so to make a survey of the need for educational television broadcasting facilities within these States, and to develop State programs for the construction of such facilities. The bill would make up to \$10,000 available to each State which desires to make such a survey and develop a construction program. This grant would have to be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Next, the bill authorizes a maximum expenditure of \$25 million for matching grants for the construction of educational television facilities. Not more than \$1 million may be granted for facilities in any one State. Appropriations for the program would cease June 30, 1966.

Applications for construction grants would be made through State agencies in those States which have developed a State program. They would be forwarded to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. In those States which have not developed a State program, applications would be made directly to the Commissioner.

In order to qualify, an applicant must be a State or local agency, or a college or university which derives its support in whole or in part from State tax revenues, or it may be a local nonprofit community organization which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and cultural institutions in the area.

Applicants must satisfy the Commissioner that they have a license from the FCC or are qualified to be licensed, and that they are financially responsible. This means not only that they have the necessary matching money but that they also will have the necessary funds to operate the station.

Before the committee reported the bill, I wrote on behalf of our committee a letter to the Governors of our 50 States, inquiring with respect to any plans their States might have for the utilization of educational television, and asking their view whether the cooperative Federal-State program contemplated by this legislation might be helpful in furthering any such plans. Forty-five Governors replied. Thirty-one endorsed the legislation. Eleven expressed no opinion, two preferred reliance on private financing, and one expressed doubt as to the availability of matching funds in his State.

In summing up, let me say to you that this is important legislation because experience in a number of States has shown that educational television can be used advantageously to supplement classroom instruction. Some States have found that educational television can save them money because educational television has made unnecessary the construction of additional classrooms. Florida, particularly, testified at length on this aspect.

Undoubtedly, the use of educational television will grow whether or not we

pass this legislation. However, the question is will it grow fast enough to justify keeping unused a considerable number of television channels in those communities in which all available channels have been taken up by commercial stations, and where there is an insistent demand that educational channels be released for commercial purposes. It is the expectation that this bill, by offering a very limited amount of Federal matching grants, will have the desired result.

Now, let us discuss briefly the principal provisions of the bill, as amended in committee. This bill is patterned after the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—commonly referred to as the Hill-Burton Act. This act has proven very successful in stimulating, with the aid of Federal matching grants, the construction of numerous State, county, municipal, and private nonprofit hospitals throughout the Nation.

I have already referred briefly to the provision of the bill dealing with State surveys. The bill seeks to stimulate the making by the several States of surveys of the need for and the utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities. It is expected that on the basis of such surveys, the construction of additional facilities will be developed. For this purpose, the bill authorizes a Federal grant of not to exceed \$10,000 to each State which desires to participate in the program. This grant must be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by the State.

The survey must be made, and the State program must be developed by the State educational television agency. The bill defines a State educational television agency in such a manner as to permit existing State agencies to conduct the required survey and prepare the program. A State educational television agency may be:

- (1) A board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State; or
- (2) A board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law; or
- (3) A State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State, designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television.

Next, we come to construction grant applicants. Applications for construction grants are made through the State educational television agency and are transmitted by that agency to the Commissioner of Education in the case of an application for a facility situated in a State for which a survey grant has been approved under this program. Otherwise, applications are submitted directly to the Commissioner of Education.

In order to qualify for a Federal matching grant, an applicant must provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education:

- (1) That the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D)

a nonprofit community educational television organization;

(2) That the operation of such educational television facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified to be an applicant;

(3) That necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities will be available when needed; and

(4) That such television facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" is defined for the purposes of this new part as meaning "a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting."

In the case of any State with respect to which an application for a survey grant has been approved an application for the construction of a facility situated in such State may be approved by the Commissioner of Education only if such application has received the approval of the State educational television agency of such State. If a construction program for educational television facilities has been developed in such State, the application may be approved by the Commissioner only if the State educational television agency has certified that the facilities applied for are included in, or that construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

Federal matching grants are limited to 50 percent of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of the project. However, if an applicant owns an existing educational television broadcasting facility and he desires a Federal matching grant for the construction of another educational television broadcasting facility or the enlargement or replacement of an existing facility, the Federal matching grant may be increased by adding to the 50 percent of the reasonable and necessary cost of the proposed project 25 percent of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Commissioner of all educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant at the time of the filing of the application.

In computing the cost of a project there may be included the cost of acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television broadcasting but there must be excluded the cost of constructing and repairing structures to house such apparatus. Thus, applicants must provide television studio buildings and other structures to house apparatus without any Federal aid.

Upon a determination by the Commissioner that an application for a construction grant meets the requirements set forth in this legislation, he may make a grant to the applicant.

As already mentioned, the total amount of construction grants for facilities situated in any State may not exceed \$1 million.

In order to qualify for a grant under this legislation, an applicant—or the operator, if different—must either already be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate an educational television station, or he must be qualified under the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 and the Commission's rules to be so licensed.

The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this legislation.

The bill specifically provides that none of its provisions shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system. This prohibition also goes, of course, to the rulemaking powers of the Commissioner under section 397.

Finally, the bill authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this legislation as may be requested by the Commissioner.

The principal differences between the Senate-passed bill, S. 205, and the bill reported favorably by the committee are as follows:

First, H.R. 132 provides an authorization of up to \$25 million for up to 50 percent Federal grants with an overall limitation of \$1 million for facilities situated in any one State. S. 205 provides an authorization for such amounts as may be necessary for outright Federal construction grants requiring no matching by applicants but there is a ceiling on individual grants of \$1 million for each State.

The committee believes that the requirement contained in this bill, that the Federal grant must be matched, should result in about the same number of facilities being constructed with approximately one-half the expenditure of Federal funds.

The committee also feels that without the matching requirement applicants for Federal grants might tend not to be as mindful as is necessary of the continuing financial responsibilities which they must assume in connection with the operation of educational television stations.

Second, H.R. 132 seeks to assist the States in the making of State surveys and the development of State plans for the construction of educational television facilities. No comparable provision is contained in S. 205.

The committee feels that the development of comprehensive State plans for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities will help to bring into proper focus the need for, and the prospective use of, educational television. The responsibility for the making of such surveys and the preparation of such plans should be placed on the appropriate State agencies or officers. This approach paid tremendous dividends in the case of the Hill-Burton program and it is hoped that similarly

beneficial results will be accomplished under this legislation. Some of the States have already assumed a definite responsibility with regard to educational television and it is anticipated that if this legislation is enacted the remaining States will have an incentive to follow suit.

Third, H.R. 132 provides that in the case of any State with respect to which an application for a survey grant has been approved under section 392, an application for the construction of a facility situated in such State may be approved by the Commissioner of Education only if such application has received the approval of the State educational television agency of such State; if a construction program for educational television broadcasting facilities has been developed in such State, the application may be approved by the Commissioner only if the State educational television agency certifies that the facilities applied for are included in, or that construction thereof, would be consistent with, such program.

S. 205 does not provide for any State screening of applicants and would vest complete discretion in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the allocation of available Federal funds among competing applications within a State.

The committee feels that the maximum responsibility for screening applications under the program provided for in this legislation should be placed in the hands of the States rather than the Federal Government.

Fourth, the provisions of H.R. 132 relating to the qualifications of applicants for construction grants differ in some respects from those contained in S. 205.

For example, under H.R. 132 an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within a political subdivision may qualify for a grant as well as an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within a State. Under S. 205 it is not clear whether an agency or officer within a political subdivision of a State would qualify.

The committee feels that agencies or officers responsible for the supervision of public education within political subdivisions should clearly qualify for Federal matching grants since developments to date have demonstrated that several such agencies or officers are now operating or are actively planning to operate educational television broadcasting stations.

Under H.R. 132 a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues may qualify to file an application. Under S. 205 a college or university may qualify only if it is State controlled. The committee feels that colleges or universities receiving State support should qualify for grants under this legislation in addition to State-controlled colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, those are the fundamental requirements of the bill. The purpose of the bill is to bring about the utilization of this great natural resource—the spectrum. I would say that this is the kind of a proposal that we all

should be able to support. The issues that always provoke controversy in the field of education, those issues are not present here at all. It seems to me that the Congress could do no less than to try to provide a program for the utilization of this particular resource.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In regard to that last point, Mr. Chairman, on page 7, where you list the agencies that might qualify, under section (D) where reference is made to nonprofit community educational television organization, could the gentleman inform the Members of the House what types of agencies or organizations might be included in that section which would not otherwise be covered in sections (A), (B), or (C)?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has the bill and will refer to "definitions" on pages 15 and 16, the gentleman can immediately see just what the committee does in this respect. We define the term "nonprofit community educational television organization" as a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or an association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic and cultural institutions, and organizations located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

The gentleman from Kansas mentioned something that is vital in this field. I do not want anyone to get the wrong impression as to what the committee intended or what we did. The committee provided language as specific as it could. The language was offered, I think, by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. It is on page 17 and I should like to read this language.

Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.

That, it seems to me, nails down this question and there certainly should not be any serious argument on it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a good bill and I urge the members of this Committee of the Whole to give it their overwhelming support.

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I want to be very frank with the membership of this House. When our committee first held hearings on educational television bills, I felt that at that time the Federal Government could not af-

ford the additional financial burden which such a program would impose on it. However, I have had occasion to change my mind in this respect and I want to share with the Members of the House the reasons why I now support this proposal.

After our committee held hearings during the 85th Congress, it was felt that the information presented by the witnesses was not sufficient to guide the committee in its decision with regard to this legislation. Therefore, the committee decided to make an on-the-spot study of educational television and I participated in this study. I learned in the course of the study the importance of educational television which has caused me to change my mind with regard to this bill.

In the first place, educational television affords an opportunity for utilizing the services of scarce teachers in the fields of languages and the sciences to teach many more students than is possible by traditional classroom instruction. Second, educational television can save large sums of money by making unnecessary the construction of some additional classrooms. This was exemplified particularly in Miami where you have a tremendous increase in student enrollment in the public schools and where the utilization of educational television made possible a cutting back of the building construction program which otherwise would have been necessary. Thus, the State of Florida and the communities involved saved many millions of dollars. Third, the bill which the committee has reported is much different than the bill originally considered. The original bill provided for an outright grant program without any matching requirements and it left large discretionary authority to the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

The bill which the committee has worked out provides for a matching grant program following the pattern of the Hill-Burton Act. It requires State plans and thus gives a large share of the responsibility and discretion for the administration of the program to the States rather than the Federal Government.

Finally, the bill as reported cuts back the amount authorized to slightly in excess of \$25.5 million instead of the \$52 million which was authorized by the Senate bill.

For all of these reasons, I feel that this legislation, which involves a modest expenditure of Federal funds, is beneficial to the Nation as a whole. Improved education and information, both for our children and our adult population is vital to the welfare of the Nation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know there has been some doubt in the minds of those on my side of the aisle as to what the difference is between this bill and the Senate bill. I think chiefly it has to do with the amount of money that is allotted for

this particular project. The Senate bill has \$50 million with \$1 million going to each State. In other words, that is the mandatory feature of the bill. There are no incentive provisions for local assistance to the States in the Senate bill. Our bill, we believe is an improvement over the bill passed on the Senate side, because of the incentive provisions.

Let me say to my colleagues that if this bill passes and we go to conference I hope our committee will stand firm on this particular incentive provision because I believe it is of considerable importance.

In this bill we have allotted \$25 million to States for this kind of effort in the educational TV field with the provision that not more than \$1 million may go to any State. That is the maximum. This, in turn, means that if you had an average of \$500,000 to each one of the States now, and each of them took advantage of this they would in turn have to produce or vote \$500,000 out of their own pocket. In other words, if this \$25 million is fully utilized under the provisions of the bill then the States themselves must match that \$25 million. That is the kind of matching program that we have had in other types of matching legislation which has come from this committee; and I could go back over some of them through the years beginning with the Hill-Burton Act which originated in this committee.

I think this is a good provision and I think those States that are actually interested in promoting educational television have the incentive here, if they want to undertake it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just for the correction of the record, I believe that the matching funds can be furnished by the public rather than through the State if there is some educational institution that qualifies and they raise the funds by public subscription; is that not true?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. But whoever did it, I presume, there would have to be a division set out under the provisions under the bill.

A great many have asked—what is the need for this. It seems to me that the need for increasing the quality as well as the quantity of education available was never more evident than it is at the present time in this particular field. There is a constantly growing body of knowledge which can be disseminated by educational television. There is a constant increase in the interrelationship of our people with the rest of the world that necessitates a greater understanding than can be achieved only by the opportunities of learning at the university level.

We believe that the provisions of this bill will do much to fill this void. During the past few years, 65 educational television stations which are now on the air in various parts of the country have fully demonstrated to us the efficiencies in providing quantity instruction as well as the effectiveness of using

educational television as a medium for the improvement of this kind of instruction.

The evidence that has been presented by all of the national educational television agencies to our committees as well as the U.S. Office of Education indicates that not only is this use of television for educational purposes effective, but it is an extremely economical way of achieving an objective that apparently in many areas of the country could be achieved in no other way. We have a limited number of qualified teachers in higher education, and one of the demonstrated economies effected by the use of educational television has been the sharing of exceptionally qualified teachers and professors in specific subject areas with great numbers of students who would otherwise be denied the privileges of these contacts.

But, in addition to this, there has been demonstrated collaterally an equal advantage from the proper and effective development of educational television. The Commission appointed by President Eisenhower on National Goals said in its report commenting on the needs of continuing education:

If we really believe in individual fulfillment, our concern for education (in the television field) will reach far beyond the formal system. We shall expect people to continue to learn and grow, in and out of school, in every possible circumstance, and at every stage of their lives.

This simply means in addition to providing facilities for the increasing needs of formal education, we as a people must use every resource such as educational television to make available a process of continuing education that will enable our people to meet intelligently and successfully the problems and the pressures of present day life.

The evidence on every hand indicates that several States have made tremendous efforts to provide these educational facilities, and the fact that the majority of the States have provided some kind of central authority in the educational TV field or have made some kind of plan, depending on their financial ability to develop these plans, indicates the recognition of the need for educational television facilities at the local levels. It has been demonstrated that once facilities can be established and their use properly integrated into the educational processes of the localities that actual financial savings will accrue, but the problem seems to be in getting the initial investment underway and this is where this Congress can serve best. For a very small amount of money, seed money if you will, the ball can be started rolling in every State, and local and State and even private funds will be made available to match this initial Federal money to provide this Nation with the kind of auxiliary educational television facilities which can help greatly.

The very significant fact about such help is that these facilities are available in their use to all the people through this bill; to all citizens of all ages and for all areas of learning for the relatively small sum of money required to set this in operation. Congress cannot afford to withhold the initiative and encourage-

ment which will make possible the development of one of the most significant tools of education, educational television, and of general public understanding that has been developed within our time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to yield further time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. The program to be authorized by this bill could be extremely beneficial to very large numbers of people in a great many areas, particularly in rural areas where population and distances tend to discourage supplemental educational and cultural activities. Furthermore, the program to be authorized by H.R. 132 is completely a voluntary program. I think this is an extremely important factor. There must be local interest and initiative demonstrated before any Federal funds would be expended.

In Colorado, we already have some excellent examples of both local interest and local initiative which have been dramatically demonstrated. One of the country's outstanding educational TV stations, KRMA, is located in Denver. And, since 1956, it has served the schools of that area in addition to providing noncommercial programs for children and adults.

The University of Colorado, which is located in Boulder, currently is seeking funds with which to establish an educational television station in that area. Channel 12 already has been reserved for this station. In addition, channels have been reserved for educational television stations which are planned for the cities of Colorado Springs and Pueblo.

Two years ago, our State legislature passed a bill to enable our school districts to operate television facilities. Implementing this authorization, the University of Colorado offers courses in television production and has produced programs on commercial TV stations. Colorado State University, which is located at Fort Collins, also offers courses in television production, and likewise has produced programs on commercial television stations. Courses in television production also are offered by the University of Denver.

Currently available to the viewers of educational television in the Denver area are such elementary school courses as foreign languages, literature, science, social studies, mathematics, and geography. For older students and adults, the programs offered include typing, home economics, and college algebra in addition to public affairs and a variety of cultural programs which are produced locally.

Thus, in Colorado, much of the groundwork already has been done, and the enactment of H.R. 132 could stimulate the creation of a statewide system of educational television in our State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 132 represents a sound progressive advance in the national educational effort. It will permit the use of television for truly constructive purposes—enabling us to realize some of the great potential values of this medium for communication.

Furthermore, H.R. 132 meets the tests for action by the Federal Government. The House bill assists the States in making surveys and plans for the construction of educational television facilities.

The responsibility, however, remains with the States. The grants are made on a matching basis—thus stimulating State action in this important endeavor. The States will have the prerogative of screening applications for construction of educational television facilities—selection will not be made by the Federal Government.

Lastly, the construction of such facilities is a matter which the people in many parts of the country cannot accomplish for themselves. It therefore is appropriate for the Federal Government to help do the job.

In States such as my own, with relatively small populations and mountainous terrain, UHF television transmission facilities cost more than can be afforded locally. For instance, an appropriate facility for Vermont would cost about \$1,700,000 according to a recent survey. Yet such facilities are vitally needed if the public's educational level is to be raised.

I am proud to say that Vermont's present lone television station has demonstrated the use of this medium for courses in mathematics, science, social studies, and other subjects with great effectiveness for the people of our State.

I hope this bill passes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to acknowledge the kind words from my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. ELIOTT], who handled the rule on this bill; and I would like to compliment our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, on the fine presentation he made on this bill.

The bill H.R. 132 I am happy to sponsor is the result of many years of hearings and studies and intensive investigations.

It has been before the Congress for many years and was first introduced in the other body by Senator Bricker of Ohio, and Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, and reintroduced and enthusiastically supported and sponsored by the late Senator Schoeppel of Kansas. It has twice passed the Senate, with little or no opposition in the form of direct grant legislation and has been considered by the House for several years.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, favorably reported the bill on August 18, 1958, but because Congress adjourned shortly thereafter the House was unable to take action on the bill. During the 86th Congress the Senate again passed an educational television

construction grant bill—S. 12. Our committee held extensive hearings on the Senate-passed bill, and on several bills in Washington, D.C.; Birmingham, Ala.; San Francisco, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Tampa and Miami, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.; Topeka, Kans.; New Orleans, La.; Raleigh, N.C.; and Seattle, Wash.

The bill before the House today is the result of long study and full hearings and many private investigations by Members of this body. I take no pride of authorship in the bill and I have no selfish personal interest in the bill, because my own State of Alabama has done a splendid job and we have one of the finest networks in the United States, with coverage of perhaps more than 85 percent of our population. But I do feel this is a very important activity and that the Congress has a responsibility.

We find today only about 20 percent of these allocations have been utilized. We need to exercise some Federal leadership in order that we may make this very fine educational tool available to our children and to their children. Certain it is in this day when we are trying to close not only the gap in the science of space, we are not only trying to do that, but we are trying to stay ahead of the Communist bloc in every aspect of our being, it seems to me it is inevitable and absolutely tragic if we would deny the full utilization of this most available educational tool.

I believe this bill is a very sensible, conservative approach to the problem. I believe it has every built-in protection this great committee is capable of writing into a piece of legislation to insure there will be no Federal interference and that the State will control at all times the use of this educational medium.

I will not try to convince anyone that educational television is a very useful and highly wonderful instrument, but I would like to recall, or at least tell the committee about a morning in September about 2 years ago. I visited one of the grammar schools in Birmingham, Ala., along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. We visited this school where 9- and 10-year-olds were learning effectively the Spanish language.

I might also tell you that in my State of Alabama, so far as I know there is only one teacher of Russian available in our State. Yet that teacher's ability has spread throughout the more than four or five hundred schools in the State of Alabama to more than 200,000 students. This means these students are getting advantages that were not to be found in many of the more sophisticated schools in the country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] for bringing such an important piece of legislation as this to the floor, and likewise congratulate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has worked long and diligently for this legis-

lation and the Nation can be proud of his efforts.

There are a couple of questions that I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama. It is my understanding that the Kentucky General Assembly recently enacted legislation authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds to assist in financing the construction of educational television stations in Kentucky. As I read H.R. 132, there is no provision which would prevent a State from utilizing the funds derived in this manner for the purpose of matching Federal funds, even though service charges to educational agencies using the facilities would be made and pledged for the retirement of the bonds.

Now, am I correct in assuming that the Federal grants under this program would be available for such purpose?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I know of no prohibition in this bill against using the funds you mentioned as credit, and in my humble opinion, under the reimbursable section of the bill, Kentucky could use these funds as part of its credit for Federal funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, there is one further question. I have contacted the Federal Communications Commission, and I notice reference to it in the hearings, and I have been advised, based on applications, Federal Communications Docket 14396, there is indication that if and when approved by the Federal Communications Commission UHF channel reservations for educational purposes will be made for the following eastern Kentucky communities: Ashland, Ky., channel 59; Hazard, Ky., channel 19; Morehead, Ky., channel 24; Pikeville, Ky., channel 14.

Have these channels been set aside for educational television?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman if that came from the table of allocations by Chairman Minow in his statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. It is my understanding they have; that it would include the list of cities you have read.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to again compliment the distinguished gentleman for sponsoring such a splendid piece of legislation and to congratulate the educational authorities in his home State, to be perhaps the first State of the Union to take advantage of the limited amount of funds made available under the National Defense Education Act for educational television. Of course, that act was sponsored by two distinguished Alabamians, Senator HILL, and a Member of this House, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

I would like to add one or two other things. I go back to the inception of educational television in my State. I think it was due to the farsightedness of one of our Governors, Gov. Gordon Persons, who had a lot of training in communication, and to the commission which he established, particularly to Mr. Raymond Hurlburt, who is the director of our educational television commission. We have a staggered system of appoint-

ment; it is a nonpartisan body, and I think it has worked quite well in our State of Alabama. Especially do I appreciate the splendid work of our educational TV commission in Alabama who have worked so hard to make educational television work for the benefit of all our people—comprising this board are the following: Maynard Layman, president, Decatur, Ala.; Vincent Kilborne, Mobile, Ala.; Mrs. Bertha Roberts, Gadsden, Ala.; Bob Harper, Montgomery, Ala., and Harold Purdy, Birmingham, Ala.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House at this time, H.R. 132, to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, merits my wholehearted support.

Communications are the arteries which bind society together. Radio and TV have, in many instances, proved themselves effective educational tools. Educational television has reached beyond the classroom curriculum, but it has not yet reached far enough beyond. Endless dimensions of opportunity invite imagination and planning for the development of its potential. President Kennedy in his education message of February 21, 1961 said:

Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing to pursue it.

Television can play a tremendous role in increasing the excellence of education and will provide availability to all in a manner that is unequalled by any other medium. This already has been demonstrated at all levels of education, from the primary grades through adult education, and in virtually all subjects in which it has been reasonably tried.

Since 1956, the Chicago Board of Education, through the Chicago City Junior College, has been utilizing broadcast television to bring a unique educational service to the residents of Chicagoland. It has provided college instruction to people living in a radius of 50 miles of Chicago. Although the average semester enrollment is nearly 5,000 students, an additional audience, which averages 5,000 to 35,000, is also viewing each telecourse broadcast.

Of the 5,000 enrollment, the average semester enrollment for credit was 1,261 students, who registered for a total of 2,321 courses, or nearly 2 courses per person. If all of these people were gathered into a conventional college, a campus costing several millions of dollars would be required.

In a 3-year experiment by the Chicago City Junior College, it proved that it was possible to present a complete junior college curriculum on open-circuit television, and with it reach an appreciative and highly motivated student body, many of whom would otherwise be un-

able to go on with their education; and that it is possible in this kind of teaching to maintain classroom levels of instruction and student performance.

In evaluating what can be learned through TV education, a 3-year research was made comparing home TV to classroom study. The results showed no significant difference in English, social science, political science, mathematics, accounting, while more learning from TV resulted in classes of biology, physical science, and humanities.

We, in Chicago, are proud of this accomplishment by the Chicago Board of Education.

But can the same be accomplished in the primary and secondary levels of education? In October of 1959, I was a member of a special subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which conducted an educational TV study in the southeast portion of our country. The committee visited the States of North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida, where special hearings were conducted to determine the value of education using the medium of television.

Many educators, public officials, and civic-minded people, who were directly involved in experiments using television as a means of supplementing their present academic program, appeared at these hearings. The evidence they produced showed that television could increase the learning of boys and girls. They were most enthusiastic in accepting it as a part of their curriculum.

These communities have been able to finance these experiments with private support including that from great foundations, but to broaden the scope it requires large sums in order to make it available to every section of the United States where it is needed and can be useful.

Television will not replace teachers. However, it multiplies the effectiveness of the good teacher by enabling him to reach a great many more pupils, some of whom would otherwise have only mediocre instruction. It tends to equalize the educational opportunities of the children of an area, regardless of size or location of the school.

It can assist the "slower" student in grasping the meaning of a lesson because the camera can magnify small objects, present close-ups of a demonstration, a map or an object of interest, and give everyone "a front row seat." The visual impact at the moment of explanation sharpens the learning process. And with highly organized presentations, more subject matter can be covered in less time.

The States have shown their eagerness to participate in the program we are now considering. There are TV channels set aside for educational purposes. However, there is a grave danger that, unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education.

The legislation we are considering is to assist—through matching grants—

the several States to survey the need to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities; and to assist—through matching grants—in the construction of educational television facilities. It deserves the full support of this Congress. I urge that this bill be passed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has just stated, our subcommittee had the opportunity two years ago to make quite an extensive study of educational television, particularly in watching ETV in operation in many of the high schools and grade schools in the Southern States. There is no question that this medium is a reservoir largely untapped today in the field of education. In almost every area where we conducted these hearings we did, however, find certain opposition to the Federal Government injecting itself into this program. We went into many schools where classes were being conducted via the television screen. In some cases in discussing the matter with the students themselves we found that they enjoyed learning on television more than they did in the usual classroom manner.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding also that statistics show that the final examinations taken by students who took various courses on educational television were equal to those who had personal classroom instruction. I do not think there is any question that we all agree that television today has a tremendous potential as a tool in the field of education; that notwithstanding the fact there are certain problems presented in legislation of this nature. I would hope that perhaps some of these questions could be clarified in the course of our discussion here this afternoon.

For example, I do not know, as a member of the committee, just how the equal time concept, as adopted and which is now written into the regulations of the FCC through legislation, would apply in this field of educational television. There are some other built-in problems in dealing with a subject of this nature that are not just as simple as the wording itself.

Mr. Chairman, I am also frank to make this further observation: In the course of the hearings that we conducted in schools, including the junior colleges and in those areas where in-school television is used as part of the regular teaching curriculum, we found no one representing the major educational association of this country officially testifying for or against this legislation, and I refer, of course, to the National Education Association. Time after time in the hearings that were held about the country I, personally, asked if there were representatives of the local State education association present to testify and to set forth their support or protest of this legislation. In no case did they appear to give such testimony. It, I might say, is quite surprising to me, that the major educational association in the

country has not taken a stand on a bill or on legislation which is of such vital importance to the future of education in America. I hope, however, that the Members of the House, recognizing the great potential of the use of television in improving our school systems will not gather any idea that this is automation of the teaching profession, because it most certainly is not.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Membership of the House support the legislation now pending before us.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a couple of additional questions to the chairman of the committee. Is it likely that we can build anywhere in the United States an educational television broadcasting station for much less than half a million dollars?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to appear in any way as an expert on the cost of broadcasting facilities. I do think that I have enough knowledge of the subject, however, that I may say that the cost of a station generally would depend largely on the extent of the broadcasting facility. In other words, I will say to the gentleman that if someone wanted to have a station, after they got a license, which has low power—a very small station of that kind—and then went out and obtained some used equipment that might be considered obsolete, they could very well construct a station for less than the figure the gentleman mentioned. But generally speaking, if we are going to have adequate facilities and modern facilities such as are required now we feel that anything like a station adequate to serve the public would cost in the neighborhood of half a million dollars.

Mr. KYL. And the cost of operation is considerable, too, is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. KYL. In other words, what the gentleman from Iowa is trying to do at this time, Mr. Chairman, is to bring a note of practicality into this debate. Is it likely, Mr. Chairman, that any institutions other than universities or communities other than large ones would be able to establish these systems at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I will say from the experience we already have that such facilities are operating in a few communities. As an example, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] was here a few moments ago. His hometown of Monroe, La., which would be considered, generally speaking, a rather small municipality, does have very good educational television facilities. The same is true of other places that I could refer the gentleman to; Lowell Institute, WGDH, is a station of that kind in Detroit, and the University of Detroit is a member of a group operating WTVS.

Mr. KYL. But the gentleman would agree that this is simply a beginning in the amount of money necessary; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I would say that.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, maybe I did not fully understand a question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl], the last question he propounded, and perhaps my answer was not correct.

Mr. KYL. I think the response was as you would desire. I did not think we should leave the impression with every community in the country that with the funds in this bill they would now be able to go out and establish a community television system.

Mr. HARRIS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. As a matter of fact that could not be done, because there are only relatively few assignments for this purpose at present. If additional assignments are made, and if and when UHF really gets underway, then I think it would make for a different situation and we would have many more stations and may have an opportunity for a truly national educational network.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because of a peculiar situation which exists insofar as my native State is concerned. When this legislation was presented to the committee because of the success that the State of South Carolina had had in pioneering educational television, I supported the legislation.

Because of the peculiar circumstances and because of our ambitions to do the best job—which we have done—we did not try to utilize the four UHF allocations which the Federal Communications Commission had allocated for educational purposes in South Carolina. We recognized the fact that those particular stations would be unable to cover, if utilized to full capacity, over one-third of the territory of the State of South Carolina. For that reason, among others, we developed a closed circuit television system which is inferior to none. Now on a UHF station you can only present in any given hour one particular program. With the cooperation and assistance of the telephone companies and the ITT, we were able to develop a cable with which we are able to transmit at any one time a number of different programs into the same school over the same cable. So we have a system in which we can transmit from the educational television center in Columbia, S.C., into schools over the system algebra, French, Spanish, and various other subjects all at the same time.

What we are saying here today, unfortunately, and I am going to offer an amendment which I hope will be accepted, is that this is for the purpose of utilizing the UHF stations. That may be one of the purposes, but unless the purpose of this legislation is educational, then we have aborted the intent, and while I would use all the UHF allocations we might have, if you investigate

you will find out, as is the case in my native State, in order to reach everybody you want to reach, you are not going to have enough stations. It would take us more than 40 stations, I believe, to cover the State of South Carolina.

We have another peculiarity, perhaps a blessing. The commercial stations give us time. They give us time, recognizing the fact that commercial stations, particularly the VHF stations, can reach not only into the schools where we are seeking to develop this process of education, but it also reaches the general public who may wish to be advised of the courses. If you will look at page 44 of the hearings, there is an explanation contained there of the advantages of the closed-circuit system for not only the dissemination of different programs, but the advantages of efficiency. Therefore, I am going to offer an amendment, because this has been proven to be so efficient and so beneficial to the States in using this particular program, that they be included. Otherwise, we say to those States which have developed this very efficient system. We recognize the need, perhaps, to develop the UHF allocation but we are going to make education the primary purpose of this legislation and we are not going to neglect the educational purpose which is the real purpose. We have found in our experimentation and in utilization as a practical matter we can develop the ability to learn and the ability to absorb in the students themselves. We have taken the students who have had the benefit of educational television in our State and given them tests and examinations to make sure that this particular form of instruction has superior qualities, and it does have superior qualities.

It is not only taught in the classrooms, it is supplemented by the teacher who is trained for that particular purpose.

We have a Dr. Kalmbach who is in charge of our program, and with the Commissioner of Education, I visited the facilities at Columbia, S.C., and we watched them make some of the program tapes. We watched the instruction carefully. The results of that method of instruction are most encouraging, for not only do the children see a visual application of the principles, but it promotes their ability to use the language they study as it is spoken to them.

So I am going to offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, in order to say to those people who have done such a good job that we recognize that what you need is to extend the effort. We also recognize that if we use a UHF station instead of a closed-circuit television it would cost my State more money, we would have less efficiency and poorer programs and a lesser possibility of getting the job done that we seek to do.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Do I understand the gentleman wants to include closed-circuit facilities?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I propose to include the apparatus used in connection with closed-circuit television. In my opinion the bill would include them all, but I want to make sure and clarify it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Insofar as the closed circuit is concerned they do not have to get a license from the FCC. The Federal Government has no control over their licensing or broadcasting through the use of closed-circuit television.

Mr. HEMPHILL. They do have the same control they have over the UHF stations, but they still would be using communications facilities over which the Federal Government does have control. The gentleman assisted in writing this legislation. I am happy to say. The Federal Government should not have the control—the States should have, and that is in this legislation. The States are in control insofar as programs and curricula are concerned.

I include here an article on the South Carolina effort:

SOUTH CAROLINA POINTS WAY TO MULTI-CHANNEL TRANSMISSION

One of South Carolina's major contributions to the development of ETV has been in the use of closed-circuit distribution for wide geographic areas. Where closed-circuit television has been used in other States, it has been largely within the confines of a single school or college. South Carolina advocates saw at once that the open-circuit station may be forever limited to 1 channel, meaning that there could never be more than 12 half-hour subjects a day, or an average of only 1 subject for each class. Furthermore, only four open-circuit educational stations had been allocated to the State by the FCC, with an effective geographical coverage of only a third of the State.

With these limitations in mind, South Carolina investigated the possibility of closed circuits through existing and planned facilities of the telephone companies. It was known only that closed-circuit TV would allow as many channels with as many subjects as might be desired with excellent reception at every point.

The difficulty was that there were no closed-circuit educational television networks in the Nation, and no telephone company anywhere had cost figures for educational TV. In short, ETV advocates in South Carolina were seeking information that did not exist.

This problem, however, was to become an immediate challenge to Walter G. Edwards, general manager of Southern Bell Telephone Co. in South Carolina, and other top men both in the Bell System and among the independent companies of the State. A force of engineering and cost experts was assigned to a concentrated study, working day and night for many weeks pioneering in rates which had not been explored anywhere else in the world.

State Superintendent of Education Jesse T. Anderson and the late Dr. C. B. Seaborn of the State education department staff cooperated in the preparation of special maps of every county, precisely locating every public school in the State.

The result was that the legislature could be shown that every high school in the State, a total of 413, could be served with 3 channels of broadcasting, offering 36 daily half-hour subjects, at an average cost of \$12.67 per pupil a year. This cost also included the studios and transmission lines for the 3 summer months as well as afternoon and evening hours whenever needed year round for a wide variety of educational services at all levels.

The legislature was so impressed that it appropriated all that was asked for the 1960-61 school year, when the South Carolina system went statewide. The \$643,000 appropriation enabled the system to expand to 31 high schools in 11 counties using 1 channel via closed circuit. More than 60 schools volunteered to receive some of the subjects offered through cooperating commercial stations as a public service.

Thus began the first statewide closed-circuit system anywhere. In 1961-62, the legislature appropriated \$800,000, doubling the number of counties, schools, and subjects offered. No funds other than State or county appropriations have been used in the South Carolina project.

Recently, the South Carolina closed-circuit concept was put to two long range tests. Upon invitation of the South Carolina Education Association, the ETV Center agreed to prepare an exhibit for the annual meeting of the National Education Association in Atlantic City, N.J.

The ETV staff decided to broadcast directly from the ETV Center in Columbia to the headquarters hotel in Atlantic City. It took some doing, but it was done. For 5 days, the closed-circuit system delivered 5 hours a day of programs from Columbia to the South Carolina NEA booth, plus taking over a vacant channel in the hotel's TV system, permitting the South Carolina programs to go into all of the hotel receiving sets in lobbies, meeting rooms, and bedrooms. A special talk-back system permitted viewers in Atlantic City to ask questions during the unique question and answer programs that were held daily. Not once during the 5 days was there the slightest interruption of service, and thousands of educators from every State had the opportunity to view ETV beamed with perfect clarity from South Carolina to New Jersey.

Lately, Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, of South Carolina, accepted an invitation from Govs. Price Daniel, of Texas, and Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, for the South Carolina ETV Center to broadcast directly from Columbia into the hotel meetingroom of the southern Governors' conference in Nashville, Tenn. Again there was a flawless 30-minute broadcast outlining the South Carolina ETV concept for the 18 southern Governors and their staffs.

At this Governors' conference, the receiving sets which had been installed for the South Carolina ETV broadcast also were to be used to tune in on a commercial station to bring to the Governors a speech by President Kennedy before the United Nations. Shortly before the President's address was scheduled to start, the Nashville commercial station suffered a power failure. Governor Ellington consulted with the South Carolina representatives, and within 5 minutes the telephone company had switched the Kennedy speech into the South Carolina ETV system. Thus, it was broadcast.

South Carolina's ETV progress has been substantially helped by forthright expressions of approval from leading educators in the State, including State Superintendent Anderson; President Robert L. Sumwalt, of the University of South Carolina; President Robert C. Edwards, of Clemson College, and others.

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, speaking before an audience of more than 900 educators, legislators, businessmen, and farmers at the 1961 South Carolina Governors' conference on business, industry, education, and agriculture, said, "Across the Nation, South Carolina ranks first in television education."

Visitors to the State have added their accolades. Dr. Eurich has commended the closed circuit, teamwork teaching, direct instructional, and video-taped practices.

Dr. William L. Bowden, of the southern regional education board, which works closely

with the southern Governors' conference, spent 2 days in Columbia studying the South Carolina program.

"You have overwhelmed me," Dr. Bowden said. "A miracle has been performed in South Carolina. My whole concept of the use of television will have to be substantially changed."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, the educational television bill. The bill seeks to give proper launching to a new dimensional educational use that has enormous potential—far more than most of us can possibly realize. We know from past experience here in the Congress that the country has had difficulty in gearing itself to the future needs of education. Our educational processes in the United States should be our first concern, and yet it lags.

There is a shortage of classrooms, teachers are underpaid, insufficient numbers of students go on to higher education, there is too little incentive to go into the teaching profession, and there are demonstrated, severe weaknesses in language, mathematics, and the sciences.

Educational television, to the extent that it has been used in some of the States, has already proved its worth. My own State of New York, for example, is one of the chief pioneers in the field.

One reason that I argue in favor of this measure is that I am persuaded that in the absence of movement in this field, there is grave danger that ultrahigh frequency and very high frequency channels will be lost to commercial television purposes. Commercial pressures that seek to invade these frequencies for commercial purposes are heavy. They will prove irresistible unless these frequencies can be occupied by the States and localities, through educational institutions, for nonprofit educational purposes. This is serious matter, sufficiently serious that, when coupled with the educational needs of the country, it warrants the expenditure by the U.S. Government of upward of \$25 million for matching grants to the States for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

I think it appropriate to point to the pioneering advances made in New York State in the field of educational television under the leadership of Governor Rockefeller. After an extensive period of experiment and research, the New York State Legislature, at the request of Governor Rockefeller, appropriated for educational television in the fiscal year that began April 1, 1961, \$1 million. The New York program includes:

First. Pilot experimental television projects at a cost of approximately \$600,000. The major pilot projects underway are the regents educational television project in New York City, an open broadcast experiment conducted over channel 11, under contract with WPIX, with day programs designed for use in elementary and secondary schools and made available to over 740,000 students last year; the Cortland School District pilot project, a closed-circuit experiment in which the schools of that city and certain out-

lying rural schools are connected by coaxial cable and talk-back features; and two smaller projects being carried out by the State university.

Second. Legislation, enacted at the request of the Governor, providing a system of State grants to local school systems for the installation and operation of educational television through open broadcast or closed-circuit facilities. An appropriation of \$200,000 has been provided in fiscal years 1961-62 for local school system educational television projects approved by the Commissioner of Education. Under this plan, the State will pay 50 percent of the cost of acquisition and installation of equipment and will pay a decreasing proportion of operating expenses over a 5-year period.

Third. New grants for noncommercial educational television councils, chartered by the regents, for the expansion of open broadcast UHF and VHF television. New York State 1961-62 appropriations provide an additional \$200,000 to aid these councils under provisions of the State education law.

Fourth. Newly allocated planning funds for the development of a statewide system of educational television, primarily at the college level. In Governor Rockefeller's special message to the legislature on higher education in 1961, he recommended that the board of regents, in cooperation with public and private institutions of higher education, develop such a plan, and \$50,000 was appropriated for this purpose.

It seems to me that this Federal program should be available to educational television facilities already constructed, such as the WPIX program in New York City. Therefore, I wish to direct a question to the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee in order to determine whether the bill contemplates that funds will be available for completed projects such as the one I have just described. Before asking the question I want to add that I am worried that we in New York will find ourselves in the same box that we were in when the Federal highway bill was passed.

New York had pioneered in this area also, but New York was later prejudiced because the Federal program was not made retroactive. In effect, the State was hurt because it had moved ahead. So I have been curious of the exact meaning of the language in this bill in respect to educational television facilities that have already been built and planning programs that have already been undertaken.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and also any Member who cares to participate for a clarification of the language appearing in section 393, paragraph (e) of the bill. That language, as I read it, provides that in any existing facility the State, or the nonprofit institution operating under the auspices of the State, may be reimbursed to the extent of 25 percent of the cost of that facility, no matter when that facility happened to have been built. Is my think on that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. In answer to the gentleman's question, regardless of when the facilities were built,

they can take advantage of the 25 percent credit feature.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Do I understand also that regardless of when the original facility may have been built, any new additions or improvements that are made will be treated exactly like a new facility insofar as the State's participation in the program is concerned? In other words, should the existing educational TV facility in New York City, under contract with WPIX, be expanded by the addition of new equipment, would the cost of that expansion be reimbursable by the Federal Government up to 50 percent?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. As I understand the provision, it would say that they could be credited for no more than 75 percent of the new facilities.

Mr. LINDSAY. The new facilities or the improvements, whichever you wish to call it, would qualify?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes. But under no situation would the Federal Government contribute more than \$1 million to each State.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand. Over the period of time specified in the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. So that we can have it clear as to what the actual provision is that the gentleman from Alabama explained a moment ago, if you will refer to page 12, paragraph (e) of the bill, it provides in this paragraph what the credit is. I think it should be referred to as a "credit" rather than a "reimbursable" provision. On page 13, line 4 the bill reads:

Except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project.

That is very clear, I take it.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I understand it. The final and last question that I had goes to the question of planning money. Now, the bill provides for the allocation of a fixed sum of planning money to each State. Do I understand that this allocation would be available regardless of amounts already appropriated and/or spent by any State for planning purposes? In other words, if planning projects and programs have been completed by a State, in effect will there be a reimbursement up to \$10,000?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, there would not be any reimbursement. In the second place, it does not contemplate that a total of \$10,000 will be arbitrarily and automatically provided for each State. It provides up to \$10,000

if a State needs that much for a survey, then that amount can be approved. If that amount is not needed but a lesser amount, then that amount would be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two. I would like to direct them either to the distinguished chairman of the committee or to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS.

Earlier, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] made reference to the equal time restriction that applies with respect to broadcasting. Section 398 of the bill, on page 17, reads:

Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any * * * agency * * * of the United States to exercise any * * * control over educational television broadcasting.

I appreciate what the purpose of that language is but, in view of that language I wonder what remains of the equal time requirement and how it would apply to educational television broadcasting?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, section 315 has to do with political broadcasts, as the gentleman knows, and therefore primarily that would not be applicable here unless the particular educational station would determine to permit that facility to be used for such purpose. Now, in that case, if they permit them to use the facilities for such purpose, then they would be committed and obligated to meet the present requirements of law. But, I would like to remind the gentleman that on page 11 of the bill it provides that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes. So, therefore, I cannot conceive of any way that they could permit these facilities to be used for such purpose.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, that particular provision of the bill has reference to the application for a grant which is made by the Commissioner of Education, and at the particular time of making the application, the Commissioner of Education must be satisfied that the station will be used only for educational purposes. Now, let us assume that the Commissioner has been satisfied at that point, and then a station is constructed and goes into operation. After it is in operation, suppose the station is then used for political purposes. I assume that the FCC would not be without any regulatory power, but I want to clear up the matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, if the applicant, just as it is today with all licensees, proposes to use the license for a different purpose and abuses the privilege, then the Federal Communications Commission would appropriately move in.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In other words, section 398 on page 17 referring to "control of educational television" has reference to educational curriculum?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And it does not refer to the character of the broadcasting or the basis upon which the channel was awarded. If an educational station should depart from its purpose and transmit programs which are political in nature, this section would not prevent the FCC from exercising some authority?

Mr. HARRIS. Not at all. The paragraph which the gentleman refers to has to do with the educational programs, where they originate, and how they are given and presented to the public. It has nothing to do at all with the requirement for the licensee to live up to requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the chairman will permit me to go back again to the equal time provision, I wonder if the chairman of the committee could elaborate further as to whether the equal time provision will or will not apply to educational television?

Mr. HARRIS. In my judgment, the licensee would be permitted to have a license for an educational television program on the basis that such broadcasting facility would be used only for that purpose. If the licensee proceeds to use that facility for different purposes than those for which he obtained a license, obviously the Federal Communications Commission would make some inquiry and could, in my judgment, and should, take some action. Now, should that facility go beyond its authority and permit political broadcasts, in my judgment the Federal Communications Commission in carrying out its duty insofar as the issuance of the license is concerned would require equal time and equal treatment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate that explanation by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Now, I would like to call attention at page 16, to the definition of "nonprofit community educational television organization," which, according thereto, means a nonprofit foundation, corporation or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges and universities, and so forth. Could the gentleman say categorically that neither the U.S. Chamber of Commerce nor the AFL-CIO would be qualified for funds under that definition?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I would say that is true because there is another provision in the bill that says it must be such an institution or an organization that was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting. I cannot conceive of a situation where the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO admitted that they were organized for other purposes than most everybody knows.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, following this, so that there will be no misunderstanding about

what is done in these cases, I would like to point to the university in my own community, the University of Illinois, which has a rule, passed by the board of trustees, that once a statement of candidacy is filed for any political office, that person is not eligible to appear on either TV or radio in person. That is substantially the rule as I understand it that universities follow, for the simple reason of staying out of this one particular thing. Prior to that time it is my understanding that any public official, that is, prior to the time he filed a statement of candidacy for an election to come up, may appear on the stage if it is in the nature of education or if it is in the nature of supplying information, which they want to have on such a program. Of course, that appearance, naturally, would not be political.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, in that case it is a self-imposed restriction which the university has taken upon itself.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let us say they did not impose that restriction. Then they would be bound by the rules of the FCC and equal time would apply.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is your understanding that equal time would apply? I think there is some question here, because as I understand the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I do not believe he said equal time would apply. He said there should be no political appearances at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is my understanding of the subject, and I believe I am right, this would apply to what we generally consider to release local communities from Federal control in the education bills which we have passed already.

The language here is quite simple along with other language we have had in educational fields.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to nail this down a little tighter, if we can. The gentleman referred to section 398 which says:

Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize, et cetera.

In other words, this provision is applicable only to provisions in this part. Section 315 is in another part. It covers the entire scope of broadcasting. Therefore I would say categorically that it would be applicable.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that and I thank the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to be as clear as I can about this. I am fearful there might be some wrong interpretation placed on the answer I gave the gentleman a moment ago about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO. My own judgment is that what I said was correct, but I think it is only fair

to the House for me to say that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO under this language might attempt to promote some organization that would become a subsidiary or be in some way attached to it, which might be established for the sole purpose of this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that the Chairman has not helped the situation at all as far as I am concerned, and perhaps points out the need for an amendment to that particular section.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether or not we are going to have educational television. That answer has already been given: we are going to have it. The question is more appropriately presented whether or not we are going to once more inject the Federal Government into an area where the States should be supreme—they are operating and progressing—and the Federal purpose would ultimately be to control.

The State of Ohio has made noteworthy progress in this field. From the Summary of Educational Television in the Separate States, prepared by the Joint Council on Educational Broadcasting, May 2, 1961, the following is taken:

OHIO

SUMMARY

The nine channels reserved for education in Ohio are UHF. Through the untiring efforts of the State's institutions of higher learning, public schools, community groups, and the State legislature, four of these channels have been put into operation—at Columbus (WOSU-TV), Cincinnati (WCET), Oxford (WUMB-TV), and Toledo (WGTE-TV).

An educational television commission appointed by the Governor has embarked upon plans to develop a statewide network; \$60,000 was initially provided by the legislature for this purpose.

Our detailed report describes the wealth of programming which is originated by the operating stations. While the emphasis is upon lessons for inschool audiences and formal courses for adults, the range of informal, informative programming is constantly being broadened and reaches ever-increasing audiences.

Leading educators from Ohio have presented formal testimony in Washington vigorously supporting the proposed ETV legislation.

LEGISLATURE

Year 1953: The legislature instructed the legislative service commission to study educational television.

Year 1955: On recommendation of that study, the legislature enacted a measure permitting boards of education to make contributions to educational television foundations for programs to be shown in schools.

Year 1959: The legislature created an Interim Educational TV Study Commission and appropriated \$60,000 for its use during a 2-year period.

The study commission explored with other State agencies the feasibility of developing a statewide network of interconnected stations.

Year 1961: The study commission submitted its report to the legislature in Febru-

ary 1961. It recommended the creation of a nine-member Educational Television Network Commission composed of the State superintendent of public instruction and representatives from State universities and public schools. The proposed State plan envisioned an eventual 29 station UHF network across the State, with the first phase to be the construction of ETV stations for Akron-Kent, Athens, Bowling Green, Cleveland and Dayton-Zenia. Cost estimates based on an engineering study were included.

In March, bills were introduced to create the ETV Network Commission and appropriate administrative funds, and to authorize the ETV Commission to proceed with the actual establishment of the network as funds are made available.

UNIVERSITIES

ETV station WOSU-TV, Columbus, channel 34, began broadcasting programs on February 20, 1956, and was the second ETV station in Ohio to go on the air. It was established by Ohio State University.

WOSU-TV broadcasts 72 hours a week with a variety of programs for all ages, including NET programs. Inschool programming includes two French series, science for second, sixth, and ninth grades; two college credit courses; and two programs for preschool children.

The programs for elementary and secondary schools are produced in cooperation with the Columbus schools and are used in five counties in central Ohio (40,000 students).

Of special interest in a third college course, mathematics 400, which is received on campuses at Columbus, Newark, Mansfield and Marion. In connection with this telecourse, evaluations are being made as to the effectiveness of supplementing TV instruction by varying amounts and kinds of non-TV instruction.

Evaluation is also underway of several ways of using TV in teaching a course in personal health required of all students at Ohio State University. About 2,000 students are taking the course. TV sections of 320 are followed by small group discussions in the third phase of the project (spring 1961).

The university has several closed circuit TV systems, including one used to teach dentistry and one for classroom observation by teacher trainees and for occasional demonstrations in a number of subjects.

The university is cooperating in the Midwest project on Airborne Instructional Television.

ETV station WMUB-TV, Oxford, channel 14, began broadcasting programs on October 13, 1959. The station is licensed to Miami University, Oxford.

In February 1956, Miami University began to use closed circuit TV to teach three college courses to about 500 students in each course. These courses are now broadcast in late morning hours.

Other morning programs include series for preschool children and news and general interest programming for the home. The station is on the air three evenings a week with general cultural programming, some produced by the university and some provided by NET.

Ohio University, Athens, has a closed circuit TV system and is planning to construct an ETV station. In February 1961, the university petitioned the FCC to reassign channel 20 to Athens and reserve it for education. In April, the FCC issued proposed rule-making looking toward the addition of this channel at Athens.

Other colleges and universities having closed circuit TV systems are the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland; Marietta College, Marietta, the University of Akron, and the University of Dayton.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The ETV activities of the Columbus schools have been mentioned under universities, and the Cincinnati and Dayton school ETV activities are discussed below under community groups.

The Zanesville Board of Education has presented a high school biology program on Saturday mornings on a commercial TV station, which also carries some programs from ETV station WOSU-TV, Columbus.

The Newark, Ohio, public schools are planning to construct an ETV station and petitioned the FCC in October 1960 to reassign channel 28 to Newark and reserve it for education; the FCC has made the channel available for Newark ETV use.

South High School and Linmoor Junior High in Columbus have closed-circuit TV systems. At South High the students raised \$6,000 to begin their closed-circuit system by devoting to that purpose the proceeds from the noon movies shown during the lunch hour.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

ETV station WCET, Cincinnati, channel 48, began broadcasting programs on July 26, 1954. Ohio's first ETV station, it was established by the Greater Cincinnati Television Educational Foundation.

Voting members of the foundation are 38 accredited educational institutions in Ohio and Kentucky, including 7 colleges or universities, 17 county or city boards of education in Ohio and 11 in Kentucky, 2 systems of parochial schools, and the public library of Cincinnati.

WCET is on the air 49 hours a week with NET programs for home and school and locally produced series. In-school programming includes something for every grade from kindergarten through 12th, and two methods courses for teachers. Three years of French are offered for elementary students immediately after school certain days of the week; the teaching methods are carried after school on other days. The high school biology course is four times a week and is repeated at another hour.

Programs for the home are carried from 7 to 10 p.m. The general cultural programming of WCET is attracting an ever-increasing home audience. TV service men report a recent rush of order for converters, one stating that he has sold out and another that he is weeks behind with his installations.

ETV station WGTE-TV, Toledo, channel 30, began broadcasting programs on October 10, 1960, and is Ohio's newest ETV station. The licensee is the Greater Toledo Educational Television Foundation.

The member institutions of the foundation are eight public school systems, the parochial schools of the diocese, the Toledo Museum of Art, the public library, a private school, the Mary Manse College, and the University of Toledo.

The Miami Valley ETV Foundation, in the Dayton area, has produced science programs for grades 6 to 8 on a commercial TV station in Dayton, in cooperation with a local newspaper. The Miami Valley group is currently working toward establishing an ETV station on channel 16, reserved for Dayton.

The Greater Cleveland Television Education Association was incorporated in 1958 as an outcome of the ETV activities of the Adult Education Association and other groups.

The association is working to obtain financial support to construct an ETV station on reserved channel 25. It has secured a rental option on a former broadcasting property, is making an engineering study of available transmitter sites, and has the cooperation of three major school systems.

The Ohio Council on Educational Television is a statewide organization of edu-

cators and interested citizens that has been working toward the expansion of ETV service in the State. The council has voted to support the recommendations of the interim ETV study commission (described under legislature) for a State network of ETV stations.

In the months which have intervened since that report, further progress has been made. A State by State summary of activity indicates no pressing need for Federal trespass into this field.

In reading the hearings on this bill, it is significant to note that the National Education Association apparently avoided speaking out for or against this measure. In fact, no major educational organization has promoted this measure.

It is certainly conceivable that organizations other than academic could qualify under this bill. Under definitions on page 16 of the bill, the following appears:

(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

It certainly is conceivable that the State educational television agency could approve nonprofit organizations other than academic. Without adequate safeguards, the chamber of commerce could qualify as a nonprofit community educational television organization as could the AFL-CIO. COPE now calls itself educational and qualifies as nonprofit.

ETV is already "the fastest growing mass media means of communications"—without Federal financing of ETV stations and facilities.

"If ETV does help solve the educational problem, if it enables the available teachers to give higher quality instruction to more students, then ETV should prove itself in and be able largely to pay its own way," according to Caldwell Buck, staff engineer in the Business Relations Department, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

ETV has opened the door to savings in school budgets. These savings can be used, among other things, to finance costs of ETV directly from present school budgets.

A survey at Penn State of four courses showed that "the cost per student-semester-hour was only \$5.44 for televised instruction, compared with \$9.48 for conventional methods." A study by the Southern Regional Education Board—covering some 300 colleges and universities in 16 States—showed that the cost of televised instruction would run about \$2.80 per student-semester-hour, compared with the present cost of \$12 to \$18 for conventional instruction.

At Hagerstown, Md., 4 teachers now provide music and art lessons that would have required 34 teachers before television. In Dade County, Fla., the use of cafeterias and auditoriums for large TV classes has permitted 30 percent more pupils to use each school building, saving \$3 million in capital construction costs alone.

Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard visited 72 communities throughout the United

States for the fund for the advancement of education and set forth savings he could foresee—"approximately \$500 million in teachers' salaries alone."

Last year at its national convention, members of the National School Boards Association expressed their opposition to Federal financing of ETV by rejecting a resolution that "the organization go on record in favor of Federal support for State surveys of educational television and for the construction of educational television facilities."

No need has been established today, nor was need established in 1959 when the Senate considered S. 12, an ETV bill. Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming expressed his opposition to S. 12 in a letter to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON:

We have no information indicating that a Federal program, such as this bill would provide, is necessary to assure continuing development of educational television, or that there is an inability to finance the acquisition and installation of transmitting equipment.

Because no need is apparent, because other means of financing is available and being used, and because ETV is "the fastest growing mass media means of communication"—without direct Federal aid, I ask your support in rejecting this unnecessary additional burden to an already strained Federal budget.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to clarify a point which my colleague from Illinois made. If a candidate for public office is foreclosed from appearing on an educational television program once he has filed or announced his candidacy, what would be the situation in the case of a staff announcer who decided to run for public office and announced his candidacy? Would he then have to give up his position with the educational television station?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say this, that so far as the University of Illinois is concerned it is my understanding that once a statement of candidacy has been filed, whether the person is an incumbent or not, he may not appear on that station in any capacity.

Mr. COLLIER. I think this is not too farfetched a matter, because one can obviously see that a person who had access to this tremendous exposure through the medium of an educational television station could very easily find it within his heart if he had any political ambitions to become a candidate for public office and through that means, of course, use this tool to enhance his position as a political candidate.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in this particular instance, the rule is that of the university. We do have at least two Members of the House who in the past have been announcers on radio stations, I understand, and I do not know what the rule was when they became candidates.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the gentleman from Illinois has raised a question that is rather pertinent. I think I can be helpful in informing the Members of the House as to section 315. For example, in the last campaign there was an announcer who had been working for a particular broadcasting company for many years, for 18 or 20 years, perhaps, in any event a long period of time. He decided to run for the State senate in his particular State. After he announced his intention and qualified as a candidate, he continued as a news announcer on the regular daily programs. That matter was brought to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission by his opponent.

The Commission held that since he became a candidate, the opposing candidate was entitled to equal time and therefore required the station to make available to him the time that had been consumed by this newscaster who had done his job on a daily basis of news-casting since that time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the equal-time provision really goes beyond the political field. For instance, should one of these stations, like any other station, broadcast on a controversial subject that is not political, they would still have to give equal time. We have a case now, the Newburgh case, which was used as a news program of the NBC and the people of Newburgh have asked for equal time, and my information is that they have that right.

Also, the stations now are beginning to do quite a bit of editorializing and I have raised that point. I find wherever they editorialize on a very controversial subject, they must give equal time to the other side of the controversy.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. Section 315 that we have been referring to does apply to certain instances which the gentleman has brought up, but it does not require equal time. The language with reference to this particular problem that the gentleman raises provides that the stations shall "afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." There is that difference.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is, they shall afford time on the other side. They may not have exactly the same time, but they must afford the opposition time.

Mr. HARRIS. The station must afford a reasonable opportunity.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(Mr. TOLL asked and was given permission to revise and to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 132, the bill which provides for educational television. This bill offers a most important opportunity in the development of educational television in the United States. Practically all of the testimony before the extensive hearings of the congressional committees has favored passage of this legislation. The members of the Joint Council on Educational Broadcasting (JCEB) and the council as a whole have consistently supported the legislation. Support has also come from many national and local leaders representing the interests of government, education, industry, and labor.

President Kennedy said on this subject "since education is a matter of national concern, the Federal Government should assist in expediting the use of television as a tested aid to education in the schools and colleges of the Nation, and as a means of meeting the needs of adult educators."

The bill at least accelerates the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the several States in the development of State programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and by aiding government and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television through Federal matching grants in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. I feel it is a step in the right direction. I want to compliment the members of the committee, and particularly the members of the subcommittee for reporting this legislation, and to thank them for coming to the city and county of Denver more than 3 years ago to inspect the educational television station that has been operated by school district No. 1, in the city and county of Denver.

The experience resulting from the operation by the school district shows the need of educational television. I am hopeful that when this legislation is adopted it can be extended and used not only in the city and county of Denver, but also throughout the State of Colorado. At the present time the school district has established a large facility which is supported by school district No. 1.

I would like to ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee or of the subcommittee about a situation that may develop. Under the grants, Mr. Chairman, directing attention to subsection 392 which provides for a matching grant for service to be made by the State and the Federal Government where educational television is now in existence, is it possible for the State through the operations as outlined in the bill to make an application and receive a grant for a further expansion of that particular educational television facility?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It would.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would permit the State to make proper application and receive grants thereunder.

The other question is this: The school district having established a television station, as we have in the city and county of Denver, upon application by the school district to the Federal Government, is it possible to get reimbursement to school district No. 1 for that portion of construction they have already spent? That is to say we have spent several hundred thousand dollars in the construction of this station and we may want to expand it. Can we now make application and get, say, 25 percent of that back as provided in section 393 (e)?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As I said earlier in the afternoon it would be a credit; it would not be reimbursable, but on any expansion it could receive a credit.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the only opportunity a station now in existence has to obtain any money under this provision would be by an expansion of its facilities.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we of the City of Pittsburgh know how valuable educational television can be.

The first community supported educational television station in the United States is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here in Congress.

On April 1, 1954, WQED, channel 13, began telecasting as the world's first community sponsored educational television station.

Today, WQED, with VHF channel 13, and UHF channel 16 has an audience of over 1 million viewers in 10 western Pennsylvania counties.

At the end of the first semester of this school year, there were 2,715 public school and private school classrooms viewing basic school courses, such as fifth and sixth grade science, seventh, and eighth grade developmental reading, physical sciences, world cultures, physics, French and Spanish. In supplemental course participation there were 5,491 classrooms watching such subjects as current events, dance, music, Pennsylvania history, science and speech improvement. WQED's enrollment for instruction extends now to more than 8,000 classrooms in 103 school districts, reaching 250,000 schoolchildren.

This development of educational television did not come about overnight.

Many years of development work by the Pittsburgh Council of Parents and Teachers, charitable foundations, civic groups and commercial broadcasting companies, other business groups and then Mayor of Pittsburgh David L. Lawrence were required before WQED went on the air in 1954.

In the fall of 1955, WQED began "a world's first"—basic instructions through television for elementary school children. Fifth grade reading, arithmetic and French were taught in the 16 participating schools which included 20 classrooms. In 1956, television teaching expanded to high school physics and fifth grade history-geography. The number of participating schools increased to 34 with 39 regularly enrolled classrooms.

WQED inaugurated the "Adults School of the Air" to enable adults to earn their high school diplomas. During the first year, a total of 834 students enrolled in the courses. In the first graduating class were 11 prisoners in the Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary and the Allegheny County Workhouse.

For several years, WQED has conducted a "Summer School for the Air" which has served the community by offering makeup courses for academic failures at the high school level.

The allocation of a second channel—channel 16—UHF—made Pittsburgh one of the few cities in the United States with two educational television channels. This special purpose channel is used for instructional and professional as well as management and industrial training. Channel 16, which began broadcasting in March 1959 has brought a new concept of training to business, industry and labor. This may become one of our greatest assets in the job of retraining industrial workers in this time of rapid technological changes.

A few highlights from the WQED program schedule this year will suffice to show the cultural contributions that educational television can make to a community. WQED in January broadcast an art series from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts entitled "Invitation to Art," a 15-week series of Shakespearean plays titled "An Age of Kings," which depicts more than 100 years of British history; "Intertel," "Prospects of Mankind" with Eleanor Roosevelt; "Jazz Scene"; a homeviewer question-and-answer program, "Call Your Doctor"; "Open End" with David Susskind; "Play of the Week"; Boston Symphony Orchestra series; "Heritage" series, as well as informative series on law, music, travel, and roundtable controversies.

The school services division of WQED brings to the classroom the best of skills in teaching and the best of current practices in curriculum combined with the impact of the television techniques.

The philosophy of the school services division is to augment the effectiveness of classroom teaching by the advantages of television teaching. The television lesson is only part of every classroom teaching situation. The television teacher is responsible for extending, enriching, and bringing adequate visual aid to the lesson, plus the basic instruction in basic courses. The classroom

teacher is responsible for continuing the teaching and meeting the individual needs of the class.

We have found that parents have followed the education of their children by watching their children's classes at home; students out of school because of illness have been able to continue their regular classes on television. Finally, for the classroom teacher, television instruction offers the opportunity to watch a colleague develop and teach a basic course and is, therefore, an excellent source of in-service education.

Of the 64 hours of television programming Monday through Friday at WQED, 36 of these hours are devoted to instructional programming for classroom use. Highlights for the present semester—1962-63—are: students who participated in beginning Spanish can continue in intermediate Spanish; world cultures is telecast three times weekly in the morning and afternoon for easier classroom scheduling; another three-credit college course, literature for today, is presented for inservice teacher training; two new elementary courses are offered: Primary concepts in science and primary concepts in mathematics.

Concerts for young people, planned for appreciation and understanding of the Pittsburgh Youth Symphony concerts are part of the school services programs of "Music for Young People."

Mr. Chairman, through the operation of WQED, we in Pittsburgh have found educational television to be an invaluable adjunct to education. We have made high caliber teaching skills available to many more students than would otherwise have been possible. We have been able to offer such courses as Spanish to students who would otherwise be unable to learn the language. In short, Mr. Chairman, WQED has broadened and strengthened our educational program at a time when the importance of education cannot be overstated.

But this is just the beginning. From a lone pioneer in educational television, WQED has now joined a family of 62 national educational stations. These stations should now join in a fourth national television network so as to be able to show a single program simultaneously in the major cities of the United States. The savings in money and the increase in talent which we have demonstrated in Pittsburgh could be multiplied 62 times. It will cost money to achieve these savings and these improvements in our education.

Under H.R. 132 the Federal Government will share in bringing this new dimension in education to our children. Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H.R. 132.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, legislation that would create a Federal-State cooperative matching fund program to encourage educational television. This bill will launch our country generally upon the path of bringing into our educational system the great advantage and opportunity afforded by the television medium. My interest in the development of educational television extends back to 1949 when as a New York State senator I sponsored the first legislation for sup-

port of State educational television in New York State. New York State has been a leader in the field of educational television. In New York City we have the National Educational Television and Radio Center and through its efforts the Metropolitan New York area has obtained channel 13 which will provide full-scale educational television service for our great metropolitan area. Our New York experience, however, highlights the need for Federal and State assistance to communities in the establishment of educational television. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that television has the capability to expand a massive upgrading in the quality of American education for a cost which we can easily afford, a cost in fact which we cannot afford not to pay. This bill will achieve that objective.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has on innumerable occasions raised its voice in behalf of freedom and has gone on record in condemning all regimes which deny freedom to their subject peoples. Specifically this House has censured in no uncertain terms the Soviet Union's oppressive policy in East European countries by resolving to summon the American people to observe the Captive Nations Week annually until the liberation of these nations from Communist tyranny imposed upon them by the Soviet Union. In this connection I would like to lend my wholehearted support to House Resolution 211.

This resolution, so eloquently sponsored by my honorable colleague from Pennsylvania and so widely supported by various anti-Communist organizations throughout the country, calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, consisting of 10 Members of this House for the purpose of undertaking "a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war." I can conceive no better way of informing ourselves of the actual conditions prevailing in these countries, and then devising ways of aiding these peoples in their relentless struggle for freedom. I respectfully urge the adoption of House Resolution 211.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 132, a bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

The pending legislation would assist the States, through a program of Federal matching grants, in surveying the need and developing programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as well as in constructing such facilities. H.R. 132 would authorize Federal grants, not to exceed \$520,000 for the next 3 fiscal years, for the development of State surveys and programs for constructing educational television broadcasting facilities; and an additional grant, not to exceed \$25 million for the next 4 fiscal years, for the construction of these facilities. The total amount for construction

of facilities within any one State would be limited to \$1 million.

Similar legislation, providing Federal assistance for educational television, has been before the Congress for several years. Let me attempt to point out the urgent need for final action on this measure.

In 1952 the Federal Communications Commission set aside television channels for the exclusive use of educational television broadcasting—to date over 270 have been reserved for noncommercial educational stations. There are at present, however, only 62 educational television stations on the air. Although the Commission has expressed its desire to cooperate with programs which assist the development of educational television, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes is great. Unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, these reserved channels may be lost to education.

One of the major problems in the development of educational television lies not in the lack of interest, desire and planning among our States, local communities or educators. The distinguished chairman on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. HARRIS, sent letters to the Governors of all the States last year to determine whether the States were ready to join with the Federal Government in a cooperative program of promoting construction of educational television facilities. The response was overwhelmingly in favor of a cooperative Federal-State program in the field of educational television. The drawback, however, lies in the lack of funds available.

In his statement before the subcommittee holding hearings on educational TV last year, William G. Harley, president of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, reported that 45 States had actively participated in and supported the development of educational television; and 25 States had formed State educational television commissions by direction of their respective legislatures. Interest is widespread; then, in this new educational medium. Mr. Harley pointed out, however, that despite this fine record of progress "further development is now largely dependent on Federal assistance, and in many instances a prolonged delay would seriously retard program development and cooperative school utilization." In my own State of New York planning and activity since 1952 have resulted in an ETV station at Buffalo, three additional stations in the formative stage, and several large closed-circuit operations and production centers. New York and several other States, however, have now reached a critical point in their ETV development and without some assistance no effective progress can be made.

This Congress cannot neglect to consider favorably H.R. 132 which would serve to ease major problems in our education crisis.

Existing ETV programs give strong evidence of the advantages in the use of television as an effective tool in the edu-

cational process. Not only can it ease the teacher shortage, but it also extends the influence of superior teachers far beyond the reach of their own classrooms. Fifth graders in Pittsburgh, for example, heard and saw Robert Frost read some of his poems not long ago. Highly skilled teachers of mathematics, chemistry, and foreign languages are available to a wider range of students than is possible in the conventional classroom. And students are offered front row seats for involved science experiments and demonstrations which many schools do not offer and cannot afford.

The opportunities which educational television offer to the rural or less populous areas of our Nation cannot be overlooked. An expanded program of ETV would bring to these students the benefits of a diversified curriculum which in many cases is now economically impossible.

How does the student benefit from ETV? Studies have shown that the student accepts more responsibility for his own learning than is the case with conventional methods of instruction. In a report of the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education it was revealed that students in television classes at the elementary and secondary level make more extensive use of the school library than students in regular classes. Television instruction also allows the student to progress at his own individual rate. This is of paramount significance in our efforts to fully develop the potentials of our young people. John Burns, president of RCA, stated the case aptly before the Senate committee last year:

With television, language laboratories, and other electronic aids, each student can move ahead at a tempo best suited to his own development. The fast learner in a particular subject can be exposed to televised lectures that challenge him to his full capacity. The average learner can be encouraged to develop the particular gifts he possesses. The slow learner can be assured of the kind of attention that will prevent his falling hopelessly behind.

Television then can help bring to every student higher quality education.

But what will be the cost of an expanded ETV program. We are currently spending more than \$300 per public school pupil. With increasing school enrollments and present instructional methods that figure will continue to rise. An expanded ETV program, however, can reduce the overall cost. A survey of four courses at Penn State showed that the cost per student-semester-hour was \$9.48 for conventional methods, and \$5.44 for televised instruction. And the Southern Regional Education Board in a survey of some 300 colleges and universities in 16 States reported that the present per student-semester-hour cost was \$12 to \$18 for conventional instruction and estimated at \$2.80 for televised instruction. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power showed that savings in capital outlay for classrooms had amounted to \$3 million in Miami and potential savings over the next 5 years at an estimated \$12 million.

With these facts before the Congress, it seems imperative that we no longer delay in assisting the States in providing better educational broadcasting facilities.

President Kennedy in his education message last year said:

Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

Television, described as the most important new educational tool since the invention of movable type, offers great possibilities in increasing the excellence of our education and in broadening and enriching the learning process of American students. I urge passage of H.R. 132.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.

I have long been interested in the basic principles incorporated in this bill which have today been accepted by and large for the planning and use of television in education. In the first session of this Congress, I introduced H.R. 5536, a bill which is similar to H.R. 132. The purpose of these bills is to speed up the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities by aiding governmental and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television with Federal matching grants.

One hundred years ago, America's educational goals found expression in the Morrill Act which established the land-grant colleges throughout the United States. The fundamental significance of the Morrill Act was that for the first time our colleges were brought to the people. Teaching and research were not limited to the confines of campuses. The Morrill Act was described in the report of a National Manpower Council as "the most important single Government step in the training of scientific and professional personnel."

While significant strides have been made since 1862 in all levels of our educational systems, one problem in U.S. education is paramount. As of this moment, there are more students to be educated than we are prepared to handle effectively by current techniques of teaching and administration. It is clear that our standards of education must be raised and greatly improved. Both the procedures and the facilities of education must be reevaluated in the light of current and future demands. Almost 50 million persons are receiving some type of schooling in the United States today. Public elementary and secondary schools alone are carrying a load of more than 36 million enrolled pupils. An additional 6 million youngsters are in independent and church-related schools. By 1965, it is estimated that public school enrollment will top 41 million while the national population grows to more than 190 million. Hence, the pressure of sheer numbers will get greater in the years ahead.

One of the constants of our changing world is the passage of time—the moving hour hand of the clock. Student enrollments, teacher shortages, facilities are the inconstants, the invariables, as are the interrelationships of these three elements—teacher-student ratios, group sizes and the spaces for school learning and living activities.

Aside from the curricular requirements in the years ahead, it is necessary that thought be given to the redeployment of our students and teaching skills so that more effective advantages can be gained. Extension of the skills of our teachers to move students, greater use of existing and planned school buildings, enrichment of curricular offerings all demand increased use of audiovisual aids.

Of the audiovisual aids currently available, television appears to offer the greatest potential in the broadest areas. It has been said that for education, television is one of the most significant technological developments since the invention of printing. Although still in its infancy, television already has made a significant impact upon the collective mind of our society. While there is evidence that television has experienced erosion from a stream of mediocrity and abuse in commercial use, this in no way, however, impugns the potential value of television used properly and intelligently as an educational tool.

Television has no magic—it is not a self-contained educational entity; rather, it is simply another medium of communication, like a book or a human voice. Communication commences with intelligible transmission and ends with intelligent reception. Any medium of communication is but a middle link between two or more minds. The medium may be the gesture of a hand, sound waves from a human larynx, ink impressions from movable type arranged on the pages of a book, radio waves transmitted and gathered into a receiver, or electronic emanations and receptions involving television equipment.

Television does not modify the recognized goals of education; nor does it replace the classroom, even as the advent of the printed book did not mean the elimination of the teacher. Rather, it suggests alternative and possibly better techniques for reaching the same goals. Alert educators have always experimented with and learned to use new teaching methods and devices. There are numerous examples of existing practices which aim to increase reading speed and comprehension, to provide easier comprehension of the basic principles of mathematics and science, and to develop techniques for expanding our ability to communicate multilingually.

The past decade has seen the first serious experiments with the use of television as a "middle link" in our educational communication between teacher and student. After a few scattered starts in schools and colleges across the United States in 1953, the television experiments began to spread until, at the beginning of the 1960's, almost 600 school districts across the Nation are now making regular use of televised instruction; 117 col-

leges and universities are offering credit for television courses; 144 closed circuit television systems are operating in educational institutions and another 21 for the military, and 45 educational television—noncommercial—stations are in operation.

There is broad support in Delaware for educational television. This support stems from the interest and efforts of the Delaware Educational Television Association, Inc., which represents about 50 major organizations throughout the State of Delaware. These groups include the Delaware State Education Association, the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington, the American Association of University Women, the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers, and other organizations including an advisory council representing business and industry. Leading educators and churchmen in Delaware have recognized that television is a versatile, dynamic medium and that its use in education can provide new and better ways of relating the activities of pupils, teachers, and parents and making the community more aware of educational processes and needs. They are hopeful that this legislation will be adopted. Typical of this community interest is reflected in a letter I received recently from the Reverend Philip H. Dunning, director, Department of Christian Education, Council of Churches, Wilmington and New Castle County, Del.

Reverend Dunning writes:

May I call to your attention, and I am sure you are already familiar with, the bill which has been introduced in the House to provide \$51 million in Federal grants to States to help set up television stations for school broadcasts.

We would appreciate it very much if you could continue to lend your strong support to any measure which will help aid the cause of educational TV in our State, as well as throughout the country.

Many thanks to you for your help in the past and for your continued help in the future. There are many of us in Delaware who are sincerely and wholeheartedly hoping for the day when WHYY will be able to broadcast on channel 12.

In the capacity as president of the Delaware Educational Television Association, Inc., Reverend Dunning addressed, under date of February 15, 1962, a letter to each member of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives urging favorable action as to H.R. 132.

The text of Reverend Dunning's letter follows:

We are writing to you in the interest of action on H.R. 132.

The Delaware Educational Television Association has studied the various bills before the Congress relating to this medium and are convinced that H.R. 132 is of immediate import. We also liked the bill introduced by our Delaware Representative, Mr. HARRIS McDOWELL (H.R. 5536) but understand that he accedes to Mr. ROBERTS' bill. We feel that H.R. 132 establishes an orderly procedure for careful utilization of the funds.

We agree with the committee report as submitted by Mr. MOULDER. He certainly speaks of us when he says that the scarcity of educational stations on the air is an indication not of a lack of interest but rather a lack of funds. We especially agree with this report that, "There is grave danger that

unless the process of getting educational stations on the air is speeded up * * * these channels * * * will be irretrievably lost to education."

The passage of H.R. 132 will not only help education to meet a serious crisis; it will help a discerning minority group to see cultural and educational programs at a time that is convenient to them.

We respectfully request that the Rules Committee report H.R. 132 out for action as soon as possible.

On March 6, 1962, I received the following telegram from Mrs. Bert F. Norling, president of the Delaware division of the American Association of University Women:

The Delaware division of the American Association of University Women reaffirms its support of educational television by urging passage of bill H.R. 132. We appreciate your active interest in making available to all children and adults the broad educational and cultural opportunities presented through educational television.

This telegram also had the endorsement of Mrs. Kenneth C. Bass, Jr., chairman of the legislative program committee and Mrs. Alfred C. Haven, Jr., chairman of the mass media committee of the Delaware division of the American Association of University Women.

In his inaugural message, Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, of the State of Delaware, on January 17, 1961, said:

During recent years, Delaware has not had the advantage of a television station located within the borders of the State providing programs of local interest. There has been much discussion about channel 12. Over 5 years ago this band was assigned to a Delaware based station which sponsored numerous programs of local interest. This helped to bring the people of our State closer together.

Unfortunately, the three major networks have TV stations near Philadelphia and apparently all believe it unprofitable to operate a duplicate facility in nearby Delaware. This does give us an opportunity to cooperate with our neighbors to the north and utilize channel 12 as an educational TV station. Such a station will provide outstanding education programs, which will be most helpful to our educational system; cultural programs for the benefit of all the people of the State; and features of State and local interest which will keep our citizens better informed about local and State industry, organizations and government. In addition, we will have the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with our local and State leaders.

Present knowledge and experience in using television as an educational medium indicates that television can become a basic educational tool for every educator, every pupil and every serious-minded adult in the United States. Wisely used, it can be as important in promoting learning as is the printed word. Educational television and the printed word are not mutually exclusive—they are complementary. I am confident that television can help bring about the best teaching of more pupils in an effective manner and at a reasonable cost. If television can alleviate school population pressures, make our best teachers available to more learners, save dollars in conventional school plant costs, make the process of learning more effective and satisfying, and provide a

wider range of experiences than hitherto possible—and I have good reason to believe that when wisely used it will do all these things—then certainly it is incumbent upon all educators to move as rapidly as possible in their own planning and through their local boards of control and State legislatures to secure the benefits of this dynamic medium of communication. Certainly, the House must help make this possible by enacting H.R. 132.

The impact of television on Americans and foreign correspondents and observers—young and old alike, was clearly demonstrated by the recent orbital flight in space by Lt. Col. John Glenn. To the millions of Americans who followed the preparations, the successful launching, the orbital flight, and the recovery of Colonel Glenn and space capsule *Friendship 7*, the medium of television was able to provide both visual and audio observations of a significant achievement—an achievement which drew on the mature talents of our scientists and technicians. On February 20, 1962, and in previous suborbital flights by U.S. astronauts, many Americans were provided the unique opportunity to acquaint themselves with and to learn about the complexities of space exploration, rocket propulsion, and other important facets of our modern technology.

While the transmission of educational courses such as mathematics or foreign languages may not be as spectacular as our efforts in space exploration, the ability to communicate through TV at the educational level can create and promote the human talent and skills that are essential to the United States in sustaining and enlarging its position of leadership among nations.

It cannot be denied that all levels of government will have to make heavy expenditures and our citizens will have to make greater sacrifices to meet the educational challenges in the years ahead. But I feel inclined to believe these expenditures are more of an investment—an investment in our children and adults who are, in the long run, America's most valuable resources. Such an investment will not lead to fiscal bankruptcy but the danger in failing to make such an investment can lead to a more serious disaster for our country.

In appreciation of the values of television as an educational medium and as an important intermediate link in the total act of educational communication, I fully support the objectives and programs which H.R. 132 seeks to establish, and I intend to vote for the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I hope and believe the great majority of the Members here, if not all, will promptly approve this measure—H.R. 132—before us, which provides for the establishment of a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

It clearly appears, from the testimony revealed, that some 200 of the Nation's television channels reserved for educational use have not been activated pri-

marily because of a lack of funds for construction of television transmission facilities.

At this time, particularly, when education in this country faces serious challenges, when the need is imperative for additional physical facilities and teachers for proper instruction of the increasing numbers of students, when subjects must be taught which only relatively few instructors are qualified and prepared to teach adequately, it seems unthinkable that this great promising medium of instruction through television should not be fully utilized as a modern and progressive teaching instrument.

We have, further, the authoritative convictions of the most highly regarded experts in this field that instruction by educational television promises to be greatly superior to conventional methods of classroom teaching in a number of subjects, particularly in science studies involving technical demonstrations for better understanding.

This bill is modeled after the Hill-Burton Act which has proven so successful in stimulating, with the aid of Federal matching grants, the construction of hospital facilities throughout the country.

This projection of instruction through television is completely in line with the recommendations of the President on this subject and there can be no doubt whatsoever that the expanded educational and cultural development objectives inherent in this legislative proposal would be in the national interest. I most earnestly urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with today's consideration of H.R. 132 by this House, to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, I should like to include in the RECORD an important survey of transmission and use of so-called ETV that was sponsored by the ETV stations comprising the Florida Educational Television Network.

There are five such stations in Florida, located as follows: Channel 2—WTHS—in Miami, owned and operated by the Dade County Board of Public Instruction; channel 3—WEDU—in Tampa—St. Petersburg, with studios in both cities, owned and operated by Florida West Coast Educational Television, Inc., a nonprofit civic and educational corporation on whose board of directors are representatives of seven county school systems; channel 5—WUFT—in Gainesville, owned and operated by the State board of control and the University of Florida; channel 7—WJCT—in Jacksonville, owned and operated by Educational Television, Inc., a nonprofit civic and educational corporation, and the Duval County School Board; and channel 11—WFSU-TV—in Tallahassee, owned jointly by the State board of control, the Florida Educational Television Commission, and Florida State University, which operates it.

Channel 2 began operating in August 1955, and the others have been in operation for periods ranging from nearly 3 years to nearly 4 years. The general

consensus of opinion is that all five have met with a good deal of success.

During the past year, a total of 5,702 classrooms—including 326 large ones—in 880 schools have been the recipients of ETV instruction. Involved have been 286,221 students, and this coverage has averaged 90.5 hours weekly. Of the 90.5 hours, roughly one-quarter has been allocated each to elementary, junior high school, senior high school, and college buildings.

The 23-hour telecast for elementary school students predominantly covered courses in social studies, Spanish, science and American history. The 19.5 hours telecast for junior high school students concentrated primarily on science and mathematics. Senior high school student coverage was mainly in English and biology, while the nearly 25 hours allocated for college students was split up among a variety of subjects, with particular emphasis on humanities, mathematics biology, English and the like.

All the above courses were offered for credit purposes. In addition several hours covering noncredit courses were available, mostly in the adult-education field and covering such diverse subjects as sewing languages, shorthand, typing, writing and the like. The estimated viewing audience in this noncredit field was 71,500 which, when added to the 286,221 viewers in courses for credit, means that 357,721 Floridians are gaining an education through the medium of television.

The really important thing about ETV, aside from its obvious value in purely instructional procedures, is its importance as a substitute for additional classroom outlays and needs. During the years since World War II, and even before, the taxpayers have been faced with an unrelenting and immediate need for additional classroom space. And, seemingly, as the need increases, so does the cost.

As an illustration, the experience of Dade County, Florida's largest, is of interest. Dade, which includes Miami, has resorted to an extended schoolday which, when incorporated with educational TV, provides the opportunity to telecast a variety of instruction to "staggered scheduled" classes at the height of the schoolday. More refined, it involves concentrating the instruction of certain classes in certain buildings on certain subjects at given hours.

For instance, under the extended schoolday or "staggered attendance" setup, seniors and ninth-graders are due at school at a certain time, with juniors and eighth-graders due at another time, and so forth, and with the same classes leaving the buildings at varying hours. Thus, when up to 600 students in junior high schools, for instance, are receiving telecast instruction in the auditoriums, the several senior high classroom teachers in teaching auditoriums in other schools can be reviewing previous lessons, making assignments, answering questions and preparing for the new lesson.

According to the assistant superintendent of public instruction for Dade

County, "the 600 students we have assigned to the auditorium for television instruction opens up additional rooms for the 600 students enrolled beyond normal capacity."

This official, Mr. Wesley Matthews, has said that the extended day has sharply cut the amount of building necessary at the senior high and junior high level and has permitted more building at the elementary level, where large class instruction is less predominant. He has estimated that it costs \$900 per student for construction.

He has also stated that when the capacity of a school is increased by 600 students by extending the day and through the use of TV lessons, "we have eliminated the need for 20 additional rooms at that school and have side-tracked a \$540,000 addition to the school."

This same official estimates that the extended day and educational television have held back more than \$10 million in building needs in the county.

Mr. Chairman, if further argument in behalf of the need for an expanded ETV program is needed, I can cite some excerpts from a Reader's Digest article entitled "They Go to School at Dawn," appearing in the January 1960 issue. The article points out that the combined audience for Dr. Harvey White's physics course and a course in modern chemistry by Dr. John Baxter, of the University of Florida, had, at that time, climbed over the million mark. Together, according to the article, Drs. White and Baxter had provided instruction that would otherwise have required 1,333 science professors in as many classrooms. Dr. Baxter also found that he can cover in 30 minutes on TV what would take 50 minutes in a classroom. The ability of the camera to produce extreme closeups and the absence of classroom noise, he contends, are additional reasons why ETV has a definite place in our educational system.

With the above arguments in behalf of ETV, coupled with the many letters in favor of ETV that Florida stations have received from enthusiastic viewers, Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that ETV opens up a complete new educational vista, and I hope that a program of expanding and supporting the present system can be effected.

This must be done, however, without Federal control over such broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction or personnel, and the bill, H.R. 132, is drafted to leave such control to State and local authorities and even as to grants for specific instruction the decisions are left to the State agencies. This is an incentive program as proposed and limited to 3 years.

I shall oppose any effort to inject any degree of control over ETV by the Federal Government, and serve notice to that effect.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. As a former television news commentator, I know the important job that television can perform in the broad field of education. In view of the obvious need we now face across the Nation for expanded and improved educational facilities, it is im-

perative that the educational potentialities of television be utilized to the full.

The people of my home city of Schenectady, N.Y., and of the surrounding capital district, have had a chance to become familiar with the value of educational television because of efforts that have been made there over the past several years by the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television, in association with the General Electric television station WRGB in Schenectady.

Back in 1953, when television was still in its adolescence, the management of WRGB agreed to set aside time for educational television programming, a novel suggestion at the time. In fact they even proposed the establishment of the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television to take over the responsibility for operating this vital public service. This council was created, and with the help of WRGB, and WTEN-TV a regular series of educational programs have been carried on in our area. Now a new educational television has been licensed, WMHT, and a drive is under way for funds to put it into operation.

Many other areas in New York State, as well as in other parts of the country, are not even as well situated as we are. In New York the needs of educational television have been badly overlooked by the State authorities. In fact only the other day the State administration reduced funds for educational television to less than one third of the amount originally proposed as essential to the development and expansion of educational television in our State.

At the present time there are 23 regular television stations in New York, covering every major city and serving the entire geographical area of the State. However, only 7 television channels have been set aside for educational purposes to serve the 17 million people of our State, with many major areas not being covered at all.

Of course the greatest need in making educational television a reality is money. In view of the failure in New York State to meet its full obligations in this regard, we must turn now to the Federal Government for help.

This of course is precisely what this legislation will do. It will fill the gap that now exists. It will begin to tap the vast resources of television for educational benefit. Here is one effective and immediate way in which we in this body can act to improve our Nation's educational standards.

I urge the adoption of this bill, so that station WMHT in Schenectady, and other educational television stations around the country, can continue to do the educational job that desperately needs to be done.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I cast my vote today in opposition to H.R. 132 as amended. This bill, as it came to the floor, was a worthwhile measure and I thoroughly supported its system of matching Federal grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. In the original version, under section 393, construction grants were available to public agencies in the elementary and secondary school category, to a State

TV agency, to public colleges and under paragraph (a) subparagraph (1)(D) to nonprofit community educational television organizations which could include private colleges and universities as well as other community groups which might be organized on a nonprofit basis to contribute to the excellence of television programming. The effect of the amendment which struck section D and substituted therefor language limiting participation of this program to public agencies only is discriminatory and unfair. Its effect is to deny participation in this very important field of educational television to well-qualified educators who are in a position to make a most valuable contribution in many fields of learning. For example, among others, great universities located in my district, such as, Long Island and St. Johns Universities, St. Francis and St. Joseph Colleges would be barred from the program by this amendment. It does not make sense to initiate a broad system of educational benefits to the public at the same time narrowing its base by cutting off and silencing institutions of higher learning merely because they are supported by other than public funds. It is my hope in the House-Senate conference the original language in the bill will be restored and I will have an opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the conference report.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION REFRESHING AND ENLIGHTENING

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

The purpose of the legislation is to speed up the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the States in the development of State programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and by aiding governmental and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television through Federal matching grants in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this legislation is an absolute necessity if we are going to explore to the maximum the educational opportunities presented by this media of communication. The Federal Government should, and with considerable justification, give financial support to foster this very worthwhile use of television.

As the report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce states, the Federal Communications Commission has set aside for educational television broadcasting 273 television channels—92 VHF and 181 UHF—out of a total of 2,227 television channels—676 VHF and 1551 UHF—as of July 29, 1961. During the 9-year period since 1952, when the first of these reservations were made, only 57 educational television stations—41 VHF and 16 UHF—went actually on the air while the Commission authorized 77 educational television stations—47 VHF and 30 UHF—to begin operations.

EDUCATIONAL TV HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN NEW ENGLAND; EXPANSION NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, one of the first non-commercial educational television broadcasting stations in the country, and in 1958 the only one operating along the east coast, was WGBH-TV, channel 2, in Boston, operated by the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council. Jack Gould, the distinguished television critic for the New York Times, wrote on January 5, 1957, that Boston's channel 2 presents low-cost brain waves and that WGBH-TV gets the top minds for its telecasts. Unfortunately, WGBH-TV's studio was destroyed by fire last October. Let me read to you from Mr. Gould's article in the New York Times of January 13, 1957, concerning educational television:

But it is equally apparent that Madison Avenue has scratched only one side of the medium; educational TV, despite its forbidding title, is one of the most hopeful remedies yet seen for what ails the electronic colossus. The lesson of WGBH-TV is that after a while a viewer can be entertained to death; there does come a time when it is refreshing to have the mind titillated with regularity and purpose.

A drive for funds is now underway to rebuild the WGBH-TV studio and the Ford Foundation has offered up to \$500,000, on a matching funds basis, for a new home for this wonderful New England educational television outlet.

Other areas of the United States have not been as fortunate as we in New England with WGBH-TV. And there is grave danger that unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education. I urge my colleagues to help prevent this by voting passage of this bill today.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse this measure to authorize aid for educational television. In an age in which increasingly difficult scientific and technical skills are required to assure national growth, educational television offers a way to multiply our teaching resources through better utilization of skills. Experimental educational programs underway at Huntsville, Ala., for instance, in teaching Army men the intricacies of space and rocket guidance equipment, or at Fort Monmouth, N.J., where radar and communications maintenance personnel are taught, offer some idea of ways in which this television tool can be used.

Connecticut is moving to use this field as rapidly as possible, with channel 24 in Hartford as its operating base. An arrangement has been made for this educational channel to use the television towers of VHF channel 3 cooperatively, and will result in school, college, cultural, and educational programing being afforded to the Hartford area. The Connecticut Educational Television Corp. is a nonprofit organization formed to fulfill the responsibility of operating the State's three assigned educational television channels. It has vigorously sought financial aid from private individuals, business and industry, and other

sources. The size of the task makes it imperative that all possible help be forthcoming to make this vital national program successful.

Direction and control of the Connecticut Educational Television Corp. are vested in a board of trustees representing the sponsors of educational programs, the participants, private associations and corporations, and other contributors. This is a broadly based State program and deserves full support.

I want to commend the committee for its study of this subject and its report and urge passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FACILITIES GRANTS

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 390. The purpose of this part is—
 "(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television facilities.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 391. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums not to exceed \$52,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390.

"GRANTS FOR SURVEYS

"Sec. 392. (a) To be approved, an application for funds for carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 390—

"(1) must be made by a duly constituted State educational television agency;

"(2) must provide for the making of a survey and the development of a program by such State educational television agency in accordance with paragraph (1) of section 390; and

"(3) must provide assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that any grant made by the Federal Government under this section will be matched with an equal amount by the State.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any application for funds which complies with subsection (a).

"(c) The total amount of the grant made to any State for the carrying out of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall not exceed \$10,000.

"STATE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"Sec. 393. Grants under this part for the construction of educational television facilities in a State shall be made only if the State educational television agency has submitted to the Secretary a State plan embodying a program for such construction. Such State plan shall be so submitted within three years of the date of enactment of this part.

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"Sec. 394. (a) For each proposed project for the construction of educational television facilities there shall be submitted to the

State educational television agency, for transmission to the Secretary, an application for a grant, and such application shall contain such information with respect to such project as the Secretary shall by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Secretary—

"(1) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain the educational television facilities will be available,

"(2) that the operation of such educational television facilities will be under the control of (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) a duly constituted State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from public revenues, or (D) a nonprofit community educational television organization, and

"(3) that such television facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) Upon receipt of such application the State educational television agency shall determine whether such project is in accordance with the State plan as originally submitted or as modified, and, if it makes such determination, shall transmit such application to the Secretary.

"(c) Whenever a State educational television agency receives applications for construction grants in an aggregate amount exceeding the amount of Federal funds available for the making of such grants in such State, the agency shall indicate the priority given by it to each of the several applications and the amount recommended by it in the case of each application.

"(d) Upon his determination that any application for a grant for a project for the construction of educational television facilities meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may make a grant to the applicant of an amount not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Secretary, of any educational television facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this part with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project.

"(e) The total amount of grants made to applicants from any one State for the carrying out of paragraph (2) of section 390 shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(f) No grant shall be made under this part for any project for the construction of educational television facilities in any State after the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the date of submission of a State plan under section 393.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term 'construction of educational television facilities' means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting (including closed circuit television) and does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term 'duly constituted State educational television agency' means (a) a board or commission established by State

law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, or (b) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (c) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public education or higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term 'Governor' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'nonprofit community educational television organization' means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is representative of elementary schools, colleges, universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations located in the area to be served by educational television facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"PROVISIONS OF ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSION

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Secretary.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"Sec. 397. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part.

"NO CONTROL OVER TELEVISION BROADCASTING

"Sec. 398. Nothing in this part shall be deemed to give the Secretary any control over television broadcasting."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"Declaration of purpose

"Sec. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and to develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

"Grants for surveys

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the pur-

poses of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the Legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for and utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction

"Sec. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit community educational television organization;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such

case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a) (2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a) (1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit

and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions"

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term "construction", as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission"

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations"

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited"

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the chairman of the committee. I would like to find out if under the provisions of this bill the investment which has already been made in my State of Wisconsin will qualify for reimbursement under this bill. I am proud of the progress being made in Wisconsin. We have not waited for Federal aid. Under this bill every dollar our State receives will cost Wisconsin taxpayers \$1.36.

Mr. HARRIS. As I have indicated earlier this afternoon, under the provisions of (e), page 12, there will be no reimbursement as such to the station, but on any expansion necessary it may obtain a credit up to 75 percent of the total expansion cost.

Mr. LAIRD. Only on future expansions will they receive any credit under this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for his helpful explanation. Wisconsin certainly comes out on the short end under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question with respect to the language on page 11, and see if we can obtain a better definition, under the provision for applicants, of what constitutes a nonprofit community educational television organization.

What specifically is a "nonprofit community educational television organization?" Can the gentleman tell us?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will turn to page 16 under section 395, "Definitions," he will find a definition of nonprofit community educational television organizations.

I could give an example, if the gentleman would permit.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. The Greater Washington Educational Television Association is an example of this definition.

Mr. GROSS. I take it that on page 16 you were referring to the language from line 6 through line 13; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That paragraph reads:

The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

Now, this says "cultural institutions and organizations." That is not very well defined, it does not seem to me, "and organizations,"—that could be almost any nonprofit organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I thought the gentleman was asking me a question, and that is the reason I was hesitating; I was not sure. I used as an example right here in Washington the Greater Washington Educational Television Association operating UHF channel 26. Now, as a part of that organization there is the Folger Shakesperian Institute, the Corcoran Art Gallery, which is also a part of this. Museums may become interested and join in such an organization. That is the kind of thing we have in mind.

Mr. GROSS. That is what you have in mind. You do not have, for instance, a labor or a farm organization in mind, do you?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly we do not have, and as I stated earlier in the day, conceivably a subsidiary of a labor organization or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce could organize a subsidiary or set up some organization solely for the purpose of educational television and probably come within the provisions of this bill. However, I cannot imagine and simply could not conceive of the Federal Communications Commission approving a license for a subsidiary of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO, as was mentioned here, or some such organization, and I do not believe that there would be any possibility at all for such to happen with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman refer to the chamber of commerce, because I was going to ask him if that organization could qualify as well as a labor organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Those two examples were brought up earlier this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry I was not here. Unfortunately, I had to be off the House floor at that time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the word "organizations" has to be read in the light of the preceding words, because it says "schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions." They must qualify under one of those definitions either as an institution or an organization. I think the qualifying words are the preceding words.

Mr. GROSS. With all due respect, I will have to disagree with the gentleman. When one reads this language referring to schools, colleges, universities, educational and scientific, civic and cultural institutions and organizations, I reemphasize "and organizations," I doubt there is the proper limitation.

Mr. YOUNGER. That includes all of them. I think those are the qualifying words.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL to the committee amendment: On page 15, line 10 after "broadcasting," insert the fol-

lowing: "including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I spoke of a while ago which allows a closed circuit in connection with broadcasting to participate in this program under the same rules and regulations as outlined in the other parts of the bill. I remember the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] asked me a question about whether or not the FCC would still have some authority. I may have misunderstood the gentleman's question. They would still have authority over any broadcasting, as I understand it, from either a UHF or VHF station. I wanted to clarify that.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. How does the closed circuit operate?

Mr. HEMPHILL. If a closed circuit, either UHF or VHF, used a station to get the program into the closed circuit or into the schools in any way which is contemplated, it would still be under the FCC to that extent.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, they would have only the transmitting license. There would be no other license insofar as the closed circuit is concerned?

Mr. HEMPHILL. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order that the record may be made clear on this bill. I do want it understood as to what the situation is, and the reason why I am agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when we had this particular problem before the committee an amendment was offered to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of connecting any two facilities. In other words, providing for a cable or relay system or microwave, and so forth. Now, the reason for that amendment was that there were some who were interested in preventing any private ownership of interconnecting facilities. The telephone companies and so forth wanted to have their facilities utilized on a lease basis. The committee considered all of the potentials with reference to the amendment and decided—and I think wisely so—against such a prohibition.

Now, in doing so it was felt that relays and interconnecting systems could be utilized in order that a system of education may be developed within a State. As an example, North Carolina has a pretty good system set up in part of the State, but it does want connections, as I recall the record, with other facilities in other parts of the State.

Now, the committee felt that this legislation should permit that kind of a situation to develop.

Then, the question arose as to the use of the closed circuit educational facilities.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said earlier in the afternoon, to operate a closed circuit broadcasting system, you do not have to get a license from the Federal

Communications Commission. You use leased or privately owned facilities. You do not use the spectrum.

We tried to deal with this subject, and on page 27 of the report you will find the term "broadcasting."

The term "broadcasting," which is used in the definition of "construction" and elsewhere in the committee substitute, is defined in section 3(n) of the Communications Act of 1934 to mean the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received by the public, directly or by the intermediary of relay stations.

That is the language to carry out the intent I described concerning interconnection. Then we provide this language in the report:

Thus, under the committee substitute, grants for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities could not be used to acquire or install transmission apparatus intended for use or to be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs.

What we meant there was transmission apparatus intended exclusively for use in closed circuit television programs. In other words, this is a broadcasting bill for broadcasting facilities—which use the spectrum. Closed circuit television does not use the spectrum. What we intended here was that these funds could not be used for facilities that would be used exclusively for closed circuits. It has got to be for broadcasting facilities. In view of the history made here it becomes necessary to clear up this language and to adopt the language offered by the gentleman from South Carolina which means that you cannot use this fund for the purpose of facilities that will be closed circuit television exclusively. It must be for broadcasting. But it does not prohibit these facilities from being used in connection with closed circuit operations. I want to make that explanation because I think it is important.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I take this time to make sure that what the chairman means is only the closed circuit which is used in connection with a television transmitter; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Where you have a facility set up under the provisions of this bill for broadcasting purposes and the institution finds it feasible to use some of these facilities in connection with their closed circuit television operations, it would be permitted.

Mr. YOUNGER. But the closed circuit must be used in connection with a licensed broadcasting station?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 11, line 9 after (D) strike out the words "a nonprofit community educational television organization" and insert in lieu thereof the

following: "a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for several reasons. Earlier those who were on the floor heard me ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whether under the definition of a "nonprofit community educational television organization" the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO would be qualified to receive matching funds under the bill to construct a television facility.

At first the chairman indicated that the answer to that question was definitely and categorically, no. But a few minutes later, he said he believed he should qualify his answer and indicated that, perhaps, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO could qualify if either should organize some sort of a subsidiary organization for educational purposes. Now I am not concerned only about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, but I am concerned and wonder what is meant by the language "a nonprofit community educational television organization." The definition on page 16 says it means an "association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges and universities,"—and that is all right so far—but it goes on "and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural organizations." What is a civic organization within the meaning of this bill? A very limited amount of money will be made available by this bill. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] said earlier, a limited number of stations can be constructed with the total funds. Why do we not limit the application of the bill, then, to educational institutions at the elementary, secondary or college level—and we know there is not enough money in this bill to go even that far. But let us limit the bill at that point.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow a combination of college, university, elementary or secondary educational agencies to go together and form a nonprofit association to qualify for funds under the bill. While the amendment would permit a combination of agencies to qualify, still they must be educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill would be better legislation and I, for one, could give it more enthusiastic support if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most mischievous amendment although I am quite confident it is not the purpose of the gentleman to wreak the havoc he would in some areas should this amendment prevail. I can give you two very concrete examples of the types of organizations which would be precluded from any operation of a television station under the terms of the proposed amendment.

In my home city of Sacramento, we have had for about 5 years an educational television station on the air, and

about 90 miles to the south and west in San Francisco an educational television station has been on the air for more than 10 years. These stations are operated by nonprofit organizations broadly representative of educational, civic, and cultural groups in the community—yes, and broadly representative of all of the diverse interests of a community. These stations have been operating entirely on voluntary contributions. They have had a most difficult time. I doubt it would be possible in these two communities to continue to sustain the operation of these stations without the broadly based nonprofit type of support now available.

Mr. Chairman, as to the fears of the gentleman that some particular self-seeking group might gain control, I point out first that those controlling the educational television facilities must be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. They must submit to the test of an applicant for one of the reserved educational television channels. At the time they apply, if they do not, in fact, speak for the community they seek to serve, that community is going to voice its opposition to the allocation of that channel to the applicant. There can be a comparative test of differing applicants for one of these stations just as there can be for the applicants for commercial television channels. I think we should undertake here to encourage the voluntary association in communities of those who are interested in building better educational facilities and who are willing to give unselfishly of their time and of their resources to support them. We have such stations in operation. There has been no indication in any instance of any one segment of the community attempting to become dominant. The boards of directors are balanced and they render a most worthwhile service to the communities they represent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be very pleased to yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. First of all I think we can agree that any group now organized and operating an educational television station will not be limited in their operations or affected by this bill in any way. We are only talking about what organizations or groups will in the future receive a subsidy of Federal taxpayers' funds for the construction of television facilities.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman has stated something I do not agree with, that those now in existence are not covered under this bill. I think it is contemplated that if present educational channels are to undertake the proper equipping of their facilities, they can qualify on a matching basis for the benefits of this legislation, and I do not want them to be denied that opportunity. They have shown more resourcefulness than that displayed in most of the communities of the Nation in making the progress they have made to date, and I do not want a penalty worked against them because they were resourceful and willing to stand on their own two feet and undertake a pioneering experiment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. MOSS. Certainly I yield further.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to make it clear that the question here is not whether the FCC will grant a license or assign a channel to a particular organization or group, because, as the gentleman has pointed out, the FCC grants licenses and assigns channels apart from this legislation. But as a matter of policy we might wish to limit the use of Federal funds to subsidize the construction of facilities. In view of the earlier colloquy with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], apparently it is not beyond the realm of possibility, although it might be unlikely, that funds could be allocated under this bill to help construct educational television facilities for a labor organization or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point, for he is making a statement about something with which I cannot agree. I do not think we are in any danger under the criteria established for the utilization of reserved educational television channels that the FCC would grant these channels to persons or groups we would not regard as being perfectly proper in every sense to receive the benefits of this legislation. On the contrary, I think it is clearly contemplated here that having met that test those groups will be qualified to receive the benefits. The criteria imposed here are very little different from the basic criteria the Communications Commission would utilize in attempting to determine whether it was in truth or in fact an educational effort and whether the service contemplated for the community would be undertaken.

I do not think the gentleman's amendment would do anything but discourage sincere and interested persons from joining together in a community effort to solve their own problems and to meet their own needs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If you have a truly educational broadcasting setup in Sacramento or the area adjacent thereto, why would they not be able to qualify under the other provisions of the bill? Why would the elimination of subparagraph (d) disqualify them from further broadcasting?

Mr. MOSS. I think you are going here to the type of security in control or ownership of a station; and if you exclude the type of organization which we have in my community, you would exclude my community, and I do not want it excluded, particularly in view of the pioneering effort it has undertaken. I am very proud of the work my home community has done in the educational television field.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to consider another section of this bill, and that is the definition of what "State educational television agency" means. That is definition No. 4. I think we are dealing with a lot of unnecessary fears here because I cannot conceive that either the FCC or the State agency the way it is to be organized would grant a license or make a grant of funds to such an organization as the gentleman fears might get one. I just cannot conceive that that will be done. I am very familiar with the station that operates in San Francisco, WQED. That station is a reserved educational station, channel 9, a VH station. It serves the community. It has educational, cultural, and art features about it. It is paid for by public subscription. It serves a very useful purpose in the city and in the community. It could not qualify under (A), (B), and (C), nor the definitions on page 11, if you strike out the definition (D).

Therefore I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and the amendment to the amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am taking time to call the committee's attention to the language on page 15 defining the term "State" to include the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This is certainly proper and right as far as it goes. The children of the District and of the Commonwealth should have the same educational advantages offered by television as other American children residing in the States of the Union. I regret, however, that the bill closes the door on American children in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone. It may be that facilities in those areas are not available at the present time, but I trust that if they are available and Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone desire to participate in the program subsequent legislation will make that possible. Let us not forget that Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone are part of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

"Grants for surveys"

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for and utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction"

"Sec. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for

a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a)(2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadcast educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a)(1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records"

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions"

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term "construction", as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission"

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations"

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited"

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum,

program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 132) was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: MESSRS. HARRIS, ROBERTS of Alabama, MOULDER, MOSS, SPRINGER, YOUNGER, and SCHENCK.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 6, 1962, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

PROGRAM PRACTICES OF TELEVISION NETWORKS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this month the Federal Communications Commission ended an investigation, spanning 3 years, into program practices of television networks. The compiled testimony covers about 12,000 pages.

Among the elements in the investigation are the displays of violence, program ratings, the role of affiliated stations in selecting programs, and regulation of the industry by the Federal Government.

Several months from now, the FCC will forward its findings to the Congress with possible recommendations for leg-

islation affecting both stations and networks. I am hopeful that the quality of programs, both public service and entertainment, will be improved. Many of us have watched with great expectations the arrival of Chairman Newton N. Minow to the FCC. He has succeeded, with all the frustrations, self-imposed and acquired, of the agency in provoking needed discussion among Americans about the state of both radio and television.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hour is not too late; the situation need not have become what it is.

I think it instructive to delve into the fledgling years of broadcasting when radio had not quite grown out of toyhood into a social force. Interestingly, at about the same time, indeed almost in the same year, two men, one an American, the other a Briton, recognized the problem that arose with the general dissemination, as opposed to point-to-point transmission, of messages by wireless.

The Briton was Lord Reith, father of the British Broadcasting Corp.—BBC. He foresaw that "the temptation to exploit large numbers of people has grown as it has become abundantly clear that effective technical means lie at the disposal of would-be exploiters and that the profits of exploitation are huge." He saw radio—TV was then a laboratory infant—as Promethean fire that needed fire lanes.

The American was Herbert Hoover. Now, Mr. Speaker, I concede that I do not have frequent occasion to quote the former President. But I found it most interesting in this research to learn Mr. Hoover's views on the responsibility both of the Federal Government and of the private broadcaster. And I must say—to borrow a political term and with no disrespect due Mr. Hoover—that he stands somewhat to the "left" of both the prevailing view in radio and television circles and, unfortunately, the regulatory Federal Communications Commission itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, eccentric as it may sound today, Mr. Hoover represented views of the many public-spirited citizens when he subscribed to a theory built upon an assumption that unrestrained commercial motivation pollutes the public air.

Remember that the Radio Broadcasting Act of 1927, a basic statute, was framed during the administration of Calvin Coolidge who once made the doleful statement that the chief business of Government is business.

And President Coolidge's Secretary of Commerce was Herbert Hoover. And what was Mr. Hoover's philosophy? It was this: That the Federal Government is entitled to compel an applicant for a broadcasting license "to prove there is something more than naked commercial selfishness in his purposes."

Testifying at a hearing on the 1927 legislation, Mr. Hoover told members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

It is inconceivable that the American people will allow the newborn system of communication to fall exclusively into the power of any individual group or combination.

Radio communication is not to be considered as merely a business carried on for private gain, for private advertisement or for entertainment of the curious. It is a public concern impressed with the public trust and to be considered primarily from the standpoint of public interest to the same extent and upon the basis of the same general principles as our other public utilities.

Mr. Hoover at one point withdrew his support for the lengthy regulatory bill and suggested a short bill that vested control in the Secretary of Commerce. The preamble to this short bill stated:

That it is hereby declared and reaffirmed that the ether within the limits of the United States, its territories and possessions, is the inalienable possession of the people.

His proposed draft was not accepted. And in a prophetic warning, Mr. Hoover said:

It has been found possible by indirect advertising to turn broadcasting to highly profitable use. If this were misused we would be confronted with the fact that service more advantageous to the listeners would be crowded out for advertising purposes.

The 1927 act I referred to a moment ago specified that although a radio station may be operated as a commercial venture, the license holder's commercial privilege must be "subordinated to his paramount obligation for the community and must be incidental to his trusteeship."

And the following year the Federal Radio Commission stated:

While it is true that broadcasting stations in this country are for the most part supported or partially supported by advertisers, broadcasting stations are not given these great privileges by the U.S. Government for the primary benefit of advertisers. Such benefit as is derived by advertisers must be incidental and entirely secondary to the interest of the public. Where a station is used for broadcasting of a considerable amount of what is called direct advertising, the advertising is usually offensive to the listening public. It should be incidental to some real service rendered to the public, and not the main object of a program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, note this philosophy and then judge how far astray we have come when we listen to the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System in 1960. He stated at an FCC hearing that a program "in which a large part of the audience is interested is, by that very fact, a program in the public interest." Not to be outdone, another network chieftain, Robert Sarnoff, president of the National Broadcasting Co., declared during his appearance:

Permit me to clarify one point. A network is not under any legal compulsion to meet FCC requirements for a balanced program.

Now the speciousness of the first statement and the arrogance of the second pronouncement unfortunately are ingredients in the cake of custom that has been baked since Mr. Hoover and others tried unsuccessfully to set a guide for broadcasting.

In a recent article in the American Scholar, it was pointed out that the two basic statutes in this field, the acts of 1927 and 1934, provide, in effect, not that advertising agencies and sponsors and networks should be good but indeed that