

In effect the letter states that something must be done along that line. They suggest that all this might be worked into a broad Federal aid to education bill. They also suggest that it could be added to an extension of the National Defense Education Act. If necessary that may be acceptable to the Senator from Kansas and me. We are glad if it can be worked out in that way. However, we want to get it going now, not five years from now.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator does not expect—I know he does not, and I say this only to have it clear on the record—to have these programs operated separately, but that they are to be coordinated as a unit program, with the Federal Government helping education. The Senator certainly does not expect the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to operate the three programs in different receptacles, one unrelated to another.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I certainly hope that will not be done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of January 12, 1961, for a report on S. 205, a bill "To expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs."

This bill would authorize the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner of Education during a 5-year period to make grants to State education agencies, nonprofit organizations, State educational television commissions, and State-controlled colleges and universities, for acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus for educational television facilities. The aggregate of such grants could not exceed \$1 million in any State.

S. 205 is identical to S. 12, 86th Congress, which passed the Senate on April 13, 1959.

The purpose of the instant bill—to expedite the development of the educational uses of television—is one which this Department endorses. There is no necessity in this report to again review the progress in the development of educational television broadcasting. We recognize that, heartening as this progress has been, much more needs to be accomplished in order to take advantage of the enormous potential of television for the improvement and extension of educational opportunities in all parts of the country. We also recognize that a major obstacle to the accomplishment of this objective is the high initial cost of equipment and the shortage of funds for meeting such costs. Nevertheless, the Department feels that there needs to be additional consideration of the entire problem in order to determine the most effective methods of providing Federal assistance for this purpose.

As you know, President Kennedy has recommended legislation to provide additional Federal assistance in meeting the urgent needs of public elementary and secondary schools and of higher education. We believe that the enactment of this legislation should have priority in terms of new Federal programs in the field of education. Mean-

while, our Department will give thorough consideration to additional proposals of obvious merit, such as that embodied in the instant bill. In our judgment, a number of important matters need additional consideration with respect to accomplishing the objectives sought in S. 205.

First, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters is undertaking to design an allocation plan for a nationwide system of educational television for submission to the Federal Communications Commission for the Commission's consideration. It is expected that this plan will be completed shortly and we would like to have the benefit of this effort and the findings of the Commission on it in order to coordinate the recommendations of this Department with that work. Second, we believe that further attention should be given to the role of the State in formulating a plan for statewide development of educational television, and to the role of possible regional arrangements between States. For reasons of efficiency, economy, and effectiveness, we believe that the planning and activating of educational television installations at least should follow a State pattern, and may need to be regional in character. Third, we feel that more attention needs to be given to securing effective commitments for operating funds once an installation is completed. And, finally, the Department would like to consider the Federal role in encouraging educational television in the broader context of measures designed to bring about more effective use of modern educational media and within the framework of more comprehensive Federal action to improve the quality of education.

This administration, under the leadership of President Kennedy, is deeply and forcefully committed to Federal action to help improve the quality of American education to the end of strengthening the whole fabric of our society. The Administration's proposed Educational Assistance Act of 1961 provides for stimulating and facilitating new programs to meet special education problems. Such programs might include the use of new media such as television. In addition, the President has stated in his message to the Congress of February 20, 1961, that he will ask the Congress to amend and extend provisions of the National Defense Education Act. A portion of that act is designed to foster research and experimentation and to disseminate information in the development and evaluation of television and other educational media. This Department, which has the principal responsibility for carrying out the vital administration commitments in the field of education, will carefully consider an appropriate course of action to provide adequately for the development and stimulation of various types of modern educational media including educational television. For the reasons set forth, however, we are unable to recommend favorable consideration of the instant bill.

Accordingly, we recommend against enactment of S. 205.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the debate which has been had on the pending measure today. I am supporting it. It was a little over 2 years ago that I spoke on the floor in support of S. 12, in the 86th Congress, which was a bill almost identical to the educational TV bill now before us. I regret that S. 12 failed of passage in the House, as did S. 2119 in the 85th Congress.

I believe that 3 important years have been lost in putting into effect a program

which is very vital to the American people and to my State of Kansas. The Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, has touched on this point.

The people of my State have been much interested in this subject. I said 2 years ago:

The great tragedy in lost educational opportunity lies in the impossibility of retrieval.

The hours and years doled out to each of us can be spent but once. If by inaction or inadequate plan, we give too thin a fare to those for whose learning we hold responsibility, we fail in a way that we cannot make up, for what is lost is learning time.

Of course, everything has not been lost by the delay, and I would not suggest that it has.

For example, my own State of Kansas has used the time profitably to work on a plan for a statewide educational television network.

You will find in the hearing on this bill a letter from Kansas State Senator Laurin W. Jones delineating the proposal for Kansas. In brief, these are its main points:

Six maximum power, high antennae transmitters would be erected, one each at Topeka, Hutchinson, Lincoln, Grainfield, Garden City, and Chanute.

With the exception of the one at Chanute, all would broadcast on VHF.

It is planned that major program production centers would be established at Wichita, Lawrence, and Manhattan. Minor program centers would be built at Emporia, Hays, Kansas City, Pittsburg, and Topeka.

The location of the transmitters would be such that 92 percent of the Kansas population could receive a good signal, and all of the transmitters would be linked together by microwave relay.

Any of the program centers could feed the entire network, or it could be broken into regional segments.

Much of the support for the Kansas plan has come from a Citizens Committee for Educational Television organized nearly 8 years ago.

The committee includes representatives of the various State and private colleges and universities, municipal universities, junior colleges, public school systems, and such existing organizations as the Kansas Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Kansas Medical Society, the American Association of University Women, the Kansas Council for Children and Youth, and major farm organizations. I mention this to show the interest which has developed in this important program.

In Kansas, as elsewhere, educational television is looked to as an attainable means of enriching and extending the school curriculum.

A great many of our smaller schools have found it impossible to develop a comprehensive curriculum.

Some of the subject areas found to be inadequately served throughout Kansas are these: Science, particularly chemistry and physics; elementary foreign languages; elementary science; social studies; modern foreign languages in secondary schools; English and English literature; mathematics and biology.

The testimony before our committee, both in the hearings on S. 205 and its

predecessor bills, makes abundantly clear that courses of this sort can be taught effectively through educational television. There is even a saving in money because of the joint use of materials and facilities.

I had the opportunity in my own State to observe what the Department of Defense did in cooperation with universities and other educational institutions in training men in the Military Establishment on technical subjects. The reception was marvelous, and the end results were excellent.

It is also felt that educational television would be most useful, not only in Kansas, but also in other States, particularly in the rural areas, in improving teaching training.

Additional benefits would flow through the availability of teaching to children who, for reasons of health, cannot leave their homes, and through courses for out-of-school youth and for adults.

The Kansas plan which I have here outlined is now pending in the Kansas Legislature.

It is being considered carefully because the program, once embarked upon, would take an annual capital appropriation of a million dollars for several years. I feel certain the people of my State would take the necessary financial interest in the program.

As against a Kansas outlay of about \$7 million to get the network into operation, the Federal Government, under the terms of the bill before us, with certain specific requirements and in accordance with safeguards established by the Bureau of the Budget, would contribute \$1 million, but it would come at a most helpful time and do much to get the Kansas network underway.

We who have been working on the bill in committee have had our minds particularly attuned to problems in educational TV.

For that reason, I noted with special attention the articles in the Washington newspapers which reported that the Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia is not at present willing to introduce educational TV into the District schools. I am sure many Senators read the same articles.

I urge them not to conclude that the Superintendent of the District Schools disapproves of educational TV as a teaching medium. As I understand, his position is simply that there are other things more important to do in the Washington schools at this time.

An example of what he has in mind is the experimental curriculum at Amidon school, which many of us have been happy to note returns in a large part to the fundamentals of the three R's which served so well in our own time.

Again, it must be recognized that the District of Columbia school system is a large one and rich in teaching resources that are not available in many of the schools in our home States.

It seems abundantly clear that postponement of introduction of educational TV into the District schools should not be taken as an argument against educational TV itself, especially when the program advanced by the Greater Washington Educational TV Association

is being so eagerly embraced by school systems outside of the District proper.

A belated report on the bill submitted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recommends against enactment of the proposed legislation.

I may say, in furtherance of the statement made by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that the chairman of the committee gave the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare an ample, fair, and timely opportunity to report his views on the bill. A reading of the record of the hearings will disclose that at the late date it was made public, the Secretary did not represent that his statement related to a 100 percent investigation. The Department simply wishes to proceed in some other way. In fairness, I think an evaluation ought to be placed upon the Secretary's letter in that light, because I would hesitate to believe that a man of the character and ability which I know the Secretary to have would say "No" to this kind of program. That is not the case. To think otherwise would be unfair to the Secretary of that great Department.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare similarly recommended against S. 2119 of the 85th Congress and S. 12 of the 86th Congress, so I say frankly and kindly there is no surprise in finding that the political changes which took place at the top have not disturbed subterranean convictions within the Department.

I must note, however, that in addition to the old reasons for opposing educational TV, some new ones are advanced.

The old reasons basically were that more experience and more studies are needed before anyone can say that S. 205 is the best way in which the Federal Government can help expand educational TV.

It seems to me, however, that the language of Secretary Ribicoff's report on the bill conceals possibly a fear that if the Congress acts on an educational TV bill it would feel that it has done enough for education and so bypass the President's aid to education bill. I do not believe that would be the case. In my humble judgment, it is merely something which we should get under way, and it would be complementary in a practical way to what is now being done.

I for one—and I think other Senators will say the same—am ready to consider each of these bills on its own merits.

I can well understand why there might be apprehension about the impact on the budget of the total of \$51 million that would be authorized by the bill.

However, not all of the authorized sum would be spent at one time, as has been brought out in the discussion and arguments presented by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in his colloquy with the chairman of the committee.

There are many obstacles in the way that would make the actual spending a fairly long drawn-out process, even though applications for grants must be filed within 5 years after the effective date of the legislation.

The various types of applicants, as has been brought out earlier, and as I wish to state again, must first perfect their local plans and decisions and also satisfy the requirements to be enforced by the Commissioner of Education.

Then there will be additional delays in many instances in obtaining construction permits from the Federal Communications Commission for a reserved educational TV channel.

I hesitate to say when the greatest impact of the bill would be felt, but it will always be within the control of the appropriation process, as was indicated by the chairman of the committee this afternoon.

We have passed a similar bill twice before. The reasons for doing so are still valid.

We should pass it again and then do all possible to enlist the support of our colleagues across the Capitol.

I am glad to be one of the cosponsors of this measure and to support it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the action of the Senate on the bill, but I have been seeking recognition as one of the members of the committee and one of the sponsors of the bill.

I wish to make some brief remarks, and then I shall request the printing in the RECORD of a statement I have prepared on the bill.

Mr. President, I was a sponsor and a supporter of similar bills which were considered in previous Congresses. At that time I had a direct interest in those bills, because my own State was earnestly seeking means to avail itself of the channel reserved for educational television.

I am proud to say that during the period of delay which has occurred since the consideration of those bills, New Hampshire has, with its own resources and the resources of its citizens, established the facilities, and is now utilizing this channel.

The passage of this bill at this time can only indirectly and in small measure benefit my State. But my interest in the bill, as one which is of vital necessity to the future of education in our country, is still very real. Despite the fact that the motive of self-gain for my own State has been somewhat lessened, nonetheless I hope very earnestly that the bill will be passed, for reasons which have been thoroughly covered by previous speakers and for reasons which I touch on briefly in the statement I have prepared. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COTTON
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

There is no question that educational television can do for our schools what the power loom did for the weaver. It offers new opportunities for better teaching at a saving in both teachers and buildings. But much of this potential is going to waste today despite our urgent needs in education.

Twelve percent of the Nation's television channels have been reserved for noncommercial, educational use for the past 7 years.

Only 54 of these 268 channels are now on the air, serving millions of people with a variety of education, information, and entertainment.

The bad side of the coin is that nearly 200 of these reserved channels are going begging. They have no takers. Two-thirds of the people of the Nation have no chance to see an educational TV station.

Not only is their potential being wasted, it is in danger of being lost because of the steady and increasing pressure to free these channels for regular commercial use. This is especially true of those in the VHF band covering the keenly sought channels from 2 through 13. The Federal Communications Commission has steadfastly refused to throw open these channels for commercial TV, but they can't hold off indefinitely, allowing scarce channels to remain dark and vacant.

This bill offers a means of lighting up these channels and putting them to the best possible use. By making up to \$1 million available to each State for the equipment and facilities needed for their ETV stations, it will be a galvanizing shock that can make the promise of ETV a down-to-earth reality.

It is one low-cost, high-yield, single-shot Federal spending program I can go for with enthusiasm.

Frankly, I haven't always felt this way about ETV. While I believed the channels should be used for the enlightenment of our people, young and old, and to relieve the monotony of the endless westerns on commercial TV, I had the mistaken idea that ETV was the frosting of education. I had the impression it provided the appetizer but not the main course—teaching current events, improving cultural backgrounds, and whetting the appetite of students and adults for the arts and sciences.

Hearings before our committee have left no doubts. The record is filled with specific examples of the benefits of educational TV. In Memphis 700 adults have learned to read and write; in Schenectady 4,000 are learning a foreign language at 6:30 in the morning; in Chicago 29,000 have enrolled and paid fees for a junior college course; in rural sections of Oklahoma science and mathematics are being brought to children in small schools who have never been taught them before; 1,200 classes in the Washington area have received a daily science lesson. The list is a long one.

The time has come to put ETV on a firm basis, and enactment of the pending bill will be a powerful and overdue move in that direction.

In my own State, the New Hampshire Educational Broadcasting Council, composed of representatives of 19 schools and colleges, the State Department of Education of the Catholic Diocese, and the Association of School Superintendents, has put an ETV station on the air.

New Hampshire's share of the funds provided by S. 205 will be available for such things as improving the facilities of WENH, increasing its power and range, and installing other devices to bring its benefits to a wider number of viewers, as well as for lighting the darkness of other channels in New Hampshire, and nearby States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The committee amendment will now be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, after line 5, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 3 of this Act shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe 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 section 3 of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to assist the States and certain organizations therein to establish or improve television broadcasting for educational purposes, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, by providing for the establishment and improvement of television broadcasting facilities.

SEC. 2. Any agency or officer, or organization in a State, described in clause (b) (2) of this section, which is establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities, may receive a grant as authorized in this Act to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement by—

(a) making application therefor in such form as is prescribed by the United States Commissioner of Education; and

(b) providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education—

(1) that the necessary funds to operate and maintain such facilities will be available;

(2) that the operation of such facilities will be under the control of (a) the agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, (b) a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting, (c) a duly constituted State educational television commission, or (d) a State controlled college or university; and

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

SEC. 3. Upon determining that an agency or officer of an organization has satisfied the requirements of section 2 of this Act, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make a grant to such agency, officer, or organization in such amount as is determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable and necessary to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement of facilities. An agency or officer or an organization may receive one or more grants under the provisions of this Act, but the total amount of such grants for television broadcasting facilities in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Such grants shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act, and may be made in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities" means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television (including closed-circuit television) broadcasting, and does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus, and the term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this Act as may be requested by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed (a) to give the Commissioner of Education any control over television broad-

casting, or (b) to amend any provision of, or requirement under, the Federal Communications Act.

SEC. 7. No application for any grant under this Act may be accepted by the Commissioner of Education after the day which is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 3 of this Act shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, 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 section 3 of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, beginning with "(b)" it is proposed to strike out all through "(c)" in line 19 and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 2, line 21, before the semicolon insert the following:

except that any such agency, officer, commission, college or university may for the purposes of this act distribute funds received under this act to nonprofit foundations, corporations, or associations in the same State which are organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting if the operation of the facilities which such funds are used to establish or improve will be under the control of such nonprofit organization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the second objection he makes to this measure reads as follows:

We believe that further attention should be given to the role of the State in formulating a plan for statewide development of educational television, and to the role of possible regional arrangements between States. For reasons of efficiency, economy, and effectiveness, we believe that the planning and activating of educational television installations should follow a State pattern, and may need to be regional in character.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to answer at least that objection, as raised by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to make the bill follow a State pattern.

As we know, the bill will permit each State to receive grants of up to \$1 million for the development of educational television. That is a worthy objective. The bill will help improve and expand educational television facilities throughout the country. However, it seems to me that the bill as now worded would set up a procedure which has worried

many here and which may possibly be in violation of the entire educational principle which we have come to know and to appreciate in this country.

STATE CONTROL SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

Mr. President, the bill S. 205, to permit each State grants up to \$1 million apiece for the development of educational TV has a worthy objective. It will help to improve and expand educational television facilities throughout the country. But it has come to my attention that in providing for this assistance the bill S. 205 sets up a procedure that seems to me to violate the whole principle of education in the United States.

What I mean is this: The U.S. Commission of Education has the full power and discretion to award funds either to State agencies applying or to nonprofit private groups primarily engaged in educational TV broadcasting.

This means the State agencies which have been set up and have operated for years in the area of education are competing on more or less equal terms with private groups for the right to get Federal funds for educational programs which will be broadcast in homes and schools throughout the State.

Do not mistake me. I know that private organizations can, and do, do a fine job along these lines. In the Buffalo-Niagara area of New York, for instance, educational television has been on the air for a little over a year. Although handicapped by financial needs, the western New York Educational TV Association is steadily improving its performance. It was chartered by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, and thus properly comes under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Education. Under the amendment I have proposed, there would be no danger of these organizations competing with State agencies. They would have to cooperate with and work through the State organizations, as is indeed the case with most private educational television associations today. Furthermore, the several States could still cooperate among themselves, where such cooperation is useful, by seeking the grants through State agencies.

What I do very strongly object to under the present legislation is the fact that the U.S. Commissioner of Education has the power to decide whether the duly constituted State agency shall handle this programing or whether a private group shall do so.

This amounts to Federal control, with the potentiality of completely bypassing legally constituted State and local bodies. The power to dispense funds should not be in the hands of an appointed commissioner of the Federal Government, most particularly when it concerns the programing of television projects.

The administration has already called for a massive aid to education program. Section 103 of this proposed legislation provides that "In the administration of this title no department, agency, officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of in-

struction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

Yet at the very same time, this bill would in effect hand all control of educational TV, which may ultimately become one of the principal media of education, over to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. I am sure that this is not the intent of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Even though section 6 provides that the Commissioner of Education shall not have any control over television broadcasting, in fact, he could not avoid exercising control if he has to choose between competing applicants.

Mr. President, I should like therefore to propose an amendment to this bill to the effect that only State agencies or officials may apply to the Commissioner of Education for funds, but that these State officials may, if they choose, delegate the operation of the facilities to the same kinds of nonprofit foundations, corporations, or associations organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational TV broadcasting as are mentioned in the present bill. My purpose, let me make it very clear, is not to discriminate against such organizations, but rather to insure that the power of selection stay, where it belongs, on the local level.

It is most important, in considering the field of education, to make sure that the Federal Government does not, one way or another, through the back door, if not through the front door, get control of educational policies and practices throughout the Nation. Although I realize that this is not the intent of the bill, I think that my amendment is necessary to prevent an ultimate Federal takeover in this area. I believe that my amendment might also improve the chances for House passage of the measure, which has been approved twice by the Senate but never been taken up on the floor of the other body.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. In the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the committee, who is in charge of the bill here on the floor, and acting in his behalf, I am willing to assure the Senator from New York that the committee is willing to accept his amendment and to take it to conference.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that very much. I hope the other body will see the merit of the amendment.

Perhaps I should take my seat at this time, because one well trained in the law, as is the Senator from Rhode Island, does not proceed after he has won his case.

However, the minority leader has been required to leave the floor, and he had asked that there be a quorum call at this time, unless other Senators wish to speak.

Mr. PASTORE. Other Senators will speak on the bill, and a group of Senators who are interested in textiles are ready to proceed immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot support Senate bill 205. The first reason for my opposing the bill is that it is rooted in the old proposition that, unless the U.S. Government provides the money, neither the local governments nor the States are in a financial position to establish and construct the television equipment needed to broadcast educational programs.

The objectives of the bill are good; to the extent television can be utilized for educational purposes, the Nation will be served. Educational television has been developed, I believe, through 55 facilities that have been adopted out of 268 available. In Ohio we have four of them. The city of Cleveland was in the process of constructing one, but deviated from the path on the ground that it needed the money for other purposes in the schools; \$500,000 was made available. The Ford Foundation agreed to put up that amount of money, but the \$500,000 was utilized for an increase of teachers' salaries.

Primarily, the presentation of the bill before the Senate to the Congress is rooted in the claim that the local and State governments are too poor to finance this service. I do not believe, during my presence in the Senate, there has been a single time when I have ever heard from the proponents of Federal spending that a local government or a State government was in the financial position to perform the services contemplated by the particular bill then pending before the Senate.

The argument is also made that, unless the Federal Treasury does it, the local and State governments will not be able to render the service.

With regard to the bill and its laudable objective of providing educational television, I submit to my colleagues they cannot disregard the fact that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Kennedy administration both have written opposing the bill. That is the status under which the proposal comes to us.

I am a member of the committee that heard the testimony on the bill, and I heard at least a part of it. There were supporters of the program. A lady from Cleveland and interested manufacturers of television equipment testified in favor of it; but the fact remains that the persons most highly responsible for the development of education in our country both say that the bill should not be passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has made a very emphatic statement that the two Secretaries are opposed to passage of the bill. Do the Secretaries make any reference to the amendment which has been agreed to, offered by the Senator from New York? In other words, the amendment would

change the complexion of the bill quite materially.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know that they did. In his letter, the present Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff stated that the President recommended a very large school-aid program and that it would not be prudent to supplement the proposal at this time with educational television, because the entire program should be worked out.

I do not know whether the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Fleming, dealt with the proposal offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How does the Senator feel with respect to an act in which control is to be left completely in the State?

Mr. LAUSCHE. When I read the bill I had some misgivings about allowing a private nonprofit organization to be the direct recipient of Federal aid. My recollection is that the bill provides governmental units may receive the money, and private nonprofit corporations formed for the purpose of giving television education may receive the money. I had some misgivings about the funds being channeled to the private nonprofit organizations. Am I correct in saying that is what the amendment would cure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They are to be channeled through the State educational agencies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I think that is the proper way to do it.

If this is a bill contemplated to help meet needs, let us consider the situation, to see if the purpose will be achieved.

The bill provides that there shall be given to each State a million dollars, and to the District of Columbia a million dollars. In effect that will mean the Congress declares conditions to be equal in the States, and that \$1 million for each State will solve the problem.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield in a moment.

The District of Columbia has a square mileage of 61, I think, and the population is approximately 1 million people. The District of Columbia will receive a million dollars.

Mississippi has a square mileage of 41,000. I think the per capita income is \$1,100 in Mississippi, yet that State will receive \$1 million.

Delaware, New Jersey, and Rhode Island have populations of approximately a million and square mileages of perhaps 1,000 to 2,000, yet those States will receive \$1 million.

I believe North Dakota has 50,000 square miles of territory, and the per capita income of the State is \$1,500. That State will likewise get a million dollars.

I cannot bring my reasoning to the conclusion that the District of Columbia is worthy of a million dollars, with 61

square miles, whereas Mississippi, let us say, with 41,000 square miles and a per capita income of \$1,100, should also receive only \$1 million.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have listened to the Senator's argument with interest. I should like to ask a question for the purpose of clarification.

Under section 3 of the bill, on page 3, the language reads:

The total amount of such grants for television broadcasting facilities in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. The total shall not exceed \$1 million.

That does not vary the soundness of my argument, when I say that the formula for distribution cannot be labeled as "reasonable" or "equitable."

In my opinion, there are three factors one would have to consider in fixing a formula for distribution. First is the population. Second is the square mileage of the area to receive the benefit. Third is the per capita income of the area.

If the bill is intended to help meet the needs of State and local governments, then I humbly submit the per capita income of the State becomes a most important factor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am interested in the Senator's line of reasoning. I am not a sponsor of the bill and not a member of the committee. It strikes me, however, that the amount involved is geared not to the needs of the larger States but rather to the needs of the smaller and less wealthy States. It strikes me the basic assumption of the bill must be that the need exists primarily in the States in which the expenditure of up to \$1 million would be important but that the need does not exist so much in the larger States, in which a much greater sum would be required.

In other words, the bill would, in effect, impose a greater portion of the responsibility upon other sources in the larger and more wealthy States, but the provision for up to \$1 million could be of very real assistance to the smaller and more needy States. This strikes me as possibly a basic assumption in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that the smaller and needy States would be served if there were a small and needy State. I point out, in regard to the small States, that Connecticut has an area of 4,899 square miles. The per capita income of Connecticut is \$2,817. Delaware has a square mileage of 1,978. The per capita income of Delaware is \$2,946. These small States would get the \$1 million, though they are not in what one would call the low per capita income bracket.

Let us go a step further. The District of Columbia has 61 square miles and a per capita income of \$2,943. On what grounds could we give the District of Columbia a million dollars, and yet give to Arkansas, which has 52,000 square miles and a per capita income of \$1,322,

the same amount? We simply cannot justify it.

Mr. MUSKIE. I again suggest to the Senator that the \$1 million figure—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator please ask me a question.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. Is it not true that the \$1 million figure is not to be a flat amount, that the grant to any particular State may be something less?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true. If the testimony is read, however, Senators will find that the \$1 million will be absorbed in each State, including Rhode Island.

I point out that Rhode Island has a square mileage of 1,058, according to the report from which I read. The per capita income of Rhode Island is \$2,156.

Ohio, on the other hand, has a square mileage of 41,000 and a per capita income of \$2,328.

I respectfully submit that though one may argue about the justification of the Federal Government getting into the program, one cannot argue that the formula of distribution chosen by the bill is sound.

I repeat, there are three factors which should be considered. First is the square mileage within the area. Second is the per capita income in the area. Third is the population.

Of the three, the square mileage and per capita income would be more important.

Texas, with 250,000 square miles, is put in the same category as the District of Columbia, with 61 square miles.

I should like to ask the committee chairman whether an effort has been made through an intensive study to work out a program that might give consideration to the square mileage, the per capita income, and the population of a State. Has any effort been made to devise a formula that would be related to those factors?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we discussed the possibility of a formula. As I said, there were three sessions of hearings on this subject. A formula based upon need would be almost impossible to administer in this area, because the proposal is not a permanent grant-in-aid. It is not a continuing grant, like the aid-to-education bill, for which appropriations would be made every year.

The bill is designed merely to get the program started and off the ground. We found that if we tried to supply actual need, the bill would have to provide 10 times as much in funds. Even then we would never have covered the subject.

In this particular case the square mileage would not mean a great deal because in a small State like Rhode Island much of the funds might be used for closed-circuit TV. For closed-circuit TV a tower would not necessarily have to be erected. The program in Rhode Island might be obtained from Connecticut or Massachusetts or a group of schools wired up for closed-circuit TV. This feature would be a part of the entire program.

In a State such as Montana, having large square mileage, the educational authorities might desire to use the funds for over the air TV. They would not have the problem of erecting towers. In

some States, there would be problems because of terrain. A square mileage criterion would not work in such State. It would be a little different story.

We provided that a plan should be submitted in most cases. I do not mean that the State of Rhode Island has no plan. Rhode Island may have a plan under which it would request only \$200,000. We had to leave that provision flexible because this is a new field, with criteria underdetermined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Everything being equal from the standpoint of terrain and otherwise, and there being a difference only in square mileage, the fact is that the larger square mileage the greater the problem of the State. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps not with closed-circuit TV. However, there may be greater problems with towers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then does the Senator from Washington take the position that a difference in square mileage would not vary the need of a State?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not necessarily, in this particular case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we accept as a fact that the District of Columbia, which contains 91 square miles of terrain, would be on an equality with Texas, which embraces 250,000 square miles, would the amount of money needed to supply services in those two areas be the same?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Such a result is possible, because the outlets in Texas might not be any more numerous than those in the District of Columbia. The question involved is the number of outlets in classrooms and type of system used.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator serious in that statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington believes that a State containing 91 square miles would require—

Mr. MAGNUSON. A system might be provided in Texas which would cover 100, 150, or 200 square miles and have perhaps 20 outlets to 20 consolidated schools, and yet the cost would be approximately the same as a system in the District of Columbia that might cover a radius of half a mile with 100 outlets into 100 classrooms through closed circuit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps the Senator will recall that a witness from Montana, whose testimony has been discussed today, testified that in the large State of Montana, with uneven terrain and the necessity of installing boosters or stations in the mountains, the cost would be greater. Does the Senator recall such testimony?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I listened to every page of the testimony. I was present every day. I listened to every witness. What the witness said was that the need for educational TV in a barren State with great square mileage was greater because in that State there were many one-room schoolhouses, and the problem of boosting signals over the terrain, much of which is mountainous, and carrying them on to the next station would be great.

For example, three booster transmitters to carry educational TV 500 miles in Montana need not cost any more than the cost to the State of Rhode Island, which might wish to install closed circuit TV with outlets to 300 classrooms.

What I am endeavoring to say is that every case is different. The question is relative. It is true that States with the largest areas probably need this facility more than do States of dense population that now have installations of this type. Some of the 54 stations are in the populated centers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that the State of Rhode Island has a population of approximately 800,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Montana has a population of about 500,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Rhode Island is a very thickly populated State.

Mr. PASTORE. It is the most thickly populated State in the Nation per square mile.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In a State having a compact population distribution, does square mileage mean anything?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mileage, of course, is a factor. But whether educational TV would reach certain areas would depend on the way the equipment is proposed to be used, whether transmission will be through tower or closed circuit, whether programs would be picked up on a closed circuit and transmitted into a classroom, and whether in the wideopen spaces of the West a station would be placed at each end of Montana, with boosters to cover the entire State.

Sometimes square mileage does not mean anything, or no more than would be required to pick up a broadcast on a closed circuit and transmit it to every classroom in the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us try to compare identicals with identicals.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A comparison of identicals with identicals is no comparison.

Mr. LAUSCHE. By so doing I believe we will understand each other. If terrain and population density are equal, would square mileage mean anything?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would mean something. It would depend on the method proposed to use the educational TV.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am assuming that the use is identical.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the square mileage would mean something.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator from Washington recognizes that square mileage would mean something.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the bill for the further reason that it is obvious to me that the program is a mere beginning. It will cost \$51 million in the first 3 or 5 years. However, such expenditure is a mere beginning—\$51 million will not begin to do the job. I recognize that local and State governments will be required to operate the stations. From that standpoint the Federal Government will be relieved of the responsibility. But \$51 million will not do the job and we might as well face that fact at this time. If \$1 million would be required to do the job in the District of Columbia, I submit that

\$51 million would not do the job in the entire country.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. In looking at the statement of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Ribicoff, he states three points of objection to the bill.

The Senator has been discussing two of them. The third one reads:

We feel that more attention needs to be given to securing effective commitments for operating funds once an installation is completed.

In other words, the Secretary does not feel—and I assume he is speaking for the President of the United States as well as for himself and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—that the bill is not definite enough concerning the fulfillment of the obligation on the part of the States. Would the Senator comment on that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, very gladly. I discussed the subject yesterday with the staff adviser, and he said an understanding will be made with the States that they will operate these stations. That, of course, is a declaration that they will do so. There is nothing to prevent the States from later coming to Congress and saying, "We need help in the operation."

I do not recall that Mr. Ribicoff's letter contained the statement that the matter ought to be worked out from the standpoint of assuring that the States and local governments will subsequently be performing their duty of operating the stations.

The general objectives of the bill are good. The purpose of utilizing television for giving education must be admired. I have no question that service will be rendered to the youth and probably to the adults of the country if the plan is carried into effect.

However, I submit that it can be carried into effect through the 50 States and the District of Columbia and the various municipalities of the country. They have lagged behind. My judgment is that in part they have lagged behind because they have been led to believe that if they wait the Federal Government will take the ladle and dip it into the Treasury and benignly pour back money into the local communities.

That is the attitude which has been adopted in many places. This is not an argument on whether television education is good or bad. The argument is whether the Federal Government should enter the field.

Within my State, the city of Cleveland did not install a station. Cincinnati, Toledo, and two other cities did. Without boasting, I submit that the city of Cleveland is in better position financially to install a station than is the Federal Government.

That, in a substantial degree, is true practically everywhere in the country. It may not be true in some States like Mississippi and in the \$1,300 or \$1,400 per year income States. However, if they are to be helped, they ought to be helped directly, not by helping also those who

can help themselves, and do it without any pain or discomfort at all.

On these grounds I respectfully submit that the bill ought to be defeated. I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for their efforts in the matter. I know their sincerity. I cannot agree with them, however.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I speak in support of Senate bill 205, the so-called educational television bill. It is my firm belief that this bill has exceptional merit at this time for two reasons:

First, rapid advances in other nations in various fields of education make it mandatory that we improve our educational programs in every possible way.

Second, if we do not break the bottleneck choking off educational television station construction, mounting pressure to turn these channels to commercial use may be successful.

These two points, I believe, far more than justify the maximum apportionment of \$1 million for each State contemplated under this proposal.

We must meet the growing need for 135,000 additional teachers and 140,000 more classrooms in the United States. Educational television can be a valuable supplement to present instructional procedures and of great benefit to adult education in the home. It offers the wonderfully clear feature of visual aid with direct discussion that may reach thousands of students at the same second. This is one place where, because of our technological advances, we are far ahead of any other nation, and we should seize this important advantage immediately.

The educational institutions of Texas are indeed fortunate that the Federal Communications Commission reserved 18 educational television channels in our State. That is more than the number reserved in any other State. With our large area and population of 9½ million, we need them.

As Senators know, one of these channels was put in use by the University of Houston on May 25, 1953. It was the Nation's first noncommercial television station. Its operation has been a marked success. It is making a real contribution to educational progress in the gulf coast area. Lubbock, Dallas, and San Antonio have also been granted educational applications.

Channel 13 is operated by the Area Educational Television Foundation in Dallas.

This leaves 14 educational television channel open for new education outlets. These are designated at Amarillo, Austin, Beaumont-Port Arthur, College Station, Corpus Christi, Denton, El Paso, Fort Worth, Galveston, Laredo, San Angelo, Texarkana, Wichita Falls, and Waco. All are needed.

TV will do for education what the automobile did for transportation. It broadens horizons, and calls millions of persons to intellectual travel who would otherwise have remained in one intellectual blind spot all their lives. In addition to being an invaluable adjunct to our present graded system of educa-

tion, it will stimulate millions of adults to study, and will result in the greatest adult back-to-school movement in American history.

A number of Texas education leaders are very desirous of putting these channels to use, but thus far lobbyists representing commercial interests have managed to stop appropriations of State funds for this purpose. As more commercial television stations are put in operation, the pressure will mount upon the FCC and college officials to release these channels to private use. This is a race for time between the need for education and the desire for dollars.

Senate bill 205 would serve as a timely breakthrough to let at least some additional educational groups begin television operation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will take only a minute to reaffirm what I said earlier in the day. An identical bill was before the 86th Congress. I opposed it at that time; so did the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill before the Senate this afternoon is identical in text with that bill. Anyone who wishes to look at the record will see that at page 164 of the hearings the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a letter to the chairman of the committee, expresses his opposition to the bill for quite a number of reasons.

I do not believe that a case has been made for the bill, and I therefore express my opposition to it. I do not believe it is necessary for me to labor the verities or equities of the bill, because the Secretary's letter speaks for itself.

The distinguished chairman of the committee used a rather intriguing phrase in the debate when he said, "This is only seed corn." I remarked that \$50 million is a lot of seed corn. Once we start down that road, we simply do not come back.

I know of no good reason why the States on their own cannot undertake this kind of responsibility in the educational field.

With that, Mr. President, I have done, and I am ready to record myself in opposition to the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the debate on the bill this afternoon. Like the senior Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], I find that a good case is lacking. I am indeed impressed with the letter, dated March 17, signed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he states the administration's opposition to the bill. I do not believe that the administration is opposed to Federal assistance or aid to education in some form. However, they say they are not ready for this bill. The Department of Education does not want the bill.

Nevertheless, we are about to vote on a \$51 million proposal, without endorsement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of that Department and the President of the United States. The bill should be voted down.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I, too, shall vote against the bill. While I am aware of the benefits of television and of education through television, I do not think that at this time the money would be used as efficiently as it might be in the interest of television education. The bill provides \$50 million for a period of 5 years, and the expenditures would be spread in such a way that they could not be used as efficiently as we would want to see the money used at this time for the purpose of education.

For the reasons stated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, no one believes in education more than I, but I expect to vote against the bill for three reasons.

First, I know of no authority for the National Government to enter the field of education, even though it be in the form of financial grants to television education. In my opinion, one of the best ways to teach is through television, and many States, including my own State of South Carolina, are making tremendous progress along that line. There is no interstate commerce involved in the bill.

Second, I shall vote against the bill because I feel that the States are more financially able to perform the functions proposed by the bill than is the Federal Government. I think that is the responsibility of the States, and that they should fulfill this responsibility.

Third, the bill proposes a new Federal program. Because of the country's fiscal condition, due to the tremendous amount of money which we owe today, it is my feeling that we should not be having a new Federal program such as television education unless it is required by some emergency, which it is not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we have reason to be grateful that the majority of the television facilities of our country are administered by citizens with a sense of civic responsibility. The

control of broadcasting is not a right granted to all who desire it, but a privilege accorded only to those who, according to the Communications Act of 1934, can justify the claim that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

Former President Herbert Hoover said that the grantee must prove that there is something more than naked commercial selfishness in his purpose. This, most assuredly, has been done. Management generally is to be commended for having gone well beyond the minimal requirements of the law in the strong emphasis it is placing upon educational television. In West Virginia, through WJPB-TV, our colleges under the guidance of a committee of distinguished educators and the chairmanship of Dr. Perry Gresham, president of Bethany College and Dr. Duane Hurley, president of Salem College, real progress has been made.

Within our State, television and radio owners have been most cooperative with our public schools and institutions of higher learning.

This program, as embraced in S. 205, is being established at a unique moment in the history of the American television industry—at a time when the industry has been under widespread and critical examination. In the past there have been occasional sharp and pungent criticisms—from some members of the clergy, from academicians, from professional critics, and from individuals of taste and discrimination.

But following the congressional disclosures of rigged quiz shows, payola, and deceptive advertising, these voices have finally found the support of the general public. And there has been induced a healthy, and I hope, permanent process of self-examination within large segments of the television industry.

In essence, the events of the recent years have served to reassert the principle that power and privilege must be constantly attended by a sense of public responsibility. Those who occupy the airwaves and the television spectrum do not hold this space in fee simple. They keep it in trust for all the people. And they must justify this trust by serving the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

According to industry sources, as of March 1959, 44,462,000 of 51,500,000 households in the United States contained at least 1 television set, leaving only 7,038,000 households, or 13.7 percent without a set. It is maintained, further, that in the average home television is tuned in 5 hours a day, 7 days a week. Accepting the fact that no one can state with precision how much of that time the set is actually being viewed—or by how many members of the family—5 hours a day is certainly much more than the average family spends in combined reading time—exclusive of the children's schoolwork.

Thus, within less than two decades, the technology of communication has been revolutionized. And as a result of this revolution, an infinitesimally small segment of our population has acquired control of an instrument of tremendous

power. As with any technological achievement, the instrument itself is neither good nor evil—it has neither mind nor will. But it can be used by men and women to accomplish either very great good or very great evil.

Though I, like some others, have occasionally looked upon the television programming with some misgivings, I believe educational TV can hold vast promise for the quality of American culture. The wider utilization of television will help to elevate the level of American educational progress. Passage of the bill, sponsored by Senator Magnuson and other members of this forum, is worthwhile.

Mr. President, I embrace this opportunity to state that the best of television continues to be better. John Gielgud's production of "Hamlet," the NBC production of W. Somerset Maugham's "The Moon and Sixpence" with Sir Laurence Olivier, and the sensitive interpretation of Hemingway's masterpiece, "For Whom the Bell Tolls"—to name a few of the outstanding—these reached moments of high artistic excellence.

While, in the area of public information programs, the Friendly-Murrow production on missiles offered the average citizen insight into one of the most critical areas of modern American technology.

In these and other programs television has served well the aims and interests of a democratic society. But for each of the shows I have just mentioned there have been too many others which are tuned to the glorification of violence and sadism and debasement of the public weal.

The sanction invoked by the producers of such programs is that they are giving the public what it wants. But this is a violation of the public trust, not only because much of the public has not been consulted, but also because large groups of the people can become addicted to the stimulus of such false versions of life and lose their own sense of discrimination and judgment. We do not prescribe alcohol and narcotics for those who suffer from their addiction. Nor should we prescribe an almost unremitting diet of violence on TV.

The responsibility of those who control the programming of television is not fulfilled by pandering to the lowest common denominator of public taste and intelligence. They have an obligation to lead and to instruct—to use this powerful force to elevate rather than to downgrade our standards of value. Under the plan envisaged in the measure passed today this will result.

Norman Cousins, the editor of the Saturday Review, stated:

The men who govern TV cannot have it both ways. They cannot lay claim to fabulous powers in affecting the sale of merchandise yet disclaim responsibility for affecting easy attitudes towards violence.

The Communications Act of 1934 sets forth the paramount concern of the public interest. All of us can recognize that certain practices of the television industry in matters of taste and propriety have not always served the public interest. To quote again from Cousins:

No one expects television to become a ponderous, bloated, around-the-clock Sunday sermon. But neither do we expect it to be a mammoth school for sadists.

I have hope and confidence that events and disclosures have set in motion the development of a higher sense of social responsibility among those who govern television. And a proper emphasis on educational television can be of real benefit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in the family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], and the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURRIS and Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 20]
YEAS—67

Anderson	Bible	Cannon
Bartlett	Boggs	Capewhart
Beall	Byrd, W. Va.	Carlson

Carroll	Hill	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	Neuberger
Church	Jackson	Pastore
Clark	Javits	Pell
Cooper	Johnston	Proxmire
Cotton	Jordan	Schoepfel
Douglas	Keating	Scott
Dworshak	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Engle	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Ervin	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Fong	Long, La.	Symington
Fulbright	Magnuson	Talmadge
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hart	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Morse	
Hickey	Moss	

NAYS—13

Bennett	Kerr	Saltonstall
Bush	Lausche	Thurmond
Butler	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Robertson	
Holland	Russell	

NOT VOTING—20

Alken	Chavez	Monroney
Allott	Curtis	Morton
Blakley	Dodd	Mundt
Bridges	Eastland	Prouty
Burdick	Goldwater	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Byrd, S. Dak.	McNamara	

So the bill (S. 205) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM, 1961— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of Mar. 20, 1961, pp. 4041-4042, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for an inquiry?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The conference report on the feed grains bill was just laid before the Senate. I am under the impression that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is to discuss another subject matter besides the feed grains conference report. Am I correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Rhode Island

is willing to yield in the event there is no opposition to the report, but I have been waiting since 1:30 to make this speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid there will be some opposition, and I have been marshaling Senators who are interested in the conference report to be on hand. It was only for the purpose of having time to bring them here that I spoke.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not suppose it will take more than half an hour, but I understand other Senators intend to speak on the substance of the subject matter. The subject is textiles.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would like to get the conference report acted on as soon as possible. The House has acted on the feed grains conference report, and I am very anxious to get the bill on the President's desk today, if I can.

Mr. PASTORE. I should not think we would take more than an hour or an hour and a half, all told, because in this particular case it is not the quantity, it is the quality, that will count. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other inquiry?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wishes to have the yeas and nays on the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; without losing my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT CONCERNING PROBLEMS OF THE DOMESTIC TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, 2 years ago I rose in this body to discuss the findings of our first investigation of the problems of the domestic textile industry. At that time I pointed out that the domestic textile industry had been declining for a decade. While the impact on different segments of the industry was uneven, only one—that producing the newer manmade fiber fabrics—had registered a gain in production.

There had been a sharp drop in equipment in place, and a very substantial decline of 24 percent in textile employment. Hundreds of mills had been liquidated. And many thousands of textile workers were prematurely displaced from the labor force. Some of the displaced textile workers, to be sure, found new jobs. But a distressingly large percentage were unable to find continuous employment again.

Textile wages had been lagging behind other earnings in this country. And this was not due to failure of the textile industry to increase its productivity. Indeed, productivity in the textile industry had increased much more rapidly than in manufacturing industry generally.

I also noted then that, while the domestic textile industry was declining, imports had been rising during the 10-year period covering our survey.

We noted in our first report that rising imports could not be singled out as the sole cause of the contraction of the textile industry.

Many jobs in this industry were eliminated by technological change. But it was our conclusion, after review of all trends, that rising imports pose a threat to the future stability of the domestic textile industry, and that unless the rate at which imports entered the country was controlled there would be a further damage to the industry.

In February of this year the textile subcommittee held another set of hearings to bring the record up to date. Briefly stated, we found that the trends of the past decade have been continuing and in some cases have been accelerated.

Textile sales have continued to rise more slowly than the sale of manufactured products in general. Consumers continue to spend a declining share of their total consumption expenditures on clothing.

We also found that textile production rose modestly in 1959—a year of cyclical revival. But there was a sharp drop in 1960. Imports, however, increased substantially in both years.

There has been a further decline in textile machinery in place since 1957, and despite this contraction of machinery in place, that which remains is not utilized to full capacity.

Employment in the textile industry has continued to drop. Since 1957, there has been an additional decline of about 7.5 percent in the number of textile jobs in this country. The loss of jobs has varied from region to region, but all regions where textile-mill products are made have experienced some decline in employment.

As conditions worsened, more and more textile mills closed their doors. From 1947 through 1957, a total of 710 textile mills were liquidated in this country. These mills had formerly employed about 196,000 workers. From 1957 through 1960, an additional 128 mills closed their doors, displacing approximately 33,000 more workers.

Although the cost of living, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has gone up about 28 percent since the base period 1947-49 textile prices have dropped almost 10 percent. As a consequence, mill margins—that is, the difference between the price of raw material and that of its approximate cost equivalent—have narrowed, and profit rates have remained very low.

In our first report we pointed out the anomaly of the two-price cotton system. Because of our agricultural price-support program, the price of domestically grown cotton is higher in this country than in the world at large. This adds

to the competitive disadvantage of American mills which would be unable, under the best conditions, to meet the cost of production of foreign competitors given the wide spread in wages between underprivileged countries and the United States.

Unfortunately, the situation has not been altered since then. Indeed, the latest development has been an increase in cotton price support. Unless some offsetting action is taken, this will place American mills at a further competitive disadvantage.

In spite of contraction in the industry, the downward pressure on textile prices, and shrinking profit margins, the domestic textile industry has made an effort to improve its efficiency by spending large sums on new equipment.

The textile industries of other nations have not been standing still, however. Indeed, since many textile mills in other countries have been built since the end of World War II, their machinery, on the average, is newer than ours. Ten years ago the U.S. textile industry enjoyed a considerable advantage in productivity over competing foreign nations. But the productivity gap has been narrowing steadily.

We cannot assume, as many evidently do, that higher production costs in this country are offset by greater productivity. This was partly true at one time, but it is no longer so. The textile industries of other nations have rapidly increased their productivity, and their costs—especially labor costs—continue to lag far behind those in this country. I wish to emphasize that this is not because textile wages in the United States have increased too fast. In our first investigation we found the textile earnings lagged behind those of other manufacturing workers.

And the gap has been widened even more since then. Three years ago textile earnings, on the average, were 15 percent below those of manufacturing workers in general. By the end of last year, this gap had widened to 30 percent.

I repeat, Mr. President: The gap today between earnings of textile workers and earnings of workers in other manufacturing industries is 30 percent. While textile wages in the United States are high, relative to those of other countries, they are low—quite low, indeed—relative to the wages earned by other manufacturing workers in the United States.

The major change in the textile situation since our first report was issued has been in the international market. Textile exports have continued to decline, while imports have gone up substantially. In 1954, for example, textile imports amounted to about 73 percent of textile exports. By the end of last year, however, textile imports amounted to 170 percent of textile exports.

While there has been a fairly uniform drop in textile exports, we find that there have been substantial increases in imports of virtually all categories of textile-mill products. Since 1958, imports of cotton cloth and madeup goods have gone up more than 130 percent. Wool imports have gone up 107 percent, and

manmade fiber fabric imports have increased more than a hundred percent.

There have been somewhat smaller, but still substantial, percentage increases in imports of Wilton and velvet carpets, up 60 percent; and silk goods, in respect to which imports have gone up 35 percent. In brief, there has been an across-the-board increase in textile imports, but imports of some categories of fabrics have increased more rapidly than others.

There has also been a substantial shift in the source of imports in recent years.

Five years ago Japan was the principal exporter of many kinds of textile products to the United States. But in 1956 the Japanese textile industry agreed to limit its shipments to this country under a voluntary arrangement.

The limitation was originally 235 million square yards of cloth. Only a year or so ago, by negotiation, it was increased to 246 million square yards. It was thought at that time that this would ease the impact of textile imports on the domestic industry. Unfortunately, as the figures I have just given clearly reveal that this hope was not realized. All that has happened is a shift in the source of imports.

When Japan announced that it would voluntarily limit its shipments of cotton cloth to the United States, other nations which had formerly exported only modest quantities of this product stepped up their production for export purposes. As a consequence, Japan's share of our market has been cut at a time when total imports were rising strongly. In 1958, for example, Japan accounted for 60 percent of our cotton goods imports. By the end of last year, its share had dropped to 28 percent.

The point I wish to make—and I make it emphatically at this juncture—is that Japan is not sending less to the United States. Japan is sending as much and perhaps more, but Japan's percentage of the U.S. market has dropped from 60 percent to 28 percent. If Senators analyze those two percentage figures, they will come to the conclusion that other countries have increased production and are sending much more to the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I presume it is a fact that the arrangement made with Japan was on a voluntary unilateral basis, and other countries were not included in the arrangement at all. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. I am accentuating the fact that U.S. imports have been increasing since the unilateral agreement with Japan. Japan had 60 percent of the U.S. market, and in fact limited her own exports to the United States. However, today, even though Japan is shipping the same amount and quantity of cloth to the U.S. market, the percentage is quite different. Japan now controls only 28 percent of the U.S. market, instead of 60 percent, because other countries have entered the market.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will yield further, this would indicate that U.S. imports have really doubled, compared

to 5 years ago, measured by the Japanese shipments to the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. They have gone up 250 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator, in the course of his important talk, will also develop the situation of textile exports, because the classic problem which assails people in New York, such as myself, is that we have both kinds of business, and that the opportunities for exports today are probably greater than ever. Various factors, such as the balance of international payments, and so forth, lead to the need for an export drive. Therefore, I think we ought to have—and the Senator from Rhode Island has performed a great amount of work on the subject—not only a general picture, but also a composite picture, which the rest of us can discuss. From the Senator's specialized knowledge, perhaps as he goes along he might tell us what has happened to textile exports.

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot give the figure as of today, but when we investigated the subject in 1959 we found that whereas prior to the last 10-year period about which we are talking our exports were 15 percent of our total production, the figure had dropped from 15 percent to 5 percent, and it is dropping every day.

The notion that as a result of our technology and productivity we can compete with our friends abroad is a fallacy in the textile industry, for the simple reason that their technology is as good as ours and their machinery is newer than ours. It is as simple as that.

If we compare wages, for example, of 30 cents an hour in France, 20 cents an hour in Italy, and 10 or 15 cents an hour in Japan or Hong Kong against \$1.50 to \$2 in the United States for the same type and quality of goods made by the same kind of machine and by ten fingers of two hands, we find that we cannot compete. The situation is as simple as that.

Mr. JAVITS. Before the Senator concludes perhaps he can develop some facts and figures on the export-import picture. I shall not interrupt the Senator further at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. I refer the Senator to the committee report in which certain tables are printed. I will come to that subject in a short while.

Meanwhile, imports from Hong Kong, which had amounted to 14 percent in 1958, jumped to 27 percent by 1960. And there were even larger percentage increases in the case of other nations such as Portugal, Spain, Egypt, and France. These four countries combined accounted for only 1 percent of our cotton goods imports in 1958. By 1960, their shipments amounted to 23 percent of the total, which presents another glaring example of the astronomical rise in the imports of textile goods.

Other countries stepped up their shipments to us when Japan voluntarily curtailed her exports of cotton cloth. In 1958, Formosa, Pakistan, Korea, and India collectively accounted for only 2 percent of our imports. But this share increased to 11 percent by 1960.