



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 114

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1968

No. 68

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Frank Flisser, pastor, St. John's Windish Lutheran Church, Bethlehem, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of our spirits, again we come to this place of common concern for our Nation, and for our world. Before they begin their deliberations, we lift our minds and hearts to new levels of faith through prayer and praise. Again we seek communion with Thy spirit. Again we come to be instructed and renewed by Thy power. Deeply we feel the need of more than human resources of spiritual strength if we are to live up to life during these days of confusion. So we come seeking Thee. We thank Thee that when we seek after Thee with sincerity of heart we find that Thou in Thy turn hast been seeking after us.

Humbly we pray for forgiveness and cleansing. Forgive our lack of patience and understanding. Make us more humble, more gentle. Forgive us when we have not acted like true followers of Thy way. Help us to do what is right when the right may be hard and costly.

O Lord, our God, help us to meet the problems with courageous faith and the future with confidence in Thine overarching love and care. Strengthen our confidence, we beseech Thee, in the ultimate triumph of Thy purposes for us.

May we go forth this day to meet the experiences with peace and stability of mind and heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REVEREND FRANK FLISSER

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district was honored by the House of Representatives today in having the opening day prayer delivered by Pastor Frank Flisser of the St. John's Windish Lutheran Church of Bethlehem, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, with Reverend Flisser today are his lovely wife, Martha, and their daughter Diane and son Frank, and 60 members of his congregation. I take this opportunity to welcome them to Washington.

Pastor Flisser's church, St. John's Windish Lutheran, is the largest Lutheran Church in the city of Bethlehem. The church has more than 2,200 members.

Unique is the fact that St. John's is the only Windish Lutheran Church in the United States. It derives its name, and draws the majority of its membership from Windish citizens of the Bethlehem area whose forefathers immigrated from Yugoslavia and Germany.

Pastor Flisser has served his Bethlehem congregation for the past 17 years, having previously served as pastor at Christ Lutheran Church in Trenton, N.J.

I am extremely pleased that Reverend Flisser has had this opportunity to offer spiritual inspiration as this House begins its deliberations today.

SOVIET UNION IS SUPPLYING EGYPT WITH GROUND-TO-GROUND MISSILES

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the press today that the Soviet Union is supplying Egypt with ground-to-ground missiles, capable of firing some 45 miles. This dispatch is the latest in a long litany of reports of Russia's unilateral escalation of the arms race in the Middle East. There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union seeks a resumption of the war in the Middle East. Yet Israel, which did not ask for war last year, seeks only to liquidate its effects save for the assurance of its own security. It is the Arab States that will not permit a settlement of outstanding issues.

Our country now has no choice but to match Russia's rearmament campaign. I urge our Government to send to Israel enough planes to deter the Arab States and their Russian masters from starting hostilities. We must make a gesture of

support to Israel. In the name of peace, Mr. Speaker, I urge an end to the American embargo and the immediate shipment of first-rate aircraft as requested by Israel.

EATING AND WORKING

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the Federal Government is talking of providing a guaranteed income for everyone, regardless of whether or not he works, we wonder what the Apostle Paul of Christ's time on earth would have said on that subject.

To find out what Paul thought in the day in which he did live, we have only to read I Thessalonians 2: 10-11, in which he said:

For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of making a personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker, on April 9, I attended the funeral services for the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Atlanta. During the proceedings of the House that day, there were two record votes and three quorum calls. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on roll No. 92 and "yea" on roll No. 93.

On April 22, there were two record votes and one quorum call. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 98 and "yea" on roll No. 99.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 705, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 1125 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1125

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 705) to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROVER. 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. 102]

Anderson, Tenn.	Gubser	Nix
Andrews, Ala.	Hagan	Pickie
Ashley	Hansen, Idaho	Reinecke
Ashmore	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Ayres	Hawkins	Roudebush
Bow	Herlong	Roybal
Collier	Holland	Satterfield
Conyers	Irwin	Selden
Dawson	Jacobs	Stanton
Dent	Johnson, Calif.	Stephens
Diggs	Jones, N.C.	Stubblefield
Dow	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Vanik
Fallon	Long, Md.	Waldie
Feighan	Malliard	Walker
Gallinanakis	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Gardner	Mosher	Wilson
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H. Wright
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
	Nedzi	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14940, AMENDING THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand this request for a conference is on the disarmament bill and authorizations for the further support of that Agency?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the other body, in view of the austerity program of the President—if it can be called that—reduced the monetary authorizations rather substantially.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the House conferees would join with the other body in the cuts that have been made in the authorizations for this purpose.

Mr. MORGAN. I will assure the gentleman from Iowa we will do our best.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. HAYS, ADAIR, MAILLIARD, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

VIETNAM

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford held out a profound promise of hope last Tuesday. In his speech to newspaper executives, our newest member of the President's Cabinet clearly emphasized that the South Vietnamese have at least achieved the capability of undertaking their own military security.

Based on the Secretary's statement we can gratefully conclude that the United States has fulfilled its military purpose in Vietnam and can now devote itself unreservedly to meaningful peace and to those critical tasks here at home which are urgently crying out for consideration.

No matter what direction the current peace efforts take—and men of good will everywhere pray they will be fruitful—as the Defense Secretary has indicated, America can honorably begin disengaging from the battlefield. Thank God for that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 705, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy at all on this bill. I know of none on the bill itself.

There is a rather strange kind of unanimity which I imagine will be brought out in general debate on the matter.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 1125, provides for 1 hour of debate under an open rule on House Concurrent Resolution 705.

This is a resolution to assist the veterans of the Vietnam era in obtaining suitable employment.

The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to promote both in the Government and private industry a program of opportunities of employment for veterans who return from military duty during the Vietnam era. This measure was recommended by the President in his veterans message to the Congress earlier this year.

Under the terms of the resolution all Government departments and agencies: First, shall try to provide employment opportunities for veterans; second, shall give preference, as provided by law, to veterans in selecting employees; and third, attempt to use proper means to secure voluntarily from private industry a priority in hiring veterans.

This program is to remain in effect until the Congress declares it no longer in the public interest.

Since existing facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the Civil Service and the Department of Labor are to be used, no material cost to the Government is anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. Mr. BOLLING. 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.

AMENDING THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1133

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. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, 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. After the passage of H.R. 15986, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3135, and it shall then be in order to consider the Senate bill in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy on this resolution. It provides for 1 hour of debate under an open rule on a bill which is somewhat controversial. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1133 provides for an open rule, 1 hour of debate, on H.R. 15986, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934.

This legislation was passed by the House a year ago and became law. It set up a corporation to handle public broadcasting in this country. The corporation would have a 15-member board of directors appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate. Each director would serve a staggered 6-year term. Not more than eight may be from the same party.

The bill provides for authority to operate in three related fields: to stimulate education with cultural television programming on noncommercial television stations. First, it is authorized to make grants to local noncommercial educational stations so that they can produce and broadcast educational and cultural programs for local audiences.

Second, it can make grants to production companies and employ writers, actors, and so forth, to develop and produce imaginative quality television programming which will be made available to noncommercial stations.

Third, it will provide financial assistance for interconnection. This last is to set up methods so that noncommercial stations can all be broadcasting a particular program at the time they desire, even with respect to live shows.

The corporation is not to create, however, a network. It is prohibited from owning or operating any stations.

H.R. 15986 extends the authorization for fiscal year 1969. The bill passed a year ago provided for authorization only for fiscal year 1968. It provided for an authorization of \$9 million. A year ago we were told that there was great urgency in passing this legislation, but yet many months passed before the President sent up to the Senate the names of those he wished to nominate for directors of this corporation.

The corporation was not actually incorporated in the District of Columbia until last month. As a consequence, the Appropriations Committee did not appropriate any funds, and that is the reason for the extension of this authorization for the fiscal year 1969 so that the \$9 million can be appropriated for this corporation to operate.

We were told a year ago—and this was one of the main bones of contention in the debate on the floor of the House—as to what would be the permanent funding program of this corporation. And we were told a year ago that it was then

under study and within a year's time an answer would be provided, that it was under study by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

In questioning the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in our Rules Committee yesterday, on this bill, it appears that still no report has been received from these agencies as to what they propose to recommend in regard to permanent funding for this program.

I would also like to bring to the attention of Members, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation are both making substantial grants in this area.

I called the Ford Foundation in New York City yesterday and was told by the gentleman with whom I talked that the Ford Foundation in 1968 would be granting between \$20 and \$25 million in the field of public broadcast and educational TV.

The Carnegie Foundation is also making grants in this same area. Let me quote from the Carnegie Commission report which was received by the committee on this legislation:

The corporation will require from Federal funds approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$60 million a year in the following years allowing for moderate build-up.

This kind of program is not any different from other governmental programs that are started, and once we get this thing started, although they are asking for a \$9 million authorization at the present time, here is the Carnegie Foundation report that says it needs \$40 million at least for the first year and \$60 million at least in subsequent years.

We have network commercial television operations at the present time, and also in the field of radio, operated completely under private enterprise. There is a great danger, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, as to the propriety of having Federal funds appropriated for a public broadcast corporation of a very powerful medium—TV—which could be controlled by the Federal Government and by bureaus and by personnel involved in the Federal Government. There is a very great danger, Mr. Speaker, that, although it would be handled in a most careful manner and under restrictions, propaganda broadcasts could emanate from Washington to the people of the country over TV. This, I think, is completely improper and foreign to the republican type of government we have in this country.

Another point I want to make: In view of the serious fiscal situation and the monetary crisis which faces this Nation today, this is a new program of \$9 million. It is admitted by every Member on the floor of the House that we have to curtail Federal expenditures. There is a great deal of talk about increasing taxes in order to be fiscally responsible and bring our budget into closer balance. If we are going to do all these things we all believe in, and which the American people want us to do, it is time now not to enact this program today that is going to call for \$9 million of new spending. Here is a good chance for the Members of the House to vote the way they talk.

I approve the rule, and I know of no opposition to the rule, but I am in opposition to the legislation itself. It is a very dangerous piece of legislation, not only because of what could occur under operating a public television corporation in this country, but also because of the serious monetary crisis in which we find ourselves today.

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

Mr. BOLLING. 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. STAGGERS. 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. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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. 15986, with Mr. GALLAGHER 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 West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill which I bring to the House today is simplicity itself and I will not take much time to explain it. It merely strikes out "1968" at two places in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and inserts in each place "1969." This would permit funds authorized last year by the Congress for the Public Broadcasting Corporation to be appropriated as part of fiscal year 1969 funds rather than as part of fiscal year 1968. It does nothing more.

These funds are seed money to enable the corporation to begin its operation while a permanent plan for financing its activities is being developed and placed in operation.

As most Members of the House know, the corporation is going to promote the development of educational broadcasting. This will include: First, assisting in developing educational programs of high quality; second, facilitating the availability to educational broadcast stations of educational programs; third, assisting in the establishing and development of one or more systems of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television and radio programs; and fourth, assisting in the establishment and development of one or more systems of educational television or radio broadcast stations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is one of the most important laws passed by the Congress in the last decade. It holds great promise for the people of the United States. But in order that this promise be realized, the bill before the House must be enacted.

We conducted lengthy debate on the Public Broadcasting Act last year, I believe for some 5 hours, and we went into the merits of it. Many, many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with that debate. That bill was passed.

The Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting did not get appointed until March. It was incorporated in the District of Columbia very recently. They have not had their first organizational meeting yet, and will not have it until Friday.

There have been several reasons for this delay. One is that the Chairman, Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was stricken, taken to the hospital, and operated on. He is now back in good health.

The Corporation directors have been appointed. They are among the outstanding men and women of America. I am sure when the Members of the House know who they are they will have explicit confidence in these men and women doing a good job.

I name a few of them:

James R. Killian, Jr., of Cambridge, Mass., chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Milton S. Eisenhower of Baltimore, Md., president emeritus of Johns Hopkins University.

John D. Rockefeller III, of New York City, chairman of the board of trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Joseph D. Hughes, of the Mellon Institute of Pittsburgh, a governor and vice president of T. Mellon & Sons.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These are typical of the men and women who have been appointed by the President to serve on the board of this Corporation. I believe they engender the confidence of every man and woman in America.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say the appointments were not made until March of this year?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That seems to be a common complaint about the Great Society. Congress authorizes committees, commissions, advisory boards and so on and so forth, and it is months before the members are appointed.

This leaves me to question and perhaps leaves other Members to question the necessity for it in the first place.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might answer the gentleman in this way: I am sure that he would want the President to get the best qualified people for the job. I think the Board of Directors of the Corporation consists of 15 people. The President had

to talk to them and get their consent to their appointment and so forth. He is to be complimented on the Corporation members that he has selected for this job. I think you would have confidence, also, in all of those he has selected. I certainly compliment him on the selection of these people.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask this question: What has been the expenditure thus far?

Mr. STAGGERS. There has been no money expended by the corporation.

Mr. GROSS. No money at all? No expenditure of any other funds anywhere in the Government?

Mr. STAGGERS. The Corporation has not been organized.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that your committee has made every effort to see to it that this Corporation will probably represent the public well insofar as noncommercial broadcasting is concerned. I have complete confidence in you, Mr. Chairman, in the manner that your hearings were held and the manner in which the legislation is drawn and the attitude of the committee generally insofar as the public is concerned.

As you will recall, last year I offered an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 directing that commercial broadcasting contribute toward the cost of educational television. At the same time I also requested that the Federal Communications Commission hold hearings to determine the extent to which commercial broadcasting corporations shall help or assist in funding educational television. What I would like to know is whether or not in the intervening period this question was at all gone into as to the degree to which commercial broadcasting should aid in supporting educational television. Also I would like to know whether or not the Federal Communications Commission has any ideas or any views in this connection and whether this with all be public moneys that will be expended. I take it the \$9 million to be appropriated for this purpose will be public moneys. Would the chairman be good enough to comment on that?

Mr. STAGGERS. I certainly would. As I recall telling the gentleman last year, this is one of the purposes of the new corporation. They have not been organized. They are going to try to go into all phases of this. Then they will come back to our committee, and we will take a look at it. As I assured the gentleman last year, this will be done at the proper time. We have not had a chance to do it as yet.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, may I request the chairman of the committee, then, on this Public Corporation's becoming active, to say that it is the sense of the Congress or that it is your belief or the sense of your committee to the effect that the problem of funding educational television shall be gone into and that it will be expected that commercial broadcasting, besides all other phases of

both Government and industry, shall support to some degree or to the degree feasible educational television? I say this because obviously \$9 million will certainly not be enough to operate a public broadcasting system without some financial assistance.

Mr. STAGGERS. It is our expectation to go into the question of long range financing of the Corporation at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman yielding to me. I am interested in the same point or perhaps a corollary thereof, to the point the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] just made. This corollary would be perhaps any news media has a responsibility, such as an editorial responsibility, as the responsibility of a paper. So does any news media including commercial television, or public television, or radio, or what-not as to editorial placement, headlining, and the opinions of their staff. Knowing the interest of the gentleman and having served for the last 3 years on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, I am interested in the surveillance, the oversight, and the review functions of the various committees. Would it be the gentleman's purpose in his committee to continue oversight of such public television as far as its becoming too political or as far as its headlining or as far as introducing dogma and doctrine into the minds of the public is concerned without complete information being given to them so that they might evaluate and perform a judgment factor in that regard?

Mr. STAGGERS. I may say to the gentleman that this is the intention of the committee. That would be our duty, to do just that. As you know, last year, along with your colleague on that side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], we wrote into the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 guarantees of the very safeguards that the gentleman is talking about here.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's answer is very reassuring and I certainly hope we will follow through because if we have ever had demonstrated in our time the question of some type of national hypnosis or mob psychology it can be demonstrated as it has been in large part due to the overuse or action of the news and television media as to what they use as a headline, whether they place it in the proper place and whether when a correction is made it is made in a similar headline and place in the paper or the other news media.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all familiar with the old Lord Beaverbrook case.

Is the gentleman familiar with the organization known as the National Citizens Committee for Public Television.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, did the direc-

tor of that organization Mr. Ben Kubasik testify at the hearings and testify as to the need for the change in the first bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, he appeared before our committee.

Mr. HALL. I have a copy of a speech which he recently made wherein he says—and I realize the danger myself of reading it out of context—

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem—

And I will insert, parenthetically "public television"—

sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in a revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to public television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today.

I read this only to point out what I believe in my heart that if such a bill must pass at this time it should reflect aims and objectives of the communities and, certainly, the surveillance and oversight of the committee, the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from West Virginia is chairman. This has often been said in the well of this House today. However, the problem which is before the House today is to bind and to heal the wound and not to pour salt therein.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentleman that Mr. Kubasik appeared before the committee and placed a statement in the record in which he said that the citizens committee was in favor of the bill now before the House.

Mr. HALL. Yes, but if the gentleman will yield further, my point is that his attitude and his public statements and utterances would be something that I believe we should be leery of, because all of us seek to perform whatever miracles television can do through evolution and not revolution; at this time we recognize that. And I think it is time to recognize that. I think it would be within the surcharge of the distinguished gentleman's committee to see that these people do not as vociferously and vocally as they seem to be in their testimony, and make this approach evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

Mr. STAGGERS. I agree with the gentleman.

I would like to read into the RECORD several telegrams in support of the legislation before the House:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 23, 1968.

Representative HARLEY STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting I respectfully urge that the House of Representatives favorably consider an authorization for the Corporation under title II of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Last year pursuant to congressional action educational television was established and just three weeks ago this new instrumentality was incorporated in the District of Columbia. Its first board meeting will be held on Friday. From the beginning it was contemplated that the Corporation would be funded by a combination of public and private support. Even in the short period of its

existence private funds have been made available, and the enthusiasm which has greeted the formation of the Corporation augurs well for further private funding. But without evidence of congressional support at this time no further private contribution can be expected. The momentum created by the congressional act would be lost and in my judgement could not be regained for some time to come. The ability to attract qualified personnel becomes questionable. There are vital things to be done. Public broadcasting effectively used could be a major deterrent to civic disturbances. It has particular capabilities available nowhere else in this field. The public broadcasting stations properly supported can enrich the lives of citizens of our communities and provide opportunities for self-improvement in the best American tradition. Communication with the people of our major cities and citizen identification with the community are attainable. As a former director of the budget I know the pressure of priorities. In terms of long range significance this program properly implemented has more to contribute to the preservation of the American way of life than almost any program I have observed. The membership of the Corporation's board is a solid assurance that Federal funds will be usefully and carefully spent. The way in which the Corporation operates with such funds will provide the Congress with a measure of its judgment and effectiveness when long range financing plans are considered. I urge you to support this authorization modest in relation to the need and to thereby permit this Corporation to begin its task.

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Chairman.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA.,
April 24, 1968.

Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your support of H.R. 15986 to amend appropriation authorization for corporations for public broadcasting. These funds important to West Virginia's first public TV station as well as to total national picture.

JAMES G. HARLOW,
President, West Virginia University.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 24, 1968.

Representative HARVEY O. STAGGERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

National Association of Broadcasters endorses H.R. 15986 and urges House passage of this legislation.

VINCENT T. WASILEWSKI,
President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 24, 1968.

Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

ABC reaffirms its support for the Public Broadcasting Corporation and urges passage of H.R. 15986 which makes possible support for the Corporation as previously authorized by Congress.

LEONARD H. GOLDENSON,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 24, 1968.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

NBC has been advised that the House of Representatives will consider today H.R. 15986, which would extend the present authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We wish to reaffirm our support for non-commercial broadcasting and the Corporation for Public

Broadcasting, as previously expressed in my testimony before your committee. We hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably on the pending bill.

Respectfully,

JULIAN GOODMAN,
President,
National Broadcasting Co., Inc.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 24, 1968.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STAGGERS: Westinghouse Broadcasting Company reaffirms its support to Public Broadcasting Co. and urges the House to pass H.R. 15986 providing the full amount previously authorized by Congress to apply to fiscal year 1969.

Sincerely,

DON MCGANNON,
President,
Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, am I correct that this Corporation for Public Broadcasting is already in operation, and it has been conducting programs throughout the past year?

Mr. STAGGERS. The Corporation has not as yet even been organized. It will have its first organizational meeting on Friday of this week.

Mr. BELCHER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much reassured to hear that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue oversight on this legislation, and the resulting Public Broadcasting Corporation, particularly in view of the fact that in another area of the committee's structure in this regard, and in the problem of public information or freedom of information, we have recently had what I consider to be a step backward by the closing out of the subcommittee in the Committee on Government Operations that has had oversight over freedom of information in the executive branch of the Government.

I believe it would be an unfortunate thing if we allowed that subcommittee to disappear from the structure in the House of Representatives, and did not at the same time have very careful oversight over the work of a public broadcasting corporation trying to promulgate information to the public.

Hopefully we will have at least one of these areas where we have full congressional oversight.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to reassure the gentleman from Ohio that the committee will continue its oversight of all matters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be

helpful to those who are here and who are interested, in the history of this legislation, to recall a little of what took place on September 12, 1967, when this bill passed the House.

At that time the vote on the passage of the bill was 265 yeas and 91 nays. The bill had overwhelming approval at that time.

What has happened in the meantime in which the Members might be interested since September 12, 1967?

Some have asked the question, and one of the members of the Committee on Rules raised the question as to why had not this Board, which controls the Corporation of 15 members, not been finally appointed until about 6 weeks ago?

I believe I might have to take some responsibility for that delay. I insisted long before the bill was brought to the floor of the House, and I insisted even stronger here on the floor of the House, as well as with the White House after the bill was finally signed by the President, that the success of this bill depended almost entirely upon the quality of the appointments to the Board of Directors which would run this Corporation, and unless this Board was so distinguished and so above what I would call partisanship that it could administer this in the public interest, that it would be a failure, and we would be all disappointed that we had ever voted for it. I did have confidence that if this Board were properly appointed we could succeed.

I asked the President to please take his time in making these appointments to be sure that we had 15 members whose standing in this country was sufficient to guide this kind of very sensitive public media.

Those of you who are interested can look at page 10 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power on March 27 of this year and you will see that there are 15 persons appointed. I doubt if you could find 15 more distinguished or more qualified people to run this Corporation.

For this reason I do not find fault with the Chief Executive in delaying these appointments until he was sure that he had men of that quality.

I do not believe that this Corporation can succeed unless you have such people running the Corporation.

This caused some of the delay, and then the Chairman of the Commission for the first year, Frank Pace, Jr., was in the hospital, which was a further delay. They have only been organized within the last month. So I want the House to know why there has been a delay from September 12 until about a month ago in getting this Corporation organized.

What happened when we passed the bill on September 12 of last year with reference to money? We authorized \$9 million to run this Corporation for the remainder of 1968, until July 1, 1968, when the fiscal year 1969 will begin.

Since they did not get organized until about a month ago, they have spent no money for this fiscal year and they are in the position of getting their staff together and they do not intend to spend

any money in the remainder of fiscal year 1968.

Now, what are we asking by this piece of legislation? Simply one thing—the \$9 million which was put in the legislation last year and authorized to be spent in fiscal 1968 we are asking to be put in fiscal year 1969. We are not asking for any new money. We are asking for the money which was not spent in fiscal year 1968 to be authorized for fiscal year 1969.

Where does this go in relation to the budget for fiscal year 1969? The administration in its budget requested \$20 million. In other words, it proposed \$20 million for fiscal year 1969, the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968. So, if you want to apply it to the 1969 budget, which we are asking for in this legislation, it is a reduction from the budget figure of approximately 55 percent.

There has been raised here the question by some distinguished Members about the danger and the possibility that this could be used by a government to put out its own propaganda. I think the members of that committee will recall very well one important amendment—and unless that amendment had gone in, I doubt very much if that bill would have ever left the committee—and that amendment said that programing done by the Public Broadcasting Corporation had to be—and I quote these words—“had to be balanced and objective.”

Second, there could be no editorializing.

Without those two protections in this legislation, I doubt if it would have passed out, and if it had not been in there, I would not have supported it on the floor of this House.

We felt when this bill was before the committee last year that there ought to be a built-in protection for the minority.

Therefore, on this board which was set up to head this Corporation provided that there could not be any more than eight members from one party. This is the same built-in safeguard that we have in all of the seven Federal regulatory agencies wherein majority party may have only one more member on those Commissions than the minority party.

So we tried to build into this a guaranteed objectivity.

The objection has been raised that we do not have the views from HEW on future costs. I would have been disturbed myself if we had not had those costs and this Corporation had been formed last October, because I think it would have been the business of the Corporation to get the views of HEW on this question. But I will admit that since the Corporation is not active, and has not spent any money, there is no experience in the field. But I would expect that next year HEW will come before our hearings with an estimate of what they think this will cost for a year or two.

A moment or two ago a member of the Rules Committee said on the floor of the House that he had talked with representatives of either the Rockefeller or the Ford Foundation and they said \$40 million next year, and \$60 million the following year. I will tell you that I do not rely on either of those foundations for

any opinion as to what this Corporation will cost. I am going to listen to the evidence as it comes to the committee and make up my mind on what I think this Corporation should spend during the next few years. I do not intend to rely on any outside information as to what I think this Corporation ought to spend—and I think with very good reason.

Second, I want it to be known that this Corporation has nothing to do with the Public Broadcasting Laboratory which is being financed by the Rockefeller or the Ford Foundation—absolutely nothing to do with it. Some of you have seen programs this last year by the Public Broadcasting Laboratory. All were privately financed. There is nothing we could do about it if we wanted to. That is all entirely private in nature and privately financed.

Lastly, I wish to make this clear. I hope, to all my friends who are either for or against the bill, that, in the formation of this Corporation, we are not in any conflict, in any way, with private TV or the networks. We have had testimony from all three of the networks and all three of them have given us a good word in behalf of this Corporation. CBS has offered \$1 million as its part, at least, in the beginning, to show its good will toward this Corporation. But I do believe the only issue here really—and I have taken some time to give what I thought the Members ought to have as to what we have done since September 12, 1967—but the only issue here today is that we are asking that you strike out “1968” and insert the word “1969” to authorize the \$9 million for 1969 that the Corporation will have to spend in 1968 had it been in existence. It seems to me that that is not more than a reasonable request.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has the gentleman abandoned the idea that the Public Broadcasting Corporation will find some other direct means of financing besides appropriation?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not abandoned that by any means, but I do believe that it is going to take something voluntary. I do not think there is any way we can compel anyone to come in and give money. In the beginning I was very hopeful that the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation itself would come forward. But thus far, insofar as I have been able to find out, they have not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has the CBS money actually been put into the project for this year?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not believe there has been any money actually delivered because the Corporation has been in existence for only a little over a month. I do not know whether they intend to give that \$1 million this month or this year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Presuming that they do plan to give it this year, which I understood they had committed, then the Corporation would actually have \$10 million this year if we appropriate the \$9 million, and the authorization of \$9 million for 1969?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say if the gentleman's assumption is true, that is correct. I do not assume that they are going to use any money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then there would be \$20 million for 1969. The gentleman is not suggesting that we should have appropriated and someone should have expended the \$9 million last year when there was no board of directors for the Public Broadcasting Corporation?

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no. Does the gentleman mean I was implying they should have spent \$9 million last year? Was that the question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I said, the gentleman said we originally authorized \$20 million for 1969 fiscal year, and \$9 million in 1968.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman misunderstood me. I do not believe I said it, but if I did, I will correct it. The President's budget for 1969, proposed \$20 million. Now the request is for \$9 million in this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The point I would like to make, if I may, is that the original legislation which authorized this program called for the expenditure of \$9 million in the first year. The Board of the Public Broadcasting Corporation was not named until, as the gentleman pointed out, just a few weeks ago, so in effect \$9 million does not represent a cut, but it merely represents the deferring of the action of the authorization of \$9 million for the first year to 1969, which is when the Corporation got into being.

Mr. SPRINGER. I should say it will be in operation in 1969. Yes; I believe the gentleman's last statement is true. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask this one other thing: On the ultimate cost of this program, does the gentleman feel the Carnegie Foundation estimate, that this will ultimately cost approximately \$270 million, is inaccurate or questionable?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I believe it is questionable, very questionable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the gentleman care to put an ultimate price tag on this program?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not believe anyone can say what this will cost. I will say probably a great deal will depend on how well this Corporation does its job and how serious the demand is for this type of programing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would it be a fair assumption to say it will cost far in excess of \$9 million annually?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I think certainly they would need, providing they are successful, next year far more than \$9 million. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated, this legislation today just does one thing. It provides an authorization for \$9 million that was previously authorized for fiscal year 1968, which was not appropriated, to be applied to fiscal year 1969, which begins on July 1.

I think in examining the overall fiscal situation of our Nation today, we should take into consideration particularly the economic crisis we are facing, and the remarks of William McChesney Martin and others. The fact is the President for over 7 months has been demanding that the Congress enact a surtax to help meet this particular crisis. He has berated the Congress for failing to give this to him, but he does not seem to recognize Congress represents the views of the people, and it is the people who are not feeling they should be taxed further to finance the many programs that cost a lot of money. I think inasmuch as there has not been any disposition on the part of the Congress, at least up until this time, to enact additional taxes and inasmuch as the people do not want additional taxes, and no disposition on the part of the administration to cut expenses, we can forego this \$9 million for at least another year.

I would invite the attention of the Members to the committee report that was issued on April 4, 1968, and specifically to pages 6 and 7, where the minority views appear, signed by six members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, setting forth a number of the reasons we originally resisted the Public Broadcasting Act when it was passed in 1967. Many of the things that we suggested are coming to pass.

The public corporation has just been recently activated, but on my desk and I think on the desks of all Members this morning there appeared a copy of a speech entitled "Public Television—Now," which was an address given by Ben Kubasik, executive director of the National Citizens' Committee for Public Television, apparently an address that occurred a week ago today, on April 18, before the National Society for the Study of Communications. Risking the possibility of having someone say some of his remarks are being lifted-out of context, I would just point out a few of the things that Mr. Kubasik said in pleading for the implementation of this particular legislation.

He said that television itself, and not just public television, "gave birth to the civil rights movement as we know it today."

He says:

Television has wrought changes in attitudes toward war, dissassociation from traditional party politics, and commitments in justice and love to all men. Because these changes have come to us through one medium, the relationship between war, politics and race is strikingly clear.

He says:

This participation must become more responsible. This participation must mature. This participation involves a fuller commitment to reality and to change.

And he submits that—

It is Public Television where our participation and involvement to change and reality can take place as it can nowhere else.

And that—

Nowhere near the amounts that public broadcasting really needs to begin operating as it should are contained under the act passed in 1967.

He adds:

This corporation will require * * * approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$60 million a year in the following years.

And Heavens knows how much each year thereafter.

He says:

The \$10.5 million facilities money alone, which was to have been appropriated for fiscal 1968—

That is the subject of this legislation here—

and was properly expected by the public broadcasters and their audiences as a simple extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, are desperately needed by the Public Television and Radio stations of this country.

He goes on to point out that public television "is movement and excitement and entertainment and education and humanity and joy—all scheduled regularly—on public television."

Let us look at what they have been doing. He says:

There is "NET Journal," the excellent series of broadcasts which this season included "What Harvest for the Reaper?" "Roots of Prejudice" and "North Vietnam."

Any Members who saw any of those can make their own judgments as to whether they think it was unbiased, straight reporting.

He also says:

There is the every-other-week "News in Perspective," the perceptive news analysis series with Lester Markel and top *New York Times* correspondents.

Which of course they are promoting.

There was the second annual NET coverage and probing analysis of the President's State of the Union Message.

Again we wonder. I ask my colleagues if they endorse managed news?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I quote further from Mr. Ben Kubasik's address:

Let me stop here for a moment to say what I have heard many others reiterate. "PBL's" report on Martin Luther King, the Sunday following his assassination on Thursday, told more about him, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the responsibility with which King and his people were forging their Poor Man's March on Washington, than anything else that was broadcast or printed before or since that sorrowful period. This was Public Television at its greatest. This is what it should strive always to be.

He says also:

Public Television station personnel of this country meet to discuss and act upon what they can further do in ghetto programming, a crucial area where Public Television has the time on its schedule to provide an un-

paralleled public service of unparalleled necessity.

He further adds:

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to Public Television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today. It is no longer enough to think of programming for a long hot summer, with the whites doing the programming.

He says:

We live now in a long hot twelve-months-a year, every year, year-in and year-out—and the challenge in conscience, justice and love has to be met.

He adds:

It is television which has made us look at war in the faces of an alien people's crushed and wounded children and, in that alien country, our own people's maimed and dying youth.

He concludes that "it," meaning public television—

It alone among our communications media, be they broadcast or print, is capable at all times of reaching out to all our people and helping set aright the disorder and chaos reflected daily in spoken or written headlines.

This, of course, would indicate to you that public television has to implement your knowledge and give you direction, because you cannot believe everything that you see or hear or read in the newspapers. In effect, in my analysis of his speech, he is saying that public television will be giving you the guidelines that you need and you will not get them from any other source. It seems to me another big step in the direction of socialistic orientation, where we authorize the expenditure of public funds to create another public body to centralize thinking power, authority and control, away from our basic free enterprise system. I feel it can create a dangerous bureaucracy for news management.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. Would it come under the purview of this committee, if this educational TV bill passes and the Commission is established and rules and regulations and guidelines are drawn up, to supervise and investigate or at least to inquire into the question and the effect that might be had by computers plus a legitimate sample taking which is done on election days and the broadcasts and estimates made long before the polls are closed in the other latitudes of the Nation?

Mr. DEVINE. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, it would not fall within the purview of this corporation that is created by this committee. The jurisdiction for that particular matter would still remain in the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. HALL. This would change nothing with regard to that because, if there is anything that our Nation needs, it is to realize that just because something is in print or you see it on television it does not necessarily make it so.

Mr. DEVINE. In all fairness, Mr. Chairman, I am including the entire speech of Mr. Kubasik, in order that it can be read in its full context:

PUBLIC TELEVISION—Now

(An address by Ben Kubasik, executive director, National Citizens Committee for Public Television, April 18, 1968, before the National Society for the Study of Communication, New York, N.Y.)

As with all speeches that I have ever been involved with, their titles are made up one or two months in advance to fit any contingency. "Future Directions and Dimensions of Public Television" is such a title. My life has been spent in news—on newspapers and in broadcasting—and so perhaps I have more of a crisis mentality than most. I always expect that I have to be free to move in any direction based on any emergency that might come up no matter what I am talking about. Enough has happened this past two and one-half weeks to justify my propensity for open-ended titles.

"The future directions and dimensions of Public Television" are taking their final form now. Everything I have to say today is based upon that premise.

Better than many, those of you assembled here have your own ideas as to the effect that mass communications, notably television, can and does have on its audiences. While there are attempts to determine the size of television audiences, there really is no effective measuring device by which to know television's impact on ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. Undoubtedly, all of television, from the most crass to the most significant, has its effects. We intuitively can grasp where television's impact is the greatest. We cannot deny, for example, that what is chosen to be shown and what we choose to watch tells us much about ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

The Vietnam War, at any other point in our history, could have been and probably would have been remote to most Americans, despite the fullest coverage by newspapers, magazines, even radio. But death and devastation as shown on television are seen with devastating clarity. The imagination does not ignore or erase or turn into mock heroics actual sights of suffering. The debate, the dissent over Vietnam and its immeasurable consequences on our society comes, more than from anywhere else, from television.

Political candidates, those seeking office and those disclaiming such ambitions, are made into the reality they become not so much because of what they say but because of how they say it or appear to be saying it—and how we react to what they are saying—on television. These men cannot ignore the communications capability of their age. The degree to which they can communicate themselves, their programs, their policies and their accomplishments to the rest of us will determine the degree to which they will be successful in seeking or remaining in office.

It is said that television gave birth to the civil rights movement as we know it today. That is unquestionably true. This nation's most recent tragic assassination was not merely the reporting or recording of an event; it was a commentary on ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. So were the many years of the sequential and unforgettable series of moving events that television brought to us to sear our minds and hearts and consciences—from Bull Conner's dogs to Martin Luther King's March on Washington to the sorrow and shame of a nation that we experienced only a few days ago.

Television is not only an observer. It is a participant. Watching television, we are not only observers. We are participants. Together—television and you and I—we are involved in the choice of selecting the shape of our destiny as no other body of men ever was capable in the history of humanity. With

reality on television, there is no such thing as passive involvement. What television tells us in our hearts about war, about politics, about race, has to be translated, has to change us, has to make us better or worse. Television has brought us to the precipice of an informed conscience. Television cannot now remove itself from helping us make decisions as though it were not here. Because, you see, it is. It is part of our lives, our cities, our ghettos, our landscape, our world and—to the extent that we assimilate into ourselves what it shows us and television assimilates us into showing us back to ourselves—it is us.

It is not enough to give birth to anything and then to let that which has been born seek its own solutions. Television has wrought changes in attitudes toward war, disassociation from traditional party politics, and commitments in justice and love to all men. Because these changes have come to us through one medium, the relationship between war, politics and race is strikingly clear. They are one story, one movement in history. Television's involvement, as our involvement with it and it with us, must increase and grow. This participation must become more responsible. This participation must mature. This participation involves a fuller commitment to reality and to change. And I submit that it is Public Television where our participation and involvement to change and reality can take place as it can nowhere else.

There are, at this moment, some 160 non-commercial television stations in this country which the Carnegie Commission Report has given the over-all title of Public Television. Public Television is a loose confederation of community educational television stations and stations licensed under university, school board and state auspices. Its programming is achieved locally as well through broadcasts provided by National Educational Television (NET) and its autonomous division, the Public Broadcast Laboratory (PBL). Only occasionally do the Public Television outlets have the capability of interconnection, of networking, that is, of simultaneously joining the various stations on a coast-to-coast hookup for its broadcasts.

Despite the present networking limitations, Public Television, night after night, in season and out of season, has continued doing a remarkable job of informing the American people on precisely those subjects which most affect us. More has to be done, obviously, and more can be done—provided that the wheels which have been set in motion to make Public Television a strong, healthy and productive service are allowed to pick up momentum. There is a Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 under which money for new facilities and construction is authorized and under which a Corporation for Public Broadcasting is established. A fifteen-man board has been selected for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will have its first meeting later this month.

Only through the offices of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, according to Congress' own definition in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, can all the activities that a strengthened Public Television this country needs be accomplished. It is intended that the Corporation will:

Facilitate the full development of Public Broadcasting.

Be the body to assist in the establishment and development of non-commercial television and radio stations.

Make funds available for production of programs of high quality for non-commercial broadcasting.

Obtain grants from various sources and make payments to local stations for programming and other costs of operations.

Arrange by grant or contract for interconnection facilities at the free or reduced rates which the communications common carriers are permitted by the Act to provide.

Engage in activities that will assure maximum freedom of the system and its stations.

Have final responsibility for recommending a permanent financing plan for Public Broadcasting.

There is one major problem in conjunction with the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, however. No governmental monies as yet have been appropriated for either the Corporation or for facilities. The \$9 million intended for the Corporation to begin its operations is being moved by the Congress into next year's fiscal budget—with no guarantee that the full sum will be forthcoming then. The \$10.5 million for facilities earmarked for the current fiscal year under the Act is being ignored and the \$12.5 million that the Act calls for in the next fiscal year is going to be requested. These sums of money are nowhere near the amounts that Public Broadcasting really needs to begin operating as it should. The Carnegie Commission Report, upon which the legislation is based, said "the Corporation will require from Federal funds approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$80 million a year in the following years, allowing for a moderately rapid buildup."

At the time when the Carnegie Commission made public its report—in January, 1967—the Vietnam War, the political situation and this country's racial crises had not escalated into the complexities that need unravelling and explanation as they do today. The far-sightedness of the Carnegie Commission's fifteen distinguished members has not been allowed to flower into the full bloom that should by now have occurred. Political practicalities have dictated a slow, gradualistic approach to the most serious of our problems today, involving all of us together with Public Television in an understanding toward positive action in the solution of this nation's myriad and growing difficulties.

The \$10.5 million facilities money alone, which was to have been appropriated for fiscal 1968 and was properly expected by the public broadcasters and their audiences as a simple extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, are desperately needed by the Public Television and Radio stations of this country. Already, there are project requests in to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for funds three and one-half times the amount that was to have been but as yet has not been appropriated for fiscal 1968. The needed monies for Public Television and Radio station facilities are mounting at the rate of almost \$20 million per year while nothing is appropriated for them.

At least that \$10.5 million in facilities monies should still be appropriated for fiscal 1968. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting must inherit the strongest possible system of Public Broadcasting stations for it to service in the public interest.

There is no desire here to divorce myself from the multitudinous problems this nation faces. The Committee of which I am the servant exists, in point of fact, to foster a broadcasting system that will help this nation better to face, understand and solve these problems. Where federal funds are unavailable because of emergency budgetary considerations caused by the difficulties in which this country finds itself, it might be argued that there is sufficient reason for delay.

To answer that argument, there are several points in conjunction with the funding of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that must be made with precision. A Public Broadcasting system of the breadth envisioned in the Congress' 1967 Act cannot get fully under way until Federal monies begin to make it possible. Such a Public Broadcasting system, at this point in our history, could do much to report and clarify the issues which threaten to tear this nation apart. The fact is that any delay in starting a strong, healthy and productive

Public Television system on its way keeps our national communications from taking on a form that is absolutely essential to this nation's well-being.

The National Citizens Committee for Public Television exists to make the American people aware of the reality and the potential of Public Broadcasting. This does not mean only appealing to the converted; it means making new disciples of those countless millions who do not tune to Public Television.

Toward that end, the Citizens Committee seeks the support of national organizations and associations, through their leaders and individual members and through their publications, to spread the word about Public Television. We have an advisory council of national organizations, and I propose to you here today that the National Society for the Study of Communication would be most welcome as a member of our advisory council.

The word has to be made known through the largest possible public relations-advertising campaign that can be mounted. The methods used to sell any product for which wide acceptance or support is sought are the methods that Public Television must employ to make its message known. Public Television has been referred to as minority television—a name Public Television wholeheartedly accepts but not for the usually-stated reason that large-scale audiences would not be interested. The quality offerings of the commercial networks—enjoying the best in promotion, advertising and exploitation techniques—have shown time and again the degree to which qualitative minority programming has reached quantitative majority audiences. The four-hour-long broadcast on Africa, the "CBS Playhouse" specials, the latest Senate Foreign Relations hearings with Dean Rusk, which outdrew its daytime competition, are only a few of the examples of the thirst that America and its audiences have which must be quenched.

Whenever anybody in Public Television lets his imagination soar, he talks about some mythical future time when Public Television is going to be competitive for audiences. Audiences must begin to know in far greater abundance than is the case at present that Public Television exists and they must begin to grasp more than they do at the moment that there is movement and excitement and entertainment and education and humanity and joy—all scheduled regularly—on Public Television that they cannot find scheduled regularly anywhere else. Only by making audiences tune in can the audiences that do exist for Public Television become habitues and supporters of Public Television.

Let us look at only a few of the outstanding examples of broadcasts that have been, are and will be carried on Public Television:

There is "NET Journal," the excellent series of broadcasts which this season included "What Harvest for the Reaper?" "Roots of Prejudice" and "North Vietnam."

There is the every-other-week "News in Perspective," the perceptive news analysis series with Lester Markel and top *New York Times* correspondents.

There is the fine "NET Playhouse" series with productions such as "Home," "Next Time I'll Sing To You" and Santha Rama Rau's adaptation to E. M. Forster's "A Passage to India."

There was the second annual NET coverage and probing analysis of the President's State of the Union Message.

There is "PBL," the Sunday evening experimental series.

Let me stop here for a moment to say what I have heard many others reiterate. "PBL's" report on Martin Luther King, the Sunday following his assassination on Thursday, told more about him, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the responsibility with which King and his people were forging their Poor Man's March on

Washington, than anything else that was broadcast or printed before or since that sorrowful period. This was Public Television at its greatest. This is what it should strive always to be.

There is the outstanding programming produced and broadcast by local stations. We know it here on Channel 13 in New York. And you know it or ought to know it wherever you are from.

There are the "White House Red Carpet with Julia Child," the special series on "Men Who Teach," the three-hour-long report in May on the crises in our cities.

There is, in the long run, the Children's Television Workshop series, aimed primarily at the culturally deprived ghetto child.

Getting to the public about what is on Public Television is vital if we expect to gain audiences. If Public Television were to measure its audiences in the same way that others in broadcasting do, an "NET Journal" on a commercial network to which the public is attuned to tuning, could bring Nielsen ratings of between 4 and 12, which could translate itself to 5.5 to 16.5 million people. In the same vein, "A Passage to India," on a commercial network with an outstanding cast that included Virginia McKenna, Cyril Cusack and Dame Sybil Thorndike, could bring a Nielsen rating on a commercial network even higher than 20, but a 20 rating could be translated into 27.5 million viewers. If these yardsticks are a true indication, an audience is there to be captured for what is on Public Television. That audience must be made aware of what is on Public Television.*

What Public Television is doing and what it has still to do can only be accomplished provided there is the wherewithal to make it all happen. This Sunday here in New York, Public Television station personnel of this country meet to discuss and act upon what they can further do in ghetto programming, a crucial area where Public Television has the time on its schedule to provide an unparalleled public service of unparalleled necessity.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in its section headed "The News Media and the Disorders" stated "by and large, news organizations have failed to communicate to both their black and white audiences a sense of the problems America faces and the sources of potential solutions." It further stated that the news media "report and write from the standpoint of a white man's world. The ills of the ghetto, the difficulties of life there, the Negro's burning sense of grievance, are seldom conveyed. Sights and indignities are part of the Negro's daily life, and many of them come from what he now calls 'the white press'—a press that repeatedly, if unconsciously, reflects the biases, the paternalism, the indifference of white America."

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to Public Television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today. It is no longer enough to think of programming for a long hot summer, with the whites doing the programming. We live now in a long hot twelve-months-a-year, every year, year-in, year-out—and the challenge in conscience, justice and love has to be met.

*These ratings conclusions are based on 55,000,000 television homes, with an average 2.5 persons-per-set. The A. C. Nielsen Company estimates that in prime time the average persons-per-set fluctuates for a variety of reasons from between 2.3 to 2.9. I have arbitrarily chosen the 2.5 persons-per-set figure for illustrative purposes.

There is need, yes, for massive infusions of money too long withheld and too long delayed, for whatever the reasons, to the poor of this country. There are people, from among the middle-class white majority, who still do not understand the need for such massive funds for the poor. There are poor who still accept their lot uncomplainingly who have rights that have been trampled or kept underfoot for too long who must be made to know that the change that must come is coming, and they must know and themselves shape the role they are to play in making it all happen.

Public Television can help bring together on a lasting basis the blacks and whites who joined hands and sang "We Shall Overcome" with quivering question marks in their voices only a little over a week ago. Public Television can be the vehicle that someday can bring blacks and whites together with joined hands and hearts to sing "We Have Overcome," with their voices resounding with the proudest of explanation points. That vision would not have come this far, that vision would have been impossible if it were not for television.

We are living through the seasons of our discontent, the television seasons of our discontent. It is television that has made us arrive at the juncture in our history at which we find ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. It is television which has made us look at war in the faces of an alien people's crushed and wounded children and, in that alien country, our own people's maimed and dying youth. It is television which has taught us to recognize political sham when we see it. It is television which has brought us to this point in the struggle for equality for all men.

There is no turning back. There is no turning off the set that comes into our home and speaks the truth by showing it. There is no dimming of the issues that television raises.

Because Public Television has the time in its schedule—the space in its national pages, if you will—it offers this nation's citizens the opportunity to participate directly in democracy as nothing else in our history ever has. It alone among our communications media, be they broadcast or print, is capable at all times of reaching out to all our people and helping set aright the disorder and chaos reflected daily in spoken or written headlines. It alone has the time—and it must seek and seize the wisdom—to help us comprehend at this period of historic upheaval the changing way Americans look at war, politics and race.

Man and his society is in a constant state of change and it is Public Television—the future directions and dimensions of which are being determined now—that can lead us through the seasons of our discontent and bring us to a fulfillment of what we must do to effect a change in ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have only a very brief comment or two to make on this legislation. I merely wish to call attention to two salient facts of a financial nature about this corporation.

First, on page 43 of the hearings on this legislation, H.R. 15986, the following comment is made by Mr. James Robertson, chairman of the executive board of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. He said this in response to questioning:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had provided for the corporation a projection which is found on page 53 of the committee's former report by fiscal years, starting with \$9 million in fiscal 1968, and running up to \$120 million in 1973, with the comments that the long-range corporation budget is not expected to exceed \$160 million by about 1980.

Now, I would underscore to you that we are asked today to start a program that by 1980 will cost this Nation \$160 million per annum. I for one am reluctant to do that in the face of the comment of Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin and others about our fiscal crisis.

I would like to make one other comment, if I may, and then I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

In testimony earlier during our hearings on this legislation, Mr. Joseph B. Hughes, a member of the Board of Directors of the Public Broadcasting Corporation, pointed out that this year private contributions are expected to amount to \$2,125,000 of the proposed needed \$9 million figure.

I should like to suggest to this body that we challenge those who support this program in the private industry area to put their money where their enthusiasm is rather than expecting the taxpaying public to put its money into it. Let those enthusiastic industries supply the remaining \$6,875,000 to complete the needed \$9 million this first year. Then, perhaps next year we can take another look at the serious fiscal situation of our country and determine the relative need for public financing of public broadcasting at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me at this time. In the colloquy which was held between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois the fact was brought out that there was \$9 million authorized for fiscal year 1968.

I would like to ask the gentleman how much, if any, was appropriated for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. None of that money was appropriated, as I understand it, and none of it was expended, because the Corporation did not come into operation. No money was appropriated.

Mr. ICHORD. That was my opinion and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that we received telegrams from the National Association of Broadcasters, ABC, NBC, and the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., favoring this bill.

The comment which was made here a minute or two ago by the gentleman was not, I am sure, directed at the members of the Corporation. It is my opinion that

the gentleman would agree that the 15 members which have been selected by the President of the United States are about the highest type of men and women to be found in the United States of America. I have confidence in them, and I am sure that every Member of this House of Representatives does.

All the bill proposes to do is to change the date from 1968 to 1969.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy that the private corporations—Westinghouse and the National Broadcasting Co. and others as well, are enthusiastic about the Congress appropriating the taxpayers' money for this program. But I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be appropriate to expect that Westinghouse, the National Broadcasting Co., and those other giants of the communications industry who make a good deal of money in the private area of the communications industry should not put in their money this first year in order to get this program off the ground, in order that we may see how it goes and, perhaps, then it would be desirable for us to consider whether Federal money might be added to the money that they put into this program privately?

CBS has already done this. I would feel a lot more kindly toward this matter if they express the fact that they were willing to put in some of their profits into the program rather than asking the Congress of the United States to appropriate the taxpayers' money with which to initiate this program.

Mr. STAGGERS. In reply to that statement which has been made by the gentleman from Ohio, CBS has already contributed \$1 million and I am sure that others will.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has NBC contributed anything?

Mr. STAGGERS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, has Westinghouse contributed anything?

Mr. STAGGERS. Not to my knowledge. However, I will say to the gentleman that last year this House passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$9 million to get the Corporation started. If we do not do that, we cannot expect any corporation in America to contribute one dime.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, last year the urgency for authorizing the \$9 million was stressed on the floor of the House. Yet the President of the United States did not name the Corporation Board members until just a few weeks ago when we were expected to consider this resolution to extend this time from 1968 to 1969. Apparently, the urgency to approve this legislation somehow got lost between that time and the time the Board was named.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that having gone over the hearing record of last year, I find nothing to the effect that the legislation had to be enacted immediately or by any certain time. I do not find one word wherein any sense of urgency was expressed when this matter was pending

before the House and it was acted upon accordingly, and according to the normal course of events in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] explained the delays in organizing the Corporation very well. Each Member of this body should understand why the delay occurred. We gave our word on these funds last year and I think we have to keep it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further and if the Chairman will permit me one more question, I hope the gentleman will agree with me that apparently we are in partial agreement with Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve Board to the effect that the fiscal situation of the country has deteriorated some since the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. STAGGERS, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. Chairman, last year I reported to my colleagues of the House that I am the owner of a one-fifth minority interest in a commercial television station in my home State and district. I am still the owner of such minority interest.

Irrespective of such ownership, I wish to go on public record as strongly favoring educational television—both public and private. The educational potential of this powerful medium of communication is immense and educational television should be promoted and advanced—in the proper way and at the proper time.

I have two deep concerns about the basic legislation which was passed last year by this House. First, that in spite of efforts made in H.R. 6736 to insulate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from political involvement or control, the legislation does not sufficiently so insulate the Corporation. This involves an immense risk for the public in the area of future attempts at thought control in the political field and, until the insulation has been made much more certain, this remains an unsound situation.

Second, the whole question of permanent financing is left unresolved. Estimates of long-run costs are most sizable ranging as high as \$160 million annually; there is apparent agreement that these costs should not permanently be carried from the public treasury; and yet no alternative plan of financing has been proposed which is adequate and acceptable. When the National Treasury is in its present strained and unsound condition, it would be most unwise to saddle future budgets with an obligation to continue carrying from public funds this new and expensive program.

I wish I could support this bill today. But I do not feel that it represents the proper way at the proper time for the Federal Government to involve itself in this field, and I must therefore oppose it.

Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this—that the power that will be put into these stations by giving them Federal money seems to me exceedingly dangerous. I believe all of the Members have been told through their lives that when once the Government controls education then freedom is gone.

I would like the Members to consider this bill a little from that angle, and also from the point of view that we are presently head over heels in debt, so why can we not wait another year for this? Certainly we do not need this this year, right now. Let us wait and give it more consideration. It is not a matter of having to do this all at once, it may be we can do it next year if we are wise enough to protect our country from financial disaster, and from a whole lot of other kinds of disasters.

Mr. STAGGERS, I might say to the gentlewoman in reply to her suggestion that this be put off for another year—that I am very glad Christopher Columbus did not say, "Let us put it off," and did not get the Queen's jewels to finance his venture, otherwise we might not be here today.

Mrs. BOLTON, Christopher Columbus was helped by a woman, and so I am just trying to help my country.

Mr. BOLAND, Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill that would bring this country's Corporation for Public Broadcasting out of gestation and give it life.

I want to express my vigorous support for this bill and to urge its swift enactment into law.

Established by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that year was granted authorization for a \$9 million appropriation in fiscal 1968. But the Corporation, its schedule snarled by a series of delays, was unable to make use of the authorization in fiscal 1968. The bill we are considering today—H.R. 15986—would transfer from fiscal 1968 to fiscal 1969 the authorization for \$9 million in appropriations.

A governmental appropriation for the Corporation, of course, is merely an expedient to give the organization enough financial strength to gain its feet. The Corporation, the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are now working together in an effort to establish a permanent financing plan—a plan that would make the Corporation wholly independent of political control or interference. The Corporation's very nature demands such independence. Political control of the Corporation's purse strings would hamper its work and taint its public image.

The \$9 million authorization bill before us today, however, must be passed if the Corporation is to carry out any work at all.

Created to promote and develop a new

concept in educational and informational broadcasting, the Corporation promises to become a vital force in American life.

We in the Congress must pass H.R. 15986 if the Corporation is to begin fulfilling this promise.

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the continuation of the Public Broadcasting Act by passage of H.R. 15986.

I fear we are continuing a new political device which, with Government support, will turn undefined education into a runaway brainwashing monster.

Events of recent weeks such as the King saturation on the television networks and the CBS "Hanoi" program should be the signal to thinking Americans of the dangers of a centralized communications system.

The obvious threat to our masses is the powerful one-sided persuasion, a tool to affect thought control by a few under the guise of education.

The admitted planners of public broadcasting are the Ford and Carnegie Foundations who indicate little in the interests of America—except to dodge taxes and influence political action.

We can shortly expect, by the use of Telstar devices, one intellectual professor to teach every child in America—yes, even the world. This could be called an equal education exposure.

But what happens to the many other qualified and trained educators? Are they resolved to mere disciplinarians—to adjust the television sets and take up the tests? Who selects the courses, curriculum, and the teachers for public education?

The existing commercial networks have become highhanded and out of control in attempting to force the preferences of their few on the many. But to turn the entire network over to politicians can only nationalize the industry.

Private funds and private enterprise has brought the industry to its present development—whether we approve of it or not. I see nothing good to be gained by continuing the national public broadcasting blueprint.

I include the following as some indication of what we can expect—parental interference—from political broadcasting:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

"TOWN MEETING" ON EDUCATION TO BE
TELEVISED

District school officials and members of the Board of Education will conduct an open-end "town meeting" on educational issues April 24 on WETA, the educational television station.

The program, which will be aired beginning at 8:30 p.m., will deal with four questions:

Are children learning what they need to learn?

What powers should parents have in running schools?

Should a neighborhood control its own school?

Should three-year-olds go to school?

A panel of "experts," to be announced later, will speak on the questions, and other comments will be given by officials and taken by phone from viewers.

Two additional such programs will be broadcast by the station in May, all co-sponsored by WETA and the District Board of Education.

[From the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers, Pasadena, Calif.]

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Recently State Senator John G. Schmitz told me, in discussing a social phenomenon that has spread like cancer, not only throughout California, but to every State in the Union: "It appears to be aimed at destroying the independence, self-confidence and self-reliance of the individual—the foundations of both liberty and good government."

He was referring to that perversion of group therapy: "Group Criticism"—a method of social control through social pressure that is used by every communist regime in the exact form now spreading throughout our Nation. Only it is never called Group Criticism—but something dear to the hearts of guilt-ridden liberals. "Human Relations," perhaps, or "Operant Conditioning." Most often of all, however, you will hear it called "Sensitivity Training."

NOT ENTIRELY NEW

Now as many who read this will recognize, this process, usually under the name Sensitivity Training, has been around for several years, ever since social psychologist Kurt Lewin developed the idea in the early 1950's. Industries, businesses, groups of professional people such as doctors, lawyers, architects, have submitted to it on a voluntary, short-term basis where its destructive effects would not be widespread—although many who participated still do not speak to each other to this day.

But today there is a new generation—and the situation, backed as will be shown, by communists and communist influences, is much worse.

Sessions of so-called Sensitivity or Group Criticism (its only correct name) have invaded California with a vengeance.

Dr. James Bugental, of Psychological Service Associates, Los Angeles, says, "California is a hotbed of such groups."

Sessions take place in private living rooms anywhere from San Diego to, of course, Berkeley. Or the "scene," as some devotees call it, may be a hall or lounge at UCLA's Conference Center at Lake Arrowhead; the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute at La Jolla; a conference of business executives at a "retreat" in Ojai Valley; or simply a meeting of students at San Diego State College.

The Esalen Institute at Big Sur is a favorite location for many avant-garde artists, writers and "liberal intellectuals."

But that is not all. The process has made a beachhead in State Civil Service, notably in the Departments of Mental Hygiene and Corrections—where it is used on the staff, not the inmates, on a mandatory basis.

But what is this Group Criticism—this "Sensitivity Training"?

Actually it hides behind nearly twenty names, depending on the mood of the "intellectuals" who push it and the type of "audience" they have picked for a target. For example, in the communist police states behind the 6000 mile stretch of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, it is known, without the need to disguise its true nature, as Self-Criticism.

MODERN ORIGIN

Group Criticism, defined as "Self-Criticism followed by Mutual Criticism, always in a group setting," originated at the time of the Twelfth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution in 1929. Included among the party slogans that year was: "Through Bolshevik self-criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Called Sama Kritica, it was inspired by the Party advisers, the dreaded G.P.U., or

communist secret police. Briefly the mechanics were as follows:

The entire population would be divided into small groups of "collectives" of ten to twenty persons each, which would meet regularly on a mandatory and permanent basis so that no member would have any real life outside the group. Each group would sit in a circle, members facing each other without any "protective" table or other furniture between; then each would take his turn criticizing himself, his faults and shortcomings, no matter how trivial. Each would be encouraged to be "frank" and tell exactly how he felt about the other members, who would then criticize him.

The object? To locate faultfinders and originators of trouble. To uncover any individualists, original thinkers, possible future agitators. *The practice, of course, created a spirit of distrust and fear among the people, isolating each from every other.* And it was further affirmed by the secret police, human nature being what it is, that *most of so-called Self-Criticism would be aimed, not at the self, but at the other fellow.*

The result? Police state control, arrests and disappearances, usually after a "frank" criticism session; and frozen fear and terror among those who remained.

TODAY IN CALIFORNIA

In California, as you read this, the exact process is taking place in the Departments of Corrections and Mental Hygiene, as I have mentioned. The sessions are mandatory and, instead of arrests and disappearances, the displeasure for individualism comes forth in poor employee performance ratings.

Just this last December George Robeson, courageous columnist for the *Long Beach Press-Telegram*, discovered that a program of so-called Sensitivity Training or "T-Group Training," was in full swing in the nearby Los Altos YMCA. Several "retreats" had been held in the mountains at a "Y" camp. One 19 year old boy, after a five-day retreat, has suffered recurrent emotional distress, although his group session took place over a year ago.

Alarmed, Dr. Michael J. Singer, Long Beach psychiatrist, said: "There is danger of serious psychological damage rather than benefits from this type of group . . . meeting."

But the staff of the YMCA, none of whom is a qualified psychiatrist or group therapist, replied: "T-grouping will establish a climate of trust and openness which allows young people to experience acceptance, support, love and appreciation for their self-worth, as well as democratic process."

Democratic processes. Sound familiar? As, for instance, the "people's Democratic Discussion Groups" of Red China and North Viet Nam.

Left implicit in Robeson's two columns was the question: *Why group at all, if the children are normal?*

Dr. Carl Rogers, of the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, and one of the foremost exponents of grouping, has said that: "If therapy is good for people in trouble, then it is bound to be as good or even better for people who function well."

This astounding statement has an origin which we will take a close look at. But first it will be instructive to list the three main points of this pervasive form of Group Criticism that Dr. Rogers calls Sensitivity Training.

THREE MAIN POINTS

1. "The atmosphere helps participants to open up their behavior to examination by themselves as well as by others.

2. . . . the first step is to unfreeze the old values.

3. Gradually members unlearn the inappropriate reactions and find the courage (it's really called that!) to experiment with new responses.

While you wonder which totalitarian liberal will tell you what the "appropriate" response is, I can point out that the above forms a classical definition and analysis of Brainwashing, as both Major William E. Meyer and Edward Hunter have analyzed and defined that process.

Each also pointed out that, among American prisoners during the Korean War, the constant Group Criticism created havoc in group relations, making three out of every four men informers on their countrymen, preventing any escapes, since to escape takes teamwork and men who have torn each other apart before others in a group learn only to hate and distrust each other.

But let us examine the origin of Dr. Rogers' rationalization that what he chooses to euphemistically label "therapy" is better for the normal than for the sick.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

It is well known that when the United Nations brought the World Health Organization into existence in February 1948, it was convicted communist traitor Alger Hiss who gave it its initial impetus in the March 1948 issue of the magazine *International Conciliation*. Hiss, while neither he nor anyone else has ever been able to define mental health, did manage to define "health." In order to give the widest latitude to World Government planners to fit all mankind into a common mold, Hiss stated that: "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

The plan was then enlarged and refined by the notorious communist sympathizer, Canadian psychiatrist G. Brock Chisholm, assisted by Dr. Daniel Blain, who was Director of California's Department of Mental Hygiene until 1963. Together they reached two conclusions:

1. That the United States has an enormous mental health problem.
2. That this problem can be solved by the use of government clinics.

Chisholm followed this by the outright declaration that "Universal mental health means one world." And, for the treatment of the "sick world" in order to achieve this goal, Dr. Chisholm put near the top of his list what he chose to call "group therapy."

But it was Dr. Blain who, after helping formulate the *World Citizenship Credo*, told us exactly who the beneficiaries of that "therapy" would be. Said Dr. Blain, "Prevention of mental illness is the primary goal of the government clinic."

In other words, attention would be shifted from the *abnormal* to the *normal*! Which means that everyone supposedly is in need of Group Therapy, Criticism, or Sensitivity.

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES

As a result of the groundwork laid by Blain, Chisholm, and Hiss, the *National Education Association* has been pushing Group Criticism for the normal since 1955. For the NEA this is only natural, since it has been the stronghold of the John Deweyite, group-centered "progressive educationists" for many years. The actual missionary work and spreading of the "faith" is done by a division of the NEA, *The National Training Laboratories*, with headquarters at 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., with a branch laboratory at Bethel, Maine. It is the NTL, under Director Leland P. Bradford, Ph.D., that sponsors Sensitivity Training at the Western Training Laboratory, U.C. at Berkeley; at U.C.L.A.'s Neuropsychiatric Conference Center, Lake Arrowhead; at La Jolla, Big Sur, and even at Boston University—to name only a few.

The process is increasing rapidly in scope. State College at Long Beach has actually started on an accredited course in Sensitivity Training. And many California colleges and universities now have what are called "Synanon Games Clubs, (after the group process used at Synanon, the Narcotics Treatment

Center at Santa Monica). It has become a student fad from Berkeley to Sonoma State, Cal-Western, San Diego State, and San Fernando Valley State, to USC's School of Law.

SOME ARE MANDATORY

Most are voluntary, to spread the faith until such time as it becomes mandatory, as it already is in the Departments of Corrections and Mental Hygiene, with the Parole Departments of Michigan, Utah and Oregon planning to start Sensitivity Training programs in the near future.

Already, with the accent on community relations and a new "image for our police, the Los Angeles Police Department has weakened under liberal pressures—and will start mandatory Sensitivity Training, under the name Group Dynamics, at its Police Academy this year!

Since the effect of continued Group Criticism is to destroy group loyalty, making enemies of all members of the groups, it need hardly be said that if a police department surrenders to grouping its men, *the Leftists do not need a Civilian Review Board!*

As one business executive at Douglas Aircraft said of Sensitivity Training: "If everybody is going to know everything about everybody else, the result could be a definite deterioration in personnel attitudes. *I deplore it!*"

Dr. Al Cannon, psychiatrist at UCLA, has given a frightening view of the future he himself would like to see. A Negro, he envisions integrated "marathon groups" lasting up to 30 hours, to "improve race relations." No sleep, no rest, until resistances are overcome in sheer fatigue. *The exact precise formula was used by communist brainwashers.*

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Expose and block Sensitivity Training wherever it rears its head. Be especially alert for it in YMCA's, youth groups, schools, summer camps, and in Civil Service.

2. Write your Assemblyman, Councilman or State Senator, letting them know of the situation and asking that they question those responsible as to their motivation and authority.

3. Learn to recognize the process, no matter what it involves. Self-Criticism followed by mutual criticism, always in a group setting; and that the criticism will be vicious, hurtful, aggressive, and serve no purpose but to isolate each member from every other, trusting in and loyal to no one, not even himself.

But first, learn the names that Group Criticism can hide behind. Here they are: *Sensitivity Training, T-Group Training, Group Dynamics, Auto-Criticism, Operant Conditioning, Human Relations, Synanon Games Clubs, Basic Encounter Group, Broad Sensitivity, Class in Group Counseling, Management Development, Leadership Class, Self-Honesty Session, Self-Examination, Interpersonal Competence, Interpersonal Relations, Self-Evaluation, Human Potential Workshop.*

There are others and there will be more. Until the day when the mask is dropped and there is no longer any need to hide.

We must not let that day ever arrive!

EDITOR:

No sooner did I get my article on "Sensitivity Training" off to you than the biggest Sensitivity program I've yet heard of is announced for the Garden Grove District in the Santa Ana Register, clipping enclosed.

Importance

1. It is the biggest.
2. It will involve 7,550 pupils in the 7th & 8th grades on a mandatory basis.
3. It will be funded by \$77,939.
4. \$32,190 of that amount will come from Federal funds!

And:

5. For the first time, the U.S. Office of Education is making a frank head on espousal of group criticism, alias "Sensitivity"!

Several years ago Dr. Max Rafferty fought bitterly with a Dr. Richardson over Group Dynamics for school children in Orange County. But now the dam is about to burst—and not just in Orange County!

Sincerely,

ED DIECKMANN, Jr.

A WARNING TO ORANGE COUNTY PARENTS
FROM STATE SENATOR JOHN G. SCHMITZ

The most familiar duty of an elected representative of the people is to express their will in the making and carrying out of laws. But an elected representative has a further duty. When, from his point of vantage at the seat of government, he learns of a grave danger to the people he represents, he can be the first to sound a warning.

For several months I have been receiving reports from well-informed and reliable sources about a practice called "sensitivity training" which has been used here in California in the state Department of Corrections, in certain large business corporations, and in YMCA groups of high school students. Sensitivity training has already been made mandatory on a continuing basis for many California parole officers and their office staff.

These reports aroused my deep concern from the beginning, because this "sensitivity training" employs almost exactly the same method that was used to brainwash American prisoners of war in Korea—organized "group criticism."

Group criticism compels the participant to bare his soul before 10 or 15 other persons who are required to do likewise, under the direction of a group leader. The individual is pressed to seek out real or imagined shortcomings in his personality and in his thinking, to humble himself and give up his independence of mind and judgment, to make himself utterly dependent on the good opinion of the others in the group and the leader of the group.

In time this eats away the very foundations of individual resistance to indoctrination and outside control. Group criticism is used regularly and scientifically for this purpose in every communist country. In the North Korean prison camps it systematically broke down the self-confidence of American prisoners and their trust in one another as individuals and as Americans.

On March 27th a newspaper report revealed that a sensitivity training program financed in part by the U.S. Office of Education, has been proposed for the schools of Garden Grove. The group criticism sessions will include teachers, school counselors, and individual children whom they select and compel to attend. Over 7500 seventh-grade and eighth-grade boys and girls in Garden Grove schools are thus to be exposed to the same kind of psychological pressures which broke strong men in Korea and have driven seasoned parole agents in Los Angeles to the verge of nervous breakdown.

The news story stated that Garden Grove school officials expect "routine approval" of this plan.

I am confident that Orange County parents will not submit so tamely to so great a threat to their children. For if your child thinks for himself and takes pride in himself, if he respects sound moral values, if he dares to be right when the majority is wrong—then "sensitivity training" is like a gun aimed at his head.

This vicious program can be blocked if only enough Orange County people know what is happening, and tell their friends and neighbors. Many might write to our fine Orange County School Superintendent, Dr. Robert Peterson, and ask his help in the fight against it. Those who live in Garden Grove should write, phone or visit its school officials to demand that they never introduce "sensitivity training." To the best of my knowledge this is the first attempt to require group criticism for children at any public school in America. We must crush it under the weight

of a united public opinion before it has become a rooted destroyer of the best in our children.

"With so much talk about 'group psychology' and 'peer group adjustment' and 'group recreation' and more recently 'group therapy,' we are beginning to wonder what's happened to the poor unfortunate individual.

"This country was founded and settled not by groups, but by individuals—some of them pretty rugged ones. We owe our greatness and our liberty to the fact that each man was important in himself—a unique and precious thing. It's up to the schools to keep it this way.

"That's why we take a pretty dim view of such things as 'group psychological testing' and 'group counseling' in some education today. Sure, it costs more to deal directly with the individual than to lump him in a mass and deal with him that way. Your doctor could treat your ailments more cheaply, too, no doubt, if he could diagnose and prescribe medicine for a whole crowd of you at one time. But who wants this kind of medicine?" (Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education for the State of California.)

FACT SHEET: EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION
FOR THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION,
H.R. 15986

BACKGROUND

Last year, the Congress enacted the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 which provided for a nonprofit Federally-chartered Corporation for Public Broadcasting to improve the quality of noncommercial radio and television programs. \$9 million was authorized for fiscal year 1968.

PROPOSAL

The bill would postpone from fiscal year 1968 to fiscal year 1969 the authorization of \$9 million to support the Corporation.

JUSTIFICATION

Since the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was not incorporated until March 27, 1968, it is not likely that the Corporation would be able to use appropriated funds this fiscal year. However, the Corporation will need such funds in fiscal year 1969.

LONG-RANGE FINANCING

The President has directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Directors of the Corporation as well as the appropriate congressional committees to formulate a long-range financing plan.

SENATE ACTION

On March 22, 1968, the Senate passed S. 3135, which is identical to H.R. 15986.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 are each amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBERSTEIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBERSTEIN: On the first page insert the following new section after line 5:

"Sec. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that in view of the privileges granted by the United States Government to commercial

broadcasters of radio and television, such as broadcasters should contribute substantially to the expenses of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, while watching some of the educational television in New York, at the end of a program, I noticed that the gentleman sponsoring the program said to the public generally, "Please help support this station. We have no funds for public television except what is sent to us by the public."

It seems a pity to me that stations that broadcast educational television should go hat in hand to the public to seek their aid and assistance in maintaining their broadcasting station.

I do not think it is asking too much to suggest that it is the sense of the Congress that the commercial broadcasting stations should assist in maintaining educational television. I am thus introducing an amendment embodying this position.

Last year I offered a similar amendment and I also suggested at that time that the Federal Communications Commission hold hearings to determine the extent to which commercial broadcasting should assist in the support of educational television.

I was unsuccessful with my amendment last year so I am only offering half of it today. I leave to some other agency that is better qualified, to make the determination of exactly how much commercial broadcasters should contribute.

Nevertheless, it would seem to me entirely and singularly appropriate that something should be done along this line. Whether or not this amendment is adopted today, it will at least be evidence of the fact that there are some people in this House with their eyes on commercial broadcasters, to learn whether any effort is being made to assist educational television or if it is still necessary for the educational stations to come hat in hand to the public and beg for support—beg for alms, in order to maintain an educational television station.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this House for my amendment to H.R. 15986.

The amendment reads as follows:

That in view of the privileges granted by the United States Government to commercial broadcasters of radio and television, such as broadcasters should contribute substantially to the expenses of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15986 would authorize \$9 million for fiscal 1969 in program funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I support this bill because I believe these funds are essential to meet the short-term needs of the Corporation. However, like the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, H.R. 15986 contains no provision for long-term financing of this Corporation.

I think we all will agree that the question of who should contribute to the permanent financing of public television and radio is one of the major issues of our times. The answer will help spell out the scope and independence of educational broadcasting.

Mr. Chairman, on February 8, 1968, I introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 1079—which also embodied the above amendment. It was in the form of a simple statement of policy, as is this amendment today. It seems to me that because commercial broadcasting has been granted the privilege of using the public airwaves, they have an obligation to use some of their \$3 billion in annual revenues to support nonprofit educational broadcasting. I believe it is right for Congress to go on record now supporting this view.

Mr. Chairman, I have read with a great deal of interest the recent remarks of William D. Carey, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, contained in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Carey, in testifying in support of H.R. 15986, outlined present administrative thinking on long-term financing, as he stated:

At the moment, it appears there are three techniques for providing Federal funds for public broadcasting. These are: (1) a tax on television and radio sets manufactured; (2) a tax on gross revenues of commercial broadcasters; and (3) some special kind of "insulation" for general Federal revenues.

President Johnson, in his February message on education, stated that he was asking administration officials to work with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Congress in formulating a long-term financing plan.

I believe the Congress has a responsibility to go on record on this vital issue. We should play an important role in developing any financing plan. My amendment does not place a dollar figure on what commercial broadcasters should contribute, but instead, offers a statement of policy that in its work, the administration should be aware that it is the sense of Congress that commercial broadcasters should contribute substantially to any long-term financial plan for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York offered this same amendment last year and I stated then that I thought we ought to give the Corporation and the President time in order to make a study as to how the Corporation should be funded. Then the committee could take a look at what they proposed.

I assure the gentleman that all phases and all manners of funding will be gone into. I do not think it ought to be the sense of this Congress to do anything in this respect until hearings have been held.

Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment and I think it should be defeated.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman suggest that the attachment of this amendment to the bill would be harmful in any way either to the passage of the bill or to the funding of public television?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; I do believe that it would be.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I certainly do not want to be responsible for the defeat of this bill—because I favor it.

However, I do believe that some effort should be made to see that help is given to these educational television organizations.

Mr. STAGGERS. All that I can say to the gentleman in answer to him is that he is prejudging the situation and I do not believe we want to do that. I say that a study should be made of it and not have an expression of the Congress to say that there is any one method or manner in which it should be done.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. As I understand our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] he is suggesting that it is very important that we subsidize these broadcasting people. That would be enforced giving on the part of the people of this country.

In my city we support educational television and we are outsiders, we are not Government people. We manage. Let us go more slowly and let us not turn education over to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, pursuant to House Resolution 1133, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEVINE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEVINE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15986 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—241

Adair	Gilbert	Ottinger
Adams	Gonzalez	Patman
Addabbo	Gray	Patten
Albert	Green, Ore.	Peily
Anderson, Ill.	Griffin	Pepper
Andrews, N. Dak.	Griffiths	Perkins
Annunzio	Grover	Pettis
Arends	Halleck	Philbin
Ashley	Halpern	Pike
Aspinall	Hamilton	Pirnie
Barrett	Hanley	Podell
Bates	Hanna	Pollock
Bell	Harrison	Price, Ill.
Berry	Hathaway	Pryor
Bevill	Hays	Pucinski
Blester	Hébert	Quie
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Blanton	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Helstoski	Reifel
Boggs	Holifield	Reuss
Boland	Horton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolling	Howard	Rhodes, Pa.
Brasco	Hungate	Riegle
Brooks	Jarman	Rodino
Brotzman	Joelson	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Ala.	Ronan
Broyhill, Va.	Karsten	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Burton, Utah	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Button	Kee	Roth
Byrne, Pa.	Keith	Roush
Cahill	Kelly	Rumsfeld
Carey	King, Calif.	Ruppe
Carter	Kirwan	Ryan
Celler	Kornegay	St Germain
Clark	Kupferman	St. Onge
Cleveland	Kyros	Sandman
Cohelan	Laird	Scheuer
Conable	Landrum	Schweiker
Conte	Leggett	Schwengel
Conyers	Lloyd	Shipley
Corbett	Long, Md.	Sisk
Corman	McCarthy	Skubitz
Cramer	McCloskey	Slack
Culver	McCulloch	Smith, Calif.
Cunningham	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Daddario	McDonald,	Smith, N.Y.
Daniels	Mich.	Springer
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Stafford
Delaney	Macdonald,	Staggers
Denney	Mass.	Stanton
Dingell	MacGregor	Steed
Donohue	Machen	Steiger, Ariz.
Dow	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
Dulski	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Eckhardt	Mathias, Md.	Sullivan
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Tenzer
Edwards, Calif.	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	Meskill	Tiernan
Ellberg	Miller, Ohio	Tunney
Esch	Minish	Udall
Eshleman	Mink	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Mize	Van Derlin
Everett	Monagan	Vigorito
Farbstein	Montgomery	Watts
Fascell	Moorhead	Whalen
Findley	Morgan	Widnall
Fino	Morris, N. Mex.	Williams, Pa.
Flood	Morse, Mass.	Willis
Foley	Morton	Wilson, Bob
Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher	Wolf
Fraser	Moss	Wright
Friedel	Myers	Wyder
Fulton, Pa.	Natcher	Wyman
Fulton, Tenn.	Nichols	Yates
Fuqua	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.	Zablocki
Garmatz	O'Konski	Zion
Gialmo	Olsen	
	O'Neill, Mass.	

NAYS—133

Abbutt	Fountain	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Gahings	Passman
Ashbrook	Goodell	Poage
Baring	Goodling	Poff
Battin	Gross	Pool
Belcher	Gude	Price, Tex.
Bennett	Gurney	Purcell
Betts	Haley	Quillen
Blackburn	Hall	Railsback
Bolton	Hammer-	Randall
Eray	schmidt	Rarick
Brinkley	Hardy	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Harsha	Rivers
Broomfield	Harvey	Roberts
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Robison
Broyhill, N.C.	Hicks	Saylor
Buchanan	Hosmer	Shadeberg
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Scherie
Burleson	Hunt	Schneebeli
Bush	Hutchinson	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Ichord	Shriver
Cabell	Jonas	Sikes
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Okla.
Cederberg	King, N.Y.	Stuckey
Chamberlain	Kleppe	Talcott
Clancy	Kyl	Taylor
Clawson, Del	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Cowger	Lennon	Thompson, Ga.
Curtis	Lippscomb	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Tuck
de la Garza	Lukens	Utt
Dellenback	McClure	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	McClure	Waggonner
Devine	McEwen	Wampler
Dickinson	McMillan	Watkins
Dole	Mahon	Watson
Dorn	Marsh	White
Downing	Martin	Whitener
Duncan	May	Whitten
Dwyer	Mayne	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	Winn
Erlenborn	Mills	Wylie
Fisher	Moore	Zwach
Flynt	Nelsen	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Taft

NOT VOTING—58

Anderson, Tenn.	Gardner	Nedzi
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	Nix
Ashmore	Gibbons	Pickle
Ayres	Green, Pa.	Reinecke
Bow	Gubser	Resnick
Brademas	Hagan	Roudebush
Clausen, Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	Roybal
Collier	Hansen, Wash.	Satterfield
Dawson	Hawkins	Selden
Dent	Holland	Snyder
Diggs	Irwin	Stephens
Dowdy	Jacobs	Stubblefield
Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Vanik
Fallon	Jones, N.C.	Waldie
Feighan	Kluczynski	Walker
Ford, William D.	Kuykendall	Whalley
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Wilson,
Galifianakis	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
	Minshall	Wyatt
	Murphy, Ill.	
	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Coiller.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Minshall.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Resnecke.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Nix with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Walker.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. MADDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DOWNING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HUNT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1133, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3135.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 are each amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 15986) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 16729

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on H.R. 16729, the higher education amendments dealing with student assistance loans.

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

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

Mr. DULSKI. 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 House Concurrent Resolution 705, to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 705, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution 705 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It is a replacement for House Joint Resolution 1052, requested by the President of the United States in his official message on veterans—House Document No. 245—which was reported earlier by our committee but not scheduled for House action.

House Concurrent Resolution 705 is directed to one of the critical needs of our time—the providing of prompt and meaningful employment opportunities for the large numbers of veterans who are returning from the Armed Forces to civilian life.

The sacrifices being made by members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and other duty posts encircling the world surely warrant them a place of honor in this Nation.

Words of eulogy, however, cannot replace prompt, tangible action when these men and women return to civilian life in this country. They must find that we have kept our trust with them, and that their homeland is still the land of opportunity.

The resolution now before this House reaffirms the traditional policy of the Congress to recognize the debt of gratitude the Nation owes its veterans.

It sets forth the sense of the Congress—

That every arm of the Government shall exert its best efforts to provide Fed-

eral employment for these returning veterans, giving preference to them in the selection of employees;

That all departments and agencies shall urge all private parties contracting with the Government to give the returning veterans priority in private enterprise employment as soon as they return to the labor market; and

That all other sectors of private industry and commerce carry out the same objectives and purposes, and consult, advise, and cooperate with the Government in furtherance of this policy.

The resolution, therefore, places the Congress on record in support of the granting of employment priorities to facilitate the transition and readjustment of Vietnam-era veterans to private life. It is the understanding of the committee that this intention will be implemented by a program, coordinated by the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor, to channel the returning veterans toward employers who will be most receptive and who can offer real employment opportunities. It is anticipated that this program, in both the Government and private enterprise, will materially aid the veterans in finding suitable employment.

The Vietnam-era veterans' employment program contemplated by this concurrent resolution will be conducted primarily through existing facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor. Therefore, there should be no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that House Concurrent Resolution 705 expresses the desire and the deepest sentiments of all Americans that we welcome back returning veterans with more than words alone. I urge its prompt approval by the House.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice in the wholehearted support of the measure under consideration, House Concurrent Resolution 705.

This resolution, which is identical in purpose to one which I introduced on February 6, reflects reassuring action by the Congress to provide needed assistance to returning Vietnam-era veterans.

This resolution states the resolve of the Congress that a policy will be followed by each Government agency and department to exert every effort, in accordance with existing law, to provide Federal employment opportunities for these returning servicemen.

It calls on Government agencies to seek the voluntary cooperation of Government contractors to extend employment priority to these veterans.

And, it expresses the sense of Congress that all other employers in private industry will be encouraged to carry out the objectives of the resolution by also providing employment opportunities to Vietnam-era veterans.

It is fitting to extend our deepest appreciation for the sacrifices made by these men. And it is also fitting to extend, to the limits possible, the assist-

ance of the Government toward resolving the problems which our Vietnam veterans face in the period of transition to civilian life.

No part of this resolution is compulsory on private industry, nor on those Government contractors who supply material, equipment, and services to the Government. This was made quite clear in the legislative history of the resolution.

However, I do believe that the Federal Government, in its employment practices, can do no less than exert a maximum effort to assist those returning Vietnam-era veterans who seek Federal employment.

Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this resolution has languished too long and I therefore urge the prompt approval of House Concurrent Resolution 705.

Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and there is no need to prolong our doing what is right and proper for our veterans, so we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the objective of the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 705, before us today, to express the sense of Congress that Federal agencies should provide employment opportunities to veterans of the Armed Forces who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere—and I emphasize the word "elsewhere"—is an important objective.

However, I should like to point out that there are several thousand members of the U.S. Armed Forces who will not be able to receive benefits under this resolution or under present employment practices of the Federal Government simply because of the fact that they have not obtained their U.S. citizenship, although they have served honorably in the Armed Forces and have made a contribution, often at the risk of their very lives, to the United States in time of war. Because of Public Law 90-147, which generally restricts civil service employment to U.S. citizens, they would be excluded.

On March 4, when the House had before it a bill to deal with early citizenship for those who were serving honorably, in the Armed Forces, I read into the Record a letter to me dated March 4, 1968, from the Civil Service Commission which pointed out that noncitizens may be appointed to civil service positions "only on a temporary basis and even then only when qualified citizens are not available." It also pointed out that under Executive Order No. 11397 "noncitizen veterans are not eligible for transitional appointments."

I think this is a matter which should be of deep concern to Members of the House. We have passed a bill (H.R. 15147) in this body which will provide early citizenship for those aliens serving in combatant areas during the Vietnam crisis. On the opening day of the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 40 to permit lawfully admitted aliens serving honor-