

Mr. Boland with Mr. Schadeberg.
 Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. McClure.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Button.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Meeds.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Podell.
 Mr. Roe with Mr. Shipley.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Feighan.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. de la Garza.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Kazen.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Scheuer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3558, PUBLIC BROADCASTING FINANCING ACT OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3558) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 23, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, under the conference report on S. 3558 appropriations are authorized for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal years 1971 and 1972. For each year, an outright appropriation of not more than \$30 million is authorized. Not more than \$5 million is additionally authorized each year to match grants, donations, bequests, and other contributions to the Corporation from non-Federal sources.

The issues between the two Houses were simple and clear cut, so I shall not take much time discussing them.

The Senate passed a 3-year open end authorization for the Corporation and added a provision requiring public broadcast stations receiving grants from the Corporation to keep records of their programs involving controversial issues of public importance. I should note that the administration requested the 3-year open end authorization for the Corporation.

We on the committee have been disturbed about the delay in getting up a permanent plan for financing the Corporation. We also have a policy against open end authorizations. So we cut the authorization down to 1 year, fiscal year 1971, so that we could maintain closer oversight of the progress in getting up a permanent financing plan for the Corporation. Our appropriation ceiling for 1971 has been adopted for both years covered by the conference report.

The provisions in the Senate bill requiring recordings and other records were not the subject of hearings in either House. Those provisions are not included in the conference report. The conferees agreed however, that there should be hearings in the next session on legislation requiring all broadcast stations to keep recordings of their programs involving controversial issues of public importance. I am having such legislation prepared for introduction.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and I trust that it will be adopted by the House.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I regret, I must say to the gentleman, that the House capitulated to the other body on the extension of 1 year. Quite a point was made, as I recall, when the bill was before the House, that the House committee would review this program next year. To extend it another year will not be helpful in that respect.

In other words, the adoption of this conference report means it will go on for an additional year, with perhaps not too much scrutiny. I regret to see that the additional 1-year extension was given.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will permit me to explain, we are well into the present fiscal year and if the authorization were not for 2 fiscal years we would be right back working on another authorization for CPB at the start of next year instead of looking into the question of a permanent plan for financing the Corporation. This provision will give us a little time.

We were very adamant in refusing to go over to 3 years. This will give the administration a little more time to come up with its suggestions for a permanent plan for financing the Corporation. We did close the open-end authorization.

We believe the conference report is a good compromise, and about the best we could do with the Senate under the circumstances.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate what the chairman already has said, that this is essentially the same bill that passed the House of Representatives recently.

The other body, of course, was insistent on having 3 years, and they did make the point to us that we would have to be right back in here in January or

February to hold hearings on the program again, and that another year would give us some more time. For that reason we did compromise on this particular point.

This is a good program and I believe we should continue it. We will soon be looking into this program again. We will be holding hearings on it either late next year or early the following year. I am sure all the members of the subcommittee and of the committee will be looking over the program, and talking to those who are responsible for it in the administration. We will be having conferences and talking to those who have the responsibility for running the program; that is, the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

We are going to be keeping a very close eye on the program as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL). He has been very helpful, as were all of the conferees, in working out the compromise. Particularly the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communication and Power of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD).

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment that subcommittee. They have worked exceedingly hard on many bills during this Congress under their very able chairman.

They are: the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD), the chairman of the subcommittee; the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DERLIN); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY); the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER); the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN); the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROZMAN); and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

I compliment each of those gentlemen for the job he has done on this subcommittee. It has been hard work and time-consuming, but they have worked right along without pause or complaint. I want to give them my thanks, and I think each Member of the House owes them a vote of thanks, also, for the work they have done.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD).

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the very gracious remarks he has made concerning our subcommittee.

Without taking much more time of the body, I would just like to say that because we receded a little bit on the time for the financing of this program, the permanent financing aspect of the bill, only means that the subcommittee, and I am sure the full committee, will be very diligent in overseeing that a permanent financing program that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) suggested should be undertaken. The subcommittee feels that the gentleman is very accurate in his statement. The full committee also feels

so. We compromised only because there would be a difference of maybe 6 or 7 months before the program came up again. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that we are going to be very diligent in seeing to it that a reasonable type of permanent financing is advanced both by the Corporation and by the administration.

The conference report before us today, on the bill S. 3558, extension of financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, will permit continuation of the Corporation's successful program of aid to local educational broadcasting systems.

The Corporation was established by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, and under the initial concept operating funds for the first years of operations have been provided by direct appropriations in slowing increasing amounts. The initial concept also called for the development of a system of permanent financing that would provide Federal funds without dependence on the annual appropriation process. This remains the intent of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Congress, and the other governmental bodies involved in the creation and support of the public broadcasting system.

The objective of a long-range financing plan is to provide insulation from direct or indirect political pressures, however well intended, that might compromise the Corporation's programing in the minds of viewers and listeners.

But it has been recognized that development of permanent financing is a complex and difficult task, requiring a high degree of coordination among the executive and legislative branches and the public broadcasting community. Accordingly, in order to yield immediate benefits from the Corporation, to develop expertise in public broadcasting operation, and to gain better insights through practical experience on the volume of funds that will be needed in the future, direct appropriations have been necessary.

The present legislation extends the authorization for the Corporation through the next fiscal year, 1972. The legislation also provides for appropriations in the current fiscal year, 1971. The House, in consideration of the committee bill, H.R. 17982, approved a \$30 million authorization for fiscal 1971. In addition, another \$5 million was authorized for appropriation of matching funds, to be dependent on amounts received as contributions to the Corporation from non-Federal sources.

The Senate had passed authorizing legislation with no fixed amounts for the next 3 fiscal years. The Senate also approved an amendment requiring educational stations to keep tapes of all public-issue programing for later inspection by interested parties. For my own part, I have no objection to broadcasting stations keeping records of broadcast material. But it was noted that neither body had held hearings on the proposal, and that, as written, such a law would single out noncommercial stations while placing no similar obligation on commercial stations. Also, the cost burden of such a

step, which would fall most heavily on low-budget operations, would most probably be very high.

The conference managers agreed to eliminate the Senate amendment on keeping recordings, but also agreed that hearings on a measure that would apply across the board to all stations should be held next session.

The Senate managers pointed out that the provision of only 1 year's authorization as voted by the House would be followed in a matter of months by the necessity of considering similar legislation for the coming fiscal year. Accordingly, they urged that a second year's authorization be added. The House conferees agreed to the request, which is set at the same level as the authorization for the present fiscal year—that is \$30 million for direct appropriations and \$5 million in matching appropriations.

Both sides agreed that the extension of the authorization to the second year did not diminish in any way the insistence on the part of the House committee that work on permanent financing should go forward with all possible speed. Limiting the authorization to 1 year was designed as a means of insuring very close committee oversight over the development of permanent financing. The addition of a second-year authorization, because the appropriations process for that year is already almost upon us, will not in any way dilute the committee's insistence that work on permanent financing must be pressed vigorously.

In our committee report, we noted that it would probably be necessary to make further direct appropriations, even though progress was being made on long-range financing. Permanent financing will involve complex legislation that cannot be put in place overnight. In the meantime the Corporation for Public Broadcasting can continue to expand on the successful beginning it has already achieved by means of direct appropriation funding as provided for in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the report.

(Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he may require to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), who has been helpful, as always, in every way.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that we did go over this when the bill was before the House before. The budget figure was \$22.5 million plus \$2.5 million in matching grants. There was a great deal of argument in the committee as to what should be done. Finally we had the budget people come down and they agreed to this figure of \$30 million plus \$5 million in matching grants. So what is contained in this conference report and in the original bill meets with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to state my strong opposi-

tion to this legislation. As I pointed out at the time of its original passage September 10, the stated purposes and activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting read like a blueprint for a Government propaganda network. Coupled with the growing restrictions by the Federal Communications Commission on the program content of private broadcasters—of which the recent FCC decision to remove station WXUR in Media, Pa., from the air for alleged violations of the "fairness doctrine" such as failing to give equal time to opponents of victory in Vietnam, is the latest and worst example—this brings us closer to outright control of the communications media by those able to influence the Federal Government in their favor.

Government broadcasting is fundamentally inimical to freedom. Every advanced totalitarian state provides for full government control of the communications media. As everyone should know by now, Federal funding means Federal control. There should be no federally funded broadcasting network. Consequently, funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be abolished, not continued.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been informed and understands that the original papers on the next conference report have not been messaged over to the House as yet. They will be here shortly.

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) in connection with the first reorganization plan, and if the papers arrive between consideration of the first and second reorganization plans, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia at that time.

DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1970—TO ESTABLISH AN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AS AN INDEPENDENT ENTITY OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 Resolution 1209, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 3; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution may continue, not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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