

the convenience of any one Senator. However, if there is no immediate urgency about the bill, it occurs to me that action should be deferred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to accommodating the Senator from South Dakota. I do not know what his interest is, or whether his interest is of such major proportion that we need postpone consideration of this very important bill. He did not appear before the committee on the bill. He never spoke to the chairman or any members of the Subcommittee on Communications regarding the bill; nor is there any amendment at the desk which bears the name of the Senator from South Dakota. Therefore, I do not know what his interest may be. It may be a great interest. However, I do not know whether we should postpone consideration of the bill. I am trying to accommodate the Senate, because there are no other measures on the calendar at the present time. Therefore, I thought we could begin the debate on the bill. If the Senator from South Dakota would like to postpone a vote on the bill, perhaps, or desires to submit an amendment, we could accommodate him, I am sure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the matter was under consideration before the Senate last year, I did oppose the bill. The then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare felt it was unnecessary. I understand that new hearings have been held on the bill this year. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would defer, of course, to the wishes of the ranking minority member of the committee. I would abide by his judgment in the matter. He tells me that he is favorable to the bill and will support it. I am willing to forgo the interest of the Senator from South Dakota, who is out of town, if the ranking minority member of the committee so suggests.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When will the Senator from South Dakota return to the city?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe he will return tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If my colleague on the committee, the Senator from Kansas, wishes to accommodate the Senator from South Dakota, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Inasmuch as I have heard stated here on the floor the interest of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in the bill, I would like to accommodate him if it were at all possible to do so, especially if it is satisfactory to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The matter is of no great urgency, so far as I know.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I would respectfully suggest to my distinguished friend from Washington that he withdraw his request and let the bill go over. Tomorrow, if he cares to call it up, I will have no objection at all.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I was heartened by the President's special mes-

sage to the Congress seeking the establishment of a Peace Corps. I am even more encouraged by the overwhelming response of the American people to the bold and courageous approach to the unsettled and highly dangerous world situation.

Through this proposal, President Kennedy is demonstrating anew America's pioneering spirit that carved this great Republic from a wilderness. To those who harbor doubts that present-day Americans lack the spirit of their forefathers, let them watch the vigor and imagination of this new Peace Corps.

The President has called on all Americans—young and old alike—to accept the responsibility of helping their fellow men, and bringing about a true and everlasting peace.

In defining this responsibility, President Kennedy's vision and energy have created a new and powerful weapon in freedom's arsenal—one which will not only combat the Red plague, but one which will help eliminate the poverty and ignorance and disease that plague so much of the world.

What he has proposed is a corps of young, and not so young, men and women who will go forth into the underdeveloped areas of this world—not to preach political doctrines and usurp personal freedom, but instead to take positive action in teaching the illiterate, demonstrating modern farming methods to primitive farmers, caring for the sick and building productive free countries which can take their rightful places in the community of nations.

The future growth of this country depends greatly on the growth and social progress of these underdeveloped nations. If we are to win this fight for survival, then we must lead the way in stamping out the ignorance and poverty which are great allies of our foes.

This is truly a new concept of foreign aid—foreign aid which utilizes American know-how, rather than American dollars.

There is a great deal of talk about the youth of America being soft. Daily, the newspapers relate statistics pointing to the growing rise in juvenile delinquency. Problems abound, of course, but one should never think that the youth of this Nation is soft and weak, and the slave of an overcreative television writer. They are young people, who realize their responsibilities and, given the chance, are willing and eager to participate in this war for freedom.

It is time many of us realized, as President Kennedy has, that the youth of this Nation has a great deal to contribute to our future, and the future of the world.

It is time we gave them the opportunity to participate in our domestic, as well as international, affairs.

Prior to the President's message, Thomas O'Brien, dean of the Graduate School, University of Nevada, outlined for me a proposal to train these young Peace Corps members—a plan created on the strength of President Kennedy's campaign speech alone.

I hope that the President, and those who will direct this bold new venture, will give full consideration to the Uni-

versity of Nevada when selecting the sites for training these young people. The university is well suited to handle such a program. Under the proposal submitted by Dean O'Brien, the university's outstanding faculty will be supplemented by personnel and aids from private industry. The university's small campus, and excellent facilities will give the trainees a better opportunity to know one another. The rugged terrain and open spaces will better suit those under training for the rigors of physical conditioning which will be so necessary in their assignments.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the New York Times published a front-page article reporting that a Department of Labor study group has completed recommendations for establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps which are expected soon to go to the President. I can only say that I am very much gratified by this announcement, because, as Senators know, I have been deeply interested in this program for some years.

As the Senate author of the Youth Conservation Corps bill, S. 404, I am naturally highly pleased that this proposal is being supported by the Department of Labor.

Senators will recall that in the last Congress the Senate passed my bill, S. 812, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps of 150,000 young men, ages 16 to 21, to work on Federal and State conservation projects. The bill which I have introduced in this Congress, S. 404, is identical with the measure we passed in 1959. I am proud to be able to state that joining as cosponsors of S. 404 are Senators RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, BURDICK, CANNON, CARROLL, CLARK, CHURCH, GRUENING, HART, JACKSON, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McCARTHY, METCALF, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PELL, WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

The purpose behind this Youth Conservation Corps proposal is to conserve both our human and natural resources. The bill represents a work-education program. It represents a genuine constructive effort.

A serious problem which we must face up to is the growing number of young men who are dropping out of school and finding it difficult, if not impossible, to find gainful employment. The highest level of unemployment is to be found in this group. And it is this group of young and idle men which is a natural breeding ground for juvenile delinquency.

In the next 10 years the number of men in this age bracket will boom by an estimated 30 percent as the "war babies" come of age. With this sharp rise in the number of young men and the growing difficulty of untrained youths to find steady employment, we are going to face a problem of ever growing magnitude.

What better way is there to put these idle young men, or at least some of them, to work on worthwhile, constructive work in the field of conservation—an

area in which much more work should be done if we are to protect and preserve our God-given natural resources.

In fact, even today, as we drive through our great national forests, we see the living testimony of the splendid work of the CCC members and the fine public works created by young men who were idle until they were given the opportunity to obtain gainful employment.

Anyone who has talked with former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's knows how much that program did for millions of young men. When the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on my YCC bill in 1959, it received testimony from scores of former CCC members attesting to how much that program did for them in equipping them for adult life. The training they received in learning to live with other people and to acquire disciplined work habits paid off in later life, and the work that these CCC members did in conservation and recreation work has served our country well.

Mr. President, I am confident that the President will be receptive to the recommendations being prepared by the Department of Labor for a Youth Conservation Corps. With the backing and support of the President I am certain that we can obtain passage of the proposed legislation in this Congress.

It may be recalled that when the President of the United States was a Member of the Senate, he supported a similar measure. I am confident that the bill can be enacted and be a self-sustaining enterprise. In fact, the testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare 2 years ago demonstrated that the savings in dollars alone due to fire prevention and reforestation would more than pay for the cost of the program. This is, in other words, a sound investment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "President Plans New Youth Corps for Conservation," published in the New York Times of today, March 21, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT PLANS NEW YOUTH CORPS FOR CONSERVATION—COMPANION TO PEACE GROUP WOULD RESEMBLE CCC OF DEPRESSION YEARS—FOR MALES OF 17 TO 19—PROGRAM IS AIMED TO HELP SCHOOL DROPOUTS, WHO FIND JOBS HARD TO GET

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The Kennedy administration will propose a Youth Conservation Corps of male teen-agers to work on conservation projects across the Nation.

A Department of Labor study group has completed recommendations, which are under review by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. Other Cabinet officials will also be consulted. The proposals are expected to go to President Kennedy later this week.

The departmental report calls for a combined education-work program for 150,000 boys aged 17 through 19. Applicants would volunteer for 1 year's services as laborers, technician's helpers and light construction workers.

The volunteers would draw token wages, live in special camps, and work under such conservation agencies as the National Park

Service, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation.

WOULD RESEMBLE CCC

The Youth Corps would most closely resemble the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression-ridden 1930's. It would have no connection with the Peace Corps, an overseas aid program largely involving college graduates, which was created by President Kennedy on March 1.

According to the Labor Department report the new group would have two principal goals.

It would furnish useful work for a large share of the 200,000 male youths who have dropped out of school and cannot get jobs. Some 7,500,000 school "dropouts are expected in the 1960's."

It is this group that suffers the highest unemployment rate, 20 percent, of any age category and it is this group that is much involved in juvenile delinquency.

It would also provide needed low-cost labor for a massive program to catch up with a \$3 billion backlog of forest, water, park and soil conservation projects.

"The program," the Department report said, "should not become something to lean on, but should rather be a stepping stone to normal participation in the labor force."

Initially, 80,000 volunteers would be recruited, with expansion over a 2-year period.

The total outlay would run about \$2,700 a year for each volunteer, according to Labor Department estimates. Thus, a 150,000-member program would cost \$405 million.

The Youth Corps idea has had considerable Democratic support in the recent past.

In a campaign speech at Scranton, Pa., on October 25, Mr. Kennedy urged creation of a Youth Conservation Corps, echoing the Democrat Party platform. Just before his inauguration, a Kennedy task force on natural resources recommended the corps establishment.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY started the ball rolling in January 1959, when he introduced a Youth Corps bill.

Opposed by the Eisenhower administration, the Minnesota Democrat's bill narrowly passed the Senate in a 47-45 vote last August 18. A companion measure submitted in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, another Minnesota Democrat, never came to a vote.

This year, Senator HUMPHREY has submitted a new Youth Corps bill and 10 similar measures have been introduced in the House. One of the House bills, sponsored by Representative CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky, calls for an urban renewal youth work program in addition to conservation projects.

President Kennedy himself, in a television broadcast with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 6, said he hoped to use the Peace Corps concept in slum and depressed areas—another slightly different approach.

In its report, the Labor Department study group endorsed a separate public-service work program for both girls and boys in city areas.

This type of program is scheduled for discussion by the Department's Advisory Committee on Youth Employment, which meets here Thursday and Friday.

PROGRAM Pondered

Although it made no hard recommendations on the city program, the Labor Department group suggested that this work-education effort should enlist volunteers who would live at home.

There might be part-time work for 16-year-old still in school. The tasks assigned the volunteers would include furnishing unskilled help in hospitals, homes for the aged, and other nonprofit institutions.

"Care should be taken to avoid job placement which would be in competition with

the regular labor force," the Labor Department report said.

Labor Department sources emphasized that in both types of program, the greatest care would be taken not to take jobs away from the building trades and other workers. These sources said the Youth Corps would necessarily involve added use of skilled craftsmen in a stepped-up conservation program.

The Youth Corps' educational program, the Labor Department study group recommended, would involve roughly 20 percent of the work day plus 4 hours on Saturday. Small classes on a staggered schedule would be the rule.

The curriculum would include, where applicable, remedial reading, arithmetic and more advanced academic and job training. No extensive vocational or technical training would be attempted. Counseling, citizenship training, and calisthenics would be included. Able youths would be promoted to head groups, with pay increases.

NINE-YEAR PROGRAM

The Youth Corps' ancestor, the Civilian Conservation Corps, was established by act of Congress in March 1933. It last until June 1942, 6 months after Pearl Harbor.

During its 9-year lifespan, the corps gave employment and work training to 3 million men, most of them joining up at the age 17 or 18. But World War I veterans and Indians were admitted regardless of age.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the bill with members of the Department of Labor, including technicians in the Department. My legislative counsel has collaborated on the details of the bill with members of the staff of the Wage and Hour Division. We are attempting to perfect proposed legislation which has already been introduced in line with some recommendations of the task force of the Department of Labor.

I am pleased to state that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Problems of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has already indicated to me his desire to hold hearings. It is my understanding that the hearings will take place after the Easter recess.

I hope Senators will consider the bill with an understanding, yet favorable, eye, because it affords an opportunity for Congress to do something worthwhile for Americans. We talk about the great Peace Corps which is designed to help the people abroad. I suggest that the Youth Conservation Corps can help Americans at home and be a tremendous source of enrichment to our national economy.

UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION FACILITIES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has a request pending, so the Chair understands.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have pursued this matter, and I think I have ascertained the views of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. We have no objection to having the

Senate proceed with consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on January 6, 1961, Senate bill 205 was introduced. It is similar to a bill which was introduced last year and then passed by the Senate.

The pending bill was favorably reported by the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who were present at the committee meeting and who have been associated for some time with this matter.

Hearings were held on March 1 and March 2. Printed copies of the hearings are on the desks of Senators. The hearings include testimony from some of the finest educators in the Nation, and also testimony from the Federal Communications Commission and its new chairman, coupled with testimony submitted by other members of the Commission. It is interesting to note that the new FCC Chairman has had great experience in the educational TV field. All the testimony was strongly in favor of the objectives and the provisions of the bill.

The president of Columbia Broadcasting System television network made a very fine statement in favor of the bill, and discussed the entire matter of educational television as did the president of Radio Corp. of America and other broadcasters. Statements were submitted not only by commercial broadcasters, but also by manufacturers, civic groups, and many other persons who for a long time have been much interested in this matter. Also the witnesses included representatives of local school groups.

S. 205 is intended to expedite and accelerate the use of television in our schools, colleges, and training programs in each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

The bill would authorize grants not in excess of \$1 million to any State for establishing or improving educational television broadcasting facilities. Applicants would be required to provide assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education that necessary funds would be available to operate and maintain such facilities.

Ten years ago, approximately 242 channels were set aside by the Federal Communications Commission for educational use. This number has been increased to 268. I believe that to date only 54 of those channels are in use. In other words, 214 very valuable educational channels in the spectrum have for 10 years been unused, and thus the Nation has lost the use of that large part of this brand new medium of expression and communication—the greatest the world has ever known—in the field of education. In other words, two-thirds of a generation of schoolchildren could have had the advantage of educational

programming if those educational television channels had been activated.

Applications for the assistance provided by this bill would be made to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the applicants would be required to provide assurance that the operation of such facilities will be under the control of: first, the agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools; second, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting—which is the case in some of the great urban centers of the Nation; third, a duly constituted State educational television commission; fourth, a State-controlled college or university; and that such facility will be used for educational purposes.

Under the provisions of S. 205, the FCC is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of the bill as may be requested by the Commissioner of Education.

Of course, that will be in the field of engineering—to advise as to the channel to be used, and how it is to be used from an engineering point of view—advice which now is necessary in connection with the construction and use of all channels.

Furthermore, it is specifically provided that nothing in the bill shall be deemed to give the Commissioner of Education any control over television broadcasting.

I may say that when the educators appeared before the committee, the chairman of the committee was very particular to ask all of them to read the section of the bill which completely eliminates any Federal control of the program in education, and the chairman asked if that language was sufficiently strong. All of them said it was, and said it would accomplish our purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this measure generally the same as the bill the Senate passed in the last Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So it has had not only the recent hearings, copies of which are on our desks at this time, in connection with Senate bill 205, but also the rather substantial and extended hearings which were held by the Senator's committee during the past 2 years; is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. In fact, the Senate has twice passed the bill; this is the third go-around. Ample notice in advance was given in connection with the invitation for witnesses to attend the hearings. This year no witness who appeared at the hearing opposed the bill, in spite of the fact that witnesses from all over the Nation appeared to testify at the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Washington is to be commended for his persistence in connection with this measure. As he knows, most of the great universities and schools are very much interested in programs of this

type, in order to extend, expand, and improve our educational television.

I believe this program is long overdue; and I hope that instead of simply, being a Senate bill, as the measure has been before, it will now become public law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Minnesota has always been a strong supporter of education. I say to him that we have found that, first, it should be clearly understood that television is not a substitute for classroom work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is merely a means of doing things that could not be done otherwise. The testimony received from witnesses from the smaller States, where the country schools have no chance to have all of the necessary teaching facilities—and even in the case of the one-room school, where some instruction by means of television could be given—was that they found that whenever television educational programs have been put into operation, there has been no suggestion from the State legislatures, the school board authorities, or civic leaders that they not be continued. Some way is always found to continue the service. The legislatures may provide for it and in others it was done on a community level. Some States have moved pretty well in this matter, but many others have not.

It was difficult to say how much should be provided. We proposed not in excess of \$1 million. However, a plan, and a statement as to how it will operate, will have to be submitted, and the plan will have to be weighed.

Strangely enough, some of the States with smaller populations, but with wide expanses, such as Montana, are the States which need such a program the most. They have no educational TV. There is a closed circuit in one of the schools of the State of our distinguished majority leader.

Very few persons realize that in the Middle West and in the other parts of the West, including my own State, there are many one-room schoolhouses. It is difficult for one teacher to succeed in having 40 or 50 pupils learn subjects in the whole gamut of education.

Generally, where educational TV has been used, it has had marvelous results. In the State of Alabama, first-year college courses may be taken by means of educational TV. There has been enough experience in using the system to learn that certain students who come into college as sophomores may do better scholastically than do those who had been freshmen on the campus, because the former had the desire to do the hard work necessary.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has made reference to Dr. Erling S. Jorgenson, director of the Montana educational television project at Missoula, Mont., who appeared before the committee of the Senator from Washington, along with my distinguished colleague [Mr. MERCALF], and urged enactment of the legislation.

I note that Dr. Jorgenson made an excellent case in urging enactment of the legislation, and showed how many

schools in Montana are isolated by rugged terrain and are located considerable distances from population centers.

I read from page 4 of the report:

As an example, Missoula, Mont., a city of approximately 33,000 has a country high school with an enrollment of 2,000.

I think the RECORD should show that it is a county high school, and not a country high school. I trust that, as a result of the testimony of Dr. Jorgenson and others, and by reason of the activity of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the bill will shortly be approved and sent to the House for action, because it is a worthwhile measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Dr. Jorgenson gave some excellent testimony on the problem as it affects a State like Montana, where there are great distances involved.

Paradoxically, States that are smaller in population, but which have the greatest number of square miles, need a measure such as is proposed more than do the States with larger population. In some States, cities have gone forward with such a program. The question is asked as to why the cities of the States cannot proceed with a program such as that proposed. In some cases they have, and in some cases they have not.

There was testimony that a very large city in this country is having difficulty in getting off the ground and on the air. It seems that perhaps, after a lot of work advantage will be taken of the channel available. It may take 15 years. Half a generation of schoolchildren will be involved in that time. We cannot afford to waste their talents.

I wish to say something about the networks. Senators ought to read the testimony they presented. I stated to them it was my hope that, if we can plant the seed corn, we shall have a fourth network in this country, an educational TV network, by means of which a school will be able to pick up a lecture by a great teacher, which would not be available to the school in any other way, and that a particular subject will be taught to pupils who otherwise would not have a teacher available.

The committee of which I am chairman has been in touch with representatives of the Federal Communications Commission about TV programs. It was the general consensus that progress in that direction had not been too good. I stated to the representatives of the net works that after the educational TV operators, the universities, and all concerned get together, the programs will have a tendency to be competitive with the commercial networks, and, being competitive, will have a tendency to raise the quality of network programs. The network officials agreed with me. They said they were in favor of it, because it would help them.

The new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has long been connected with a nonprofit group in this field in the State of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. Generally in that area, where there are country schools, the Ford Foundation has agreed to finance an experiment which would place an airplane 30,000

feet in the air, and have educational programs broadcast from the airplane under the auspices of Purdue University and a number of other educational groups. Two airplanes will be used. Two airplanes are going to broadcast educational TV programs during regular school hours, from 30,000 feet, which will cover 5,200,000 schoolchildren in that particular area, who otherwise would not have such facilities available.

People can take it or leave it, but the Ford Foundation was specific in having it understood that it could conduct such an operation only once, in order to test its operation. So far as I know, the program is proceeding very successfully.

In my hometown, the University of Washington has an educational TV station. It is the only one. It does not broadcast over the mountains to the eastern part of the State. It has been operating for 6 or 7 years. For 3 or 4 years, it could not get off the ground. The legislature meets only every 2 years. We lost 2 years in getting action from the legislature. It was a new idea. A very public spirited citizen, Mrs. A. Scott Bullitt, who owns a big TV station, and who was putting new equipment into her station KING, was told of the problem confronting the University of Washington, and she contributed the equipment. In this way the educational TV was given a boost to get off the ground.

That same slow process can happen in many places. I don't know whether it has happened in Montana or Illinois, but now the State Legislature appropriates money for that program every year in my State. I suspect the program is off the ground by now, but we lost 4 or 5 years before it got under way.

The same thing is happening all over the United States. Two hundred and fourteen of the finest channels in the spectrum have been lying idle for 10 years. If we don't do something about it pretty soon, I ask my colleagues if they do not think the commercial TV interests will be looking for a possible use for those channels.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, now that the Senator has got off the ground, I wonder if he can forebear me for a moment to make sure one observation gets into the RECORD?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no doubt the Senator from Illinois will get an observation into the RECORD, regardless, because he usually succeeds in doing so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been very successful so far.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have two observations. First, the distinguished Senator from Washington has referred to this proposal as seed corn. Believe me, \$50 million is a lot of seed corn for States ranging all the way from Rhode Island to Texas or Alaska or Hawaii. Second, I fought a similar bill last year. The former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was opposed to it; and, interestingly enough, the bill this year is identical with the bill of last year, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is still opposing it, as appears on page 164 of the hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yielded to the Senator, but I was about to discuss that matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought I would put that statement into the RECORD, since I have had such difficulty getting the floor.

The Secretary discusses this in his letter written on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1961, to our illustrious and distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from the State of Washington.

Since these things always appear in the hearings in such small type that trifocal and bifocal men, like me, have difficulty reading the print, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to our distinguished chairman be printed in the body of the RECORD in the customary type as a part of my remarks, so that all who run may read.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to read the letter to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I can proceed with my discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to have the letter printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
March 17, 1961.

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

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

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

S. 205 is identical to S. 12, 86th Congress, which passed the Senate on April 13, 1959. The purpose of the instant bill—to expedite the development of the educational uses of television—is one which this Department endorses. There is no necessity in this report to again review the progress in the development of educational television broadcasting. We recognize that, heartening as this progress has been, much more needs to be accomplished in order to take advantage of the enormous potential of television for the improvement and extension of educational opportunities in all parts of the country. We also recognize that a major obstacle to the accomplishment of this objective is the high initial cost of equipment and the shortage of funds for meeting such costs. Nevertheless, the Department feels that there needs to be additional consideration of the entire problem in order to determine the most effective methods of providing Federal assistance for this purpose.

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

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

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

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

Accordingly, we recommend against enactment of S. 205.

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

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to say, as an aside—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the Senator will permit me to conclude, in one sentence. The Secretary says:

Accordingly, we recommend against enactment of S. 205.

I find myself now holding up the hands of the new Secretary of the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I simply say, as an aside, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Illinois concerning the fine print in all our reports. I think the fine print of letters from departments, in our reports which is always customary, and the telephone book have contributed more to forcing Senators to wear glasses than any other thing of which I know. I think the people who print them are in league with the optometrists.

I suggested at one time to the Joint Committee on Printing, that we should print the letters in even bolder type, but I was told it would cost too much. Again it was said, it would cost too much.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I finish my opening statement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to pursue what the Senator from Illinois said.

Is the letter of the present Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare included in the report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is on page 164.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it in the report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois will bear with me a minute, I shall conclude my statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The letter is printed in the hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sent a letter on March 17, which was Friday.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why was the letter not printed in the report?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because the report was printed prior to that time.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the letter, which I intend to read to the Senate, if I may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the committee report the bill without obtaining a recommendation from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We asked the Department, a long time ago, to appear. We asked the Department during the hearings to appear, and Department representatives did not appear because they had not formulated their position.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the bill was recommended favorably without the committee having had an opinion, before the recommendation was made, as to what was the judgment of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill was reported after the committee had written to the Secretary on two occasions. Apparently the Secretary did not wish to testify. He suggested to me that the Department would testify when the bill went to the House of Representatives. The letter was written March 17. I saw it only this morning, because it arrived this past weekend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The report was filed March 14?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The letter was written March 17.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

We asked the Department on January 12 to send us their position.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I am trying to make is that ordinarily we wait for the department of Government which is particularly concerned with a bill to express its opinion. In this case the committee recommended passage of the bill before it heard from the Secretary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not an absolutely accurate statement of fact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thought the Senator said he received the letter on the 17th.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee ordinarily waits to get recommendations from the departments. We ask the department representatives to appear, and we ask for their comments. We wait a reasonable time, sometimes a long time.

On January 12 we asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for an opinion. We waited almost 6 weeks. We assumed the Department representatives did not wish to appear.

The Department was later again asked to appear.

The committee often passes bills with respect to which executive departments have not made comments. When an executive department is asked to do so time and time again, and does not make comments, we assume that either the Department has no interest in the bill, or for some good reason does not wish to testify.

Any implication that the committee was trying to report the bill to the Senate because it had not heard from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is simply not the fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator refers to the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who had not answered by letter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to finish my colloquy?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish my opening remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely said it is rather abnormal for a committee to file a report without having in the report an opinion of the department of Government which is most vitally concerned. I do not think the Senator from Washington would challenge the correctness of that statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can show the Senator hundreds of reports on bills, with respect to which there has been no communication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would be abnormal and unusual if the committee filed a report without asking the

Department representatives to appear, and without allowing the Department a reasonable time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The hearings were conducted on March 1 and 2?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. That is almost 2 months after the request went to the Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The report was filed on the 14th of March, and the letter was written on the 17th of March?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it is very vital, at least for the people of the country, to know that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the Kennedy administration says the bill should not be passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not quite the fact. I will read the letter, and the letter will speak for itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on a more tranquil subject?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to hold hearings away from the city of Washington, D.C., today.

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

UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION FACILITIES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges and in adult training programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for his courtesy. I assure the Senator that a degree of legislative independence on occasion is refreshing to the body and to the soul.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I hope we can maintain independence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I compliment the Senator from Washington for his fine work in regard to the bill. It surely has my enthusiastic and wholehearted support.

When the letter is read I am sure it will be clear that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be amenable to the many fine recommendations of the Senator from Washington, who is able to persuade even those who have deep doubts on most serious questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Secretary says in his letter that this is a proposal with obvious merit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With "obvious merit"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. With obvious merit, yes. On its face the proposal has obvious merit.

Mr. President, this is the same sort of letter which was sent to the Congress last year by the Department, in which the Department suggested it should study the proposal a little longer. It was said, in effect, "This is a good bill. Perhaps this ought to be done in some other way."

This is exactly what I am trying to do. Let us get started. We have now lost 10 years in regard to the proposal. The Department could study it for a long time. All the Department has to do is to read the testimony. There is not a single bit of testimony against the proposal by any witness who appeared in open hearing in three long hearings, after people were notified weeks in advance or months in advance of the hearings.

I do not know why Mr. Ribicoff sent the letter on St. Patrick's Day. [Laughter.] But that is what happened. The Secretary was invited to testify. We asked the Secretary to testify.

Frankly, it was my informal understanding with the Secretary, who was going to look into the proposal, since it was new to him, that the Department was going to look it over and perhaps testify before the committee of the House of Representatives. I suppose they are planning to do so. The House committee is starting hearings on the bill today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to hear what is in the letter. I have not seen the letter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall put it in the RECORD in full. I was trying to finish my opening statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator read the letter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a very short statement.

The authority under this legislation will expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this bill.

Nine years have passed since the FCC originally set aside 242 TV channels—268 today—or approximately 12 percent of all TV channels in the United States for noncommercial educational use. In this period, only 54 educational stations have been constructed. These stations serve a wide area, but it is estimated that two-thirds of the population of the United States have no access to educational television. Yet, in the same period we have seen a rapid growth in the number of commercial television stations and in the number of homes that can be reached by it.

Of course, in 10 years the sale of television sets available to the people has increased. Not only would the educational programs be a great value to children, but also a great number of adults would benefit from them. We have no estimate of the number of such adults, and I suppose we never could get such an estimate.

It is apparent from the data supplied to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the failure of the educators to utilize the unused

educational reservations is not the result of a lack of interest, desire, planning, or zeal on their part. It is apparent that the largest problem facing the educators today in making use of television is the lack of funds to pay for the basic installation of the transmitting apparatus.

Experience demonstrates once a station has been built, State legislatures, local educational systems, and local communities raise the funds to produce the programming and operate the stations. It is indeed a credit to those people who have labored in this field to look back and view the remarkable progress that has been made in establishing the 54 stations that are now serving more than 50 million people.

This legislation would create, in a sense, a Federal-State cooperative matching fund program which would set a constructive tone in this most important field of education. At the time when the Nation's educational program is being severely taxed by a serious serious teacher shortage, rapidly rising enrollments, and inadequate facilities, it is imperative that every avenue and approach be tried in order to alleviate this problem.

The Federal Communications Commission, in furtherance of this educational program, should offer upon request assistance and advice to the State-approved agencies which receive these Federal funds. Such assistance and advice, it is felt, will enable the States to better utilize funds. However, it is to be understood the FCC is not to exercise any control of funds allotted under this program.

We all know that television is a powerful means of communications. This bill is intended to launch our country generally upon the path of bringing into our educational system the tremendous advantage and opportunity afforded by the television medium. Time is of the essence.

AMENDMENT

As a protection against waste or improper use of funds, the committee has adopted the amendment recommended by the General Accounting Office which requires recipients of the grants to keep records that would fully disclose the disposition of funds and authorize the Commissioner of Education and the Comptroller General or authorized representatives to have access to such records for the purpose of audit and examination. The amendment requires the grantees to establish proper accounting procedures and at the same time eliminates any doubt as to the authority of the GAO to audit the books.

No problem of whether the program would benefit private or public schools is involved. Anyone could take advantage of the program who wished to do so. Educational TV would go deeply into the education program of all types of schools, because children are children, and they need to be educated.

In urban centers, particularly in New York, Chicago, and other similar areas, adults would use the proposed facility for the study of languages and other subjects, and it is estimated that the number of such adult listeners would be