



WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

JUL 17 1978

LIBRARY.



BOX 54, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002 • TEL. 202-547-4440
TWX 710-822-1976 ISSN: 0001-1746

Vol. 30

June 23, 1978

No. 6

: All or any part of the ALA Washington Newsletter :
: _____ may be reprinted for distribution _____ :

C O N T E N T S

Approp. '79 - Labor-HEW, ACTION NEEDED	p. 1	Rehabilitation Act Extension	p. 6
Approp. '79 - NHPRC, NEA & NEH	p. 2	ACTION NEEDED	p. 6
Approp. '79 - LC, ACTION NEEDED	p. 3	LSCA Proposed Regs	p. 6
Medical Libraries	p. 4	Copyright	p. 7
ESEA Extension	p. 5	Telecommunications	p. 7
		*Grants-Telecommunications Demo.	p. 7

Attachments: Copyright Press Release; Communications Act of 1978

Appropriations, FY 1979 - Labor-HEW

By a vote of 338-61 the House passed the FY 1979 Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (HR 12929, H. Rept. 95-1248) on June 13. Soon after, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee concluded its series of markup sessions on the bill, reaching major library programs on June 21. A brief comparison of the Senate subcommittee recommendations with the House-passed bill and FY 1978 funding is shown below. Both the House and the Senate subcommittee deferred funding for the Medical Library Assistance Act because a new authorization is needed. Bills extending the program are pending in both chambers.

	<u>FY 1978</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>FY 1979</u> <u>House Bill</u>	<u>FY '79 Senate</u> <u>Subcommittee</u>
<u>Elementary & Secondary Educ. Act</u>			
Title IV-B, School Libraries	\$167,600,000**	\$175,000,000**	\$185,000,000**
<u>Higher Education Act</u>			
Title II-A, College Lib. Resources	9,975,000	9,975,000	9,975,000
II-B, Training	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
II-B, Demonstrations	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
II-C, Research Libraries	5,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000
VI-A, Undergrad. Educ. Equip.	7,500,000	-0-	-0-
<u>Library Services & Construction Act</u>			
Title I, Public Library Services	56,900,000	60,000,000	65,000,000
II, Construction	-0-	-0-	-0-
III, Interlibrary Cooperation	3,337,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
<u>Medical Library Assistance Act</u>	7,987,000	deferred	deferred
<u>National Library of Medicine</u>	28,759,000	31,887,000	35,000,000
<u>National Comm. on Lib. & Info. Science</u>	563,000	648,000	648,000

** Advance funded program

Senate subcommittee members responsible for increases over the House amounts should be thanked by their constituents for their actions. The \$10 million increase in ESEA IV-B funding was suggested by subcommittee chairman Warren Magnuson (D-WA) and supported by Sen. Edward Brooke (R-MA), the ranking minority member. Sen. Brooke was also responsible for the \$5 million increase in LSCA Title I. An increase in HEA II-C research library funding was requested by Sen. Thomas Eagleton (D-MO). A \$2 million increase was accepted, although Sen. Quentin Burdick (D-ND) questioned the need for the program.

On the House floor the budgets of several departments were slashed across the board as members reacted to the California taxpayers' revolt and similar sentiments across the country. On the Labor-HEW Appropriation bill the House accepted by a vote of 220-181 an amendment offered by Rep. Clarence Miller (R-OH) making a 2 percent overall cut. The reduction would affect all programs not mandated by law for a total of about \$800 million. For education and library programs, carrying out the cut would be at the discretion of the Commissioner, except that no appropriation account, activity or project could be cut by more than 5 percent to achieve the overall 2 percent reduction. An amendment offered by Rep. Robert Michel (R-IL), and agreed to by a vote of 290-87, reduced the level of funding in the bill by \$1 billion limited to those areas in which fraud, abuse and waste had been identified.

Defeated by voice vote was an amendment by Rep. George O'Brien (R-IL) that sought to add \$225 million for the removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped in elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, public libraries, and vocational rehabilitation centers. Included was \$25 million for LSCA Title II.

ACTION NEEDED: The full Senate Appropriations Committee is expected to consider HR 12929 shortly after returning from the July 4 recess. Librarians concerned about any of the Senate subcommittee amounts should contact members of the full Appropriations Committee (see list attached to March 17 newsletter) while the Senators are home during the week of July 3. In particular, urban library supporters should press for a full committee amendment increasing the LSCA Title I figure so that the final amount after conference with the House will be high enough to give the new urban library provision a good start.

Appropriations, FY 1979 - NHPRC

The Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill (HR 12930, H. Rept. 95-1249) passed the House on June 7, and included \$4 million for FY 1979 for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The budget request was \$3.5 million, but the bill contains the full \$4 million authorized for the NHPRC, which provides grants to publish and preserve source materials significant to U.S. history. In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee ordered its version reported on June 15--also containing \$4 million for NHPRC. ALA had urged approval of \$4 million in testimony filed with both the House and Senate committees this spring.

Appropriations, FY 1979 - NEA and NEH

The Interior Department appropriations bill (HR 12932, H. Rept. 95-1251), passed by the House on June 21, includes the full budget requests for the National Endowment on the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment on the Humanities (NEH), both of which provide funding opportunities for libraries. The bill would provide for NEA \$102,160,000 in program areas, \$30 million in matching grants, and \$30 million in challenge grants. For NEH it would provide \$98,300,000 in program areas, \$27 million in matching grants, and \$27 million in challenge grants requiring each federal dollar to be matched by 3 nonfederal dollars.

Appropriations, FY 1979 - Library of Congress

A House-passed amendment cutting Congress' own funding by 5 percent would reduce the Library of Congress budget by \$8.7 million--below current service levels in some cases. Before passing the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill (HR 12935) on June 14, the House approved by a vote of 220-168 an across-the-board 5 percent reduction (no single program more than 10 percent) proposed by Rep. Silvio Conte (R-MA).

The criticism of LC networking activities contained in the House Appropriations Committee report (H. Rept. 95-1254) as reported in the May 31 newsletter was mitigated somewhat by an explanation delivered on the floor by Rep. Adam Benjamin (D-IN). Benjamin, who presided at the LC budget hearings earlier this year, commented as follows:

....on page 24 of the report, the committee included language cautioning the Library of Congress to control growth in its internal automation workloads and suggesting that outside agencies providing bibliographic data be utilized whenever possible. It should be pointed out that the committee did not mean that the Library of Congress should not share its enormous bank of bibliographic information with other libraries and information centers or that the library be precluded from continuing existing arrangements for online access with other libraries with which it has cooperative cataloging arrangements such as the Northwestern University Africana project or the research libraries group project. The committee did intend to remind the Library of its priorities and did not want these cooperative programs to interfere with its existing automation programs which were designed to assist the Congress in carrying out legislative functions.

However, in reply to these comments, Rep. Lawrence Coughlin (R-PA), also a member of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, raised some questions:

No one can dispute the need for the services of the Library of Congress. They are beneficial and they are good services. But as you look at the kind of taxpayers' revolt that is going on in the country now, you can ask the question I have always asked when that part of the appropriation bill comes up. What does the Library of Congress do for the man who is operating a press, or who is walking the streets, or who is working 8 hours a day in a factory? What does it really accomplish for him, because the appropriations for the Library of Congress, Mr. Chairman, in 10 years, have gone from \$37 million to \$193 million. And again I would repeat that, from \$37 million to \$193 million.

(The Benjamin and Coughlin comments are on pp. H5509-10 of the June 14 Congressional Record, daily edition.)

What the Library does for the man in the street through bibliographic support of his local public, school and college libraries will be hurt if the 5 percent cut remains intact through Senate consideration and final passage of the funding bill. Because the House allowed so few of LC's growing workload requests, the cut would not only wipe out expansion of programs but would require a reduction of services and personnel. For instance, for automated systems support LC requested an increase of \$6.3 million but the House approved only \$1.4 million, the amount needed to maintain the current level of service. A 5 percent reduction would cut that necessary increase in half and mean a definite retrenchment. Other areas would also be cut back below the current level--purchase and preparation of books, cataloging distribution service, reader services, preservation, central support services.

ACTION NEEDED: Congress admits only grudgingly that its Library is also a national library, and it does not fully understand LC's national role. The burden of explaining this role should not fall entirely on the Library itself. Although ALA regularly supports LC's budget and emphasizes its services to other libraries, the message will mean more if it comes from constituents directly. Write to your legislators and tell them how LC helps their constituents. Give specific local examples. For instance, how do LC products help your library better serve the "man in the street?"

The Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee has restored some of the requested increases not allowed by the House, but Senate reaction to the 5 percent overall cut is still uncertain. The full Senate Appropriations Committee has postponed consideration of the bill until after the July 4 recess. Write to Senate Appropriations Committee members immediately protesting the House cuts and urging approval of the LC budget as requested. If the Senate should reject the 5 percent reduction, it will still be a conference item later when House and Senate resolve their differences. Thus it's important also to write to the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee members who are likely to be on the conference committee. See the May 31 newsletter for more information on the LC budget, and the March 17 newsletter for lists of committee and subcommittee members.

Medical Libraries

On May 15 both the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Senate Human Resources Committee reported bills extending the Medical Library Assistance Act for three years. The Senate measure (S. 2450, S. Rept. 95-838) would authorize \$15 million for FY 1979, \$17 million for FY 1980, and \$20 million for FY 1981. The amounts authorized in the House bill (HR 12347, H. Rept. 95-1192) are \$15 million, \$16 million, and \$17 million. Both bills provide that appointments to the National Library of Medicine's Board of Regents be made by the Secretary of HEW rather than by the President as at present. This change was made to avoid long vacancies and to be consistent with the appointment process for comparable HEW advisory bodies.

The increased amounts provided in the Senate bill would, according to the Human Resources Committee report, "provide for substantial growth as the National Library of Medicine expands its research support for information transfer activities and moves ahead in training health professionals in the computer applications of medicine." The report comments further:

The committee feels that the Library of Medicine can play a much more aggressive role in the collection and dissemination of research findings directly relevant to clinical practice. A number of pilot projects are currently underway in this area, and offer great promise of providing clinicians information on the most up-to-date techniques and treatments. Many of these projects involve computer applications, and the committee hopes that these pioneering efforts can be expanded and upgraded in the next several years.

MLAA is among the programs the Senate committee considered "essentially non-controversial in nature, and...not related to the more basic biomedical research issues that will be taken up in next year's more extensive revisions of NIH authority."

ESEA Extension

With the availability of the Senate report (S. Rept. 95-856), the provisions of S. 1753 affecting school libraries and media centers can be described in more detail. The bill is a five-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and related programs, and was reported by the Senate Human Resources Committee on May 9. It has not yet been scheduled for floor action, and HR 15 is now not due for a House vote until after the July 4 recess.

Like the counterpart bill (HR 15) in the House, S. 1753 removes the guidance, counseling and testing component of ESEA IV-B to a new part IV-D. "Most of the witnesses," according to the Senate report, "...concurred that everyone would be better off if the resources and the personnel activities were not forced to compete with each other for funding." In addition the Senate bill has a new part E program for gifted and talented children, which builds upon the existing demonstration authority and authorizes a state-level program as well as discretionary grants.

There would be various funding triggers for Title IV programs. Part B, Instructional Materials and School Library Resources, would require funding at the preceding year's level. If this funding level was not met, the Commissioner would be directed to carry out programs under ESEA II and NDEA III as they existed in FY 1978. (The former ESEA II would be repealed and in its place a new Title II would emphasize improving competency in basic skills through various means including parental participation, the use of audiovisual technologies such as broadcast, cable, tape, film, etc., and assistance to the state to develop education proficiency standards.) The new part D would require funding at the preceding year's level or, in its first year, \$18 million. At least five percent of the amounts appropriated for Title IV must be set aside for the new part E.

Like the House measure S. 1753 repeals the requirement that a single application be filed for Title IV programs. The bill also strengthens provisions regarding participation of private school children, requiring the state to provide programs even if the local school district does not receive IV-B funds, and arranging for a bypass of the state agency if the state or LEA has substantially failed or was unwilling to provide for the participation of private school children.

The ESEA IV-C provisions relating to state administration would be removed, and a new Title V (State Leadership) established, consolidating state administration of ESEA I and IV. For state administration the bill authorizes such sums to provide 1.75 percent of the amounts allocated to a state and its LEAs under ESEA I and IV, or \$550,000 (\$87,500 for outlying areas), whichever is greater. However no state would receive less than it received under the separate setasides for FY 1978. An additional quarter of one percent may be provided for state monitoring, audit resolution, and enforcement. The new Title V provides for a single state application containing all necessary assurances. Local educational agencies would not be required to submit IV-B applications more than once every three years.

Under the General Education Provisions Act, S. 1753 makes changes in maintenance of effort requirements similar to those in HR 15 (described in the May 31 newsletter). In a somewhat different approach from HR 15, the Senate bill authorizes the Education Division to coordinate paperwork requests to eliminate unnecessary or duplicative data requirements. It also extends the authorization for the National Center for Education Statistics.

Rehabilitation Act Extension

The House passed on May 16 a bill (HR 12467, H. Rept. 95-1149) extending and amending the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and related programs. The measure authorizes the Secretary of HEW to provide technical assistance to public and private entities in removing architectural, transportation, and communication barriers to the handicapped. Such sums as necessary are authorized, and the Secretary could assist directly or by contract with state vocational rehabilitation agencies or experts or consultants. The concurrence of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board established by the bill would be required. An omnibus rehabilitation bill is pending in the Senate (S. 2600, S. Rept. 95-890), but it does not include financial assistance in removing architectural barriers.

Both bills include provisions for interpreter service for the deaf and reader services for the blind, the latter designed to help the blind participate more effectively in education and employment opportunities. According to the Senate report it is intended "that reading services to be provided will not duplicate or replace those programs already operational."

However, the Senate bill would also provide for rehabilitation services for older blind persons, a state grant program to be administered by the state vocational rehabilitation agency or the state blind commission. Eligible uses of funds would include distribution of talking books and tapes, brailled and large print books, Braille typewriters, talking book machines, cassette tape players and other special aids. Amounts authorized are \$10 million for FY 1979, \$20 million for FY 1980, \$30 million for FY 1981 and such sums as necessary for succeeding fiscal years. This section of S. 2600 would duplicate to a considerable extent the nationally coordinated program for blind and handicapped persons now administered by the Library of Congress' Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. About 65 percent of those served by the LC program are elderly.

ACTION NEEDED: Librarians concerned about such a duplication of an already existing and well-functioning service should write to Sen. Jennings Randolph who chairs the Handicapped Subcommittee (under the Human Resources Committee). Other members of the subcommittee are Senators Harrison Williams (D-NJ), Thomas Eagleton (D-MO), Robert Stafford (R-VT), and Orrin Hatch (R-UT).

LSCA Proposed Regulations

Proposed regulations to implement the 1977 amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act (PL 95-123) were published in the June 5 Federal Register (pp. 24333-4). The major changes to LSCA which the proposed regs implement are: 1) federal funds spent for administration must now be matched with state or other nonfederal funds, 2) the base year for meeting maintenance of effort requirements for services for handicapped and institutionalized persons is changed from FY 1971 to the second preceding fiscal year, and 3) additional emphasis is placed on strengthening major urban resource libraries (applicable only when appropriations for Title I exceed \$60 million). USOE's Office of Libraries and Learning Resources has sent copies of the proposed regs to state library agency heads and other officials. Comments are due on or before July 3 and should be sent to Elizabeth Hughey, USOE, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W. (ROB No. 3, Room 3022), Washington, D.C. 20202.

Copyright

ALA's Ad Hoc Copyright Subcommittee chaired by Nancy Marshall recently issued a press release reacting to the pamphlet, Photocopying by Academic, Public and Nonprofit Research Libraries, published in May by the Association of American Publishers and the Authors League of America. The pamphlet contains interpretations of the new copyright law which differ from opinions expressed by ALA and other national library associations according to the press release, the text of which is attached to this newsletter.

In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright Law (of education and library organizations) has issued both a press release and a statement, "Comments on AAP/ Authors' League Publication on Library Photocopying." The Ad Hoc Committee represented educational interests during the development of the new copyright law; its new chairperson is August Steinhilber, National School Boards Association. Inquiries may be addressed to him at NSBA, 1055 Thomas Jefferson St. N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20007. Eileen D. Cooke has been elected to the Ad Hoc Committee's Executive Planning Committee.

Telecommunications

Following 20 months of hearings and research by the House Communications Subcommittee, Chairman Lionel Van Deerlin (D-CA) introduced on June 8 a major revision of the Communications Act of 1934. See the attachment for a brief summary of the major provisions.

On May 15 bills amending and extending the Educational Broadcast Facilities program, the Telecommunications Demonstration program, and long-term financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting were reported by the Senate Commerce Committee (S. 2883, S. Rept. 95-858) and by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (HR 12605, H. Rept. 95-1178). An increased emphasis on nonbroadcast technologies runs throughout the measures and is reflected in their common title--the Public Telecommunications Financing Act of 1978, as opposed to "Public Broadcasting" in earlier versions. Both bills move the Educational Broadcast Facilities program from USOE to the new National Telecommunications and Information Administration in the Commerce Department, and increase the authorization level from \$30 million to \$40 million for each of fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981. Both bills authorize \$1 million, the current level, for FY 1979 for telecommunications demonstrations which would continue to be administered by HEW.

 * *Grants - Telecommunications Demonstrations *
 *
 * August 14 is the deadline for applications for HEW's Telecommunications *
 * Demonstration Program according to a notice in the June 15 Federal Register *
 * (pp. 25876-78). Up to five new projects are expected to be funded from the *
 * \$1 million available for FY 1978. Public and private nonprofit agencies, *
 * organizations and institutions may apply for grants to carry out telecommuni- *
 * cations demonstrations using nonbroadcast technology for the delivery of *
 * health, education and social services. Applications and regulations are *
 * available from: Grants Officer, Office of the Assistant Secretary for *
 * Planning and Evaluation, HEW, Rm. 405F, 200 Independence Ave., S.W., *
 * Washington, D.C. 20201. *
 *
 * *****

Attachments (2)



AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON OFFICE
BOX 54 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002
TELEPHONE: AREA CODE (202) 547-4440

EXECUTIVE
OFFICES:
50 EAST HURON ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60611

PRESS RELEASE

COPYRIGHT UPDATE

The Association of American Publishers, Inc. (AAP) and the Authors League of America, Inc. have recently issued a pamphlet entitled Photocopying by Academic, Public and Nonprofit Research Libraries. In the words of the authors, it is "A statement on library photocopying of journal articles and other short works under the new copyright law, interim guidances, and answers to questions frequently asked." The pamphlet contains interpretations of the new copyright law and accompanying guidelines similar to those found in an earlier publication by the same authors entitled Photocopying by Corporate Libraries. Both of these publications differ in several respects from opinions expressed, guidelines developed and steps taken by ALA and other national library associations to inform the library community of its rights and obligations under the new law.

The following provide assistance to the library community in copyright implementation:

Circular R21 (revised edition), Reproduction of Copyrighted Works by Educators and Librarians. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 20559, April 1978.

Peters, Marybeth. General Guide to the Copyright Act of 1976. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 20559, September 1977.

*ALA Washington Newsletter, November 15, 1976, special copyright issue, reprinted as Librarian's Guide to the New Copyright Law.

*"Copyright Law Prompts New ILL Form." American Libraries, October 1977. pp. 492-B - 492-C.

*"Warning Notices for Copies and Machines." American Libraries, November, 1977, p. 530,

*"Guidelines: Records of Interlibrary Photocopying Requests." American Libraries, December 1977, p. 624.

PRESS RELEASE (con't)

*"Guidelines for Seeking or Making a Copy of an Entire Copyrighted Work for a Library, Archives or User." Prepared by Implementation of the Copyright Revision Act Committee, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association.

*"Proposed Copyright Clearance Procedures for Photocopying." Prepared by American Library Association and Association of Research Libraries, October 1977.

*The New Copyright Law: Questions Teachers and Librarians Ask. American Library Association, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Education Association, December 1977.

*North, William D. An Interim Look at the Copyright Revision Act of 1976, American Library Association, 1977.

"Copyright, Media, and the School Librarian." School Media Quarterly, Spring 1978, pp. 192A-P. (Reprints \$2.00 each from American Association of School Librarians, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.)

Also of interest:

*Holley, Edward G. "A Librarian Looks at the New Copyright Law." American Libraries, May 1977, pp. 247-251.

*Flacks, Lewis I. "Living in the Gap of Ambiguity; an Attorney's Advice to Librarians on the Copyright Law." American Libraries, May 1977, pp. 252-257.

Librarians should remember that unilateral guidelines, independently issued, have no validity under the law. Our present responsibilities are 1) to live with the law and guidelines as they were approved by Congress and as they exist today, and 2) to develop recording, documenting and reporting procedures for the five-year review by the Register of Copyrights mandated by Subsection 108(i).

This review, rather than additional statements and unilateral interim guidelines issued by the publishing/author community, will adequately protect the interests of both library users and copyright owners.

(Signed) Ad Hoc Copyright Subcommittee
of the ALA Legislation Committee

*Available in Librarian's Copyright Kit Order Department, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611 (\$7.00).



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 95th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 124

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1978 No. 87 P. H 5231

House of Representatives

INTRODUCTION OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1978

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) and I are introducing what we ambitiously call the Communications Act of 1978. It is the result of some 20 months of hearings and research by our Subcommittee on Communications. It goes into all phases of communications, and into rapidly changing technologies in the United States.

I would implore all the Members to withhold making commitments to anyone on any part of this proposed act until they have seen the result of more hearings, and have listened to all the arguments.

Mr. Speaker, this bill marks the first effort in 44 years to rewrite the communications laws of the land. It would repeal the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which forms the basis for all Federal regulation of telecommunications.

Our Communications Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee will begin hearings next month, and expects to complete 6 weeks of consideration of this landmark legislation by the end of the year.

By early next year, a sufficient record should have been compiled to allow expeditious action by the Commerce Committee and the full House.

The bill is 217 pages long, and as vast in scope as its length suggests. Many aspects will be highly controversial, but taken together they promise new directions in the unfolding of communications policies. In an era of sweeping technological change, the old Communications Act is as outmoded as the horse-and-buggy.

Because of the great interest in this legislation, I am at this point including a summary of its major provisions:

HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1978

REORGANIZATION

1. Abolishes the Federal Communications Commission, replacing it with a Communications Regulatory Commission, and makes a finding that regulation should be necessary only "to the extent marketplace forces are deficient."

2. Sets up the National Telecommunications Agency, as an independent policy-making arm of the Executive Branch, replacing the National Telecommunications and Information Administration in the Commerce Department.

BROADCASTING

3. Deregulates radio; licenses would be for indefinite terms, subject to revocation only for violations of technical rules.

4. Extends television license terms from three to five years, but they also would become indefinite 10 years after enactment of bill.

5. Replaces the "Fairness Doctrine" with the "Equity Principle" applicable only to television.

6. Exempts candidates for President, Vice President, U.S. Senate, and other statewide offices from equal time requirements (which also would apply only to television).

7. Limits multiple ownership to five radio and five television stations and provides that no individual may own more than three TV stations in the top-50 markets—no divestiture would be required, however; these provisions would take effect at time of transfer or sale. Owners may now hold up to 21 stations—seven TV (no more than five of which can be VHF), seven AM radio and seven FM radio.

8. Restricts ownership of broadcast stations to one per market.

9. Establishes a license fee that would reflect both the cost of processing the license application and the value of the spectrum occupied by the user (applies to broadcasting and nonbroadcasting services).

10. Creates the "Telecommunications Fund" with the license fees collected; fund would support the Communications Regulatory Commission and new programs for aiding public broadcast programming, minority ownership of stations and the development of telecommunications services in rural areas.

CABLE

11. Prohibits federal regulation of cable television.

COMMON CARRIER

12. Allows any common carrier (defined in the bill as "any person engaged in the transmission of telecommunications for hire") to provide any service, through a separate company, which the Communications Regulatory Commission finds to be telecommunications or related to telecommunications; this would have the effect of freeing AT&T from the restraints of a 1958 consent decree under which the telephone company can use its equipment only to provide telephone service and is prohibited from providing unregulated services.

13. Requires any monopoly carrier (for example, AT&T) to divest itself of equipment manufacturing (for example, Western Electric) within three years after enactment.

14. Establishes the "Universal Service Compensation Fund," financed by access charges on carriers using local exchange facilities; Communications Regulatory Commission would administer fund to assure "affordable" telephone rates and the availability of nationwide basic voice telephone service.

15. Creates a task force to coordinate international telecommunications facility planning.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

16. Replaces the Corporation for Public Broadcasting with a private non-profit corporation to be known as the "Public Tele-

communications Programming Endowment," sole purpose of which would be to provide grants for production and acquisition of programming.

17. Removes restrictions on editorializing and endorsement of political candidates by public broadcasters.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I am pleased at this time to yield to the able gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications in introducing the Communications Act of 1978 and in asking the Members of Congress to look at this legislation thoroughly. It is one of the few bills I have seen that really takes us toward deregulation and gets away from government controls; it relies on competition in the marketplace in all phases of telecommunications.

It is a comprehensive act bill which, I hope, will be the foundation for a national communications policy. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to have been able to cosponsor this act, and I hope to see it passed.

MR. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1978

HR 13015, a major revision of the Communications Act of 1934, was introduced June 8 by Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin (D-CA), Chairman of the House Communications Subcommittee, and Louis Frey (R-FL), ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Van Deerlin's introductory statement includes a summary of the main provisions of the bill, which covers all aspects of telecommunications.