Mr. CAREY. I will be glad to try to do that, Mr. Chairman.

I think what we are considering here in the way of a concept is a corporation which would have very broad latitude to develop programs of a high and useful quality, and what concerns everybody, as we have struggled with problems of long-range financing, is the problem of balancing the objective of really complete freedom of such a corporation on the one hand and the conventional sanctions and controls that normally go with direct Federal Government support and financing.

It is a kind of no-man's land there somewhere. We believe that the Congress and the President ought to, at intervals, certainly, examine and reappraise what is going on in public broadcasting. I think they have that responsibility.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is a better way to do just that than to take a look at how the funds are being expended?

Mr. CAREY. I think this is right.

Mr. MACDONALD. If you have an alternative, I would like to hear it.

Mr. CAREY. I think we are saying that as far as our thinking has gone, and certainly everything I am trying to say this morning comes under that title, as far as thinking has gone—it hasn't gone too far—we think that at this point the Congress and the Executive would want to decide the intervals at which they both would examine these activities, whether they be annual intervals, whether they be triennial or quintenniel intervals, but not breathe so hard on the back of the Corporation at every decision.

Mr. MACDONALD. Traditionally, it does not go beyond 3 years. We are not about to give you an open-ended thing and say, "Okay, it is a great idea. Go ahead and do it," with no supervision over public funds. I am sure you would agree that that is correct.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Coston might have some points on this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would be happy to hear from him.

Mr. COSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think you have identified one of the very key issues that was raised in the hearing when the bill was originally discussed. It was the question of how you strike a balance between insulation by the Corporation from unwarranted Government interferences on the one hand, and how you retain your stewardship and responsibility for proper use of tax moneys.

This committee, I think very wisely, did a number of things. First of all, they limited the authorization to 1 year, so that the committee would have a chance to take a look at it again, to see just how it got set up.

Second, the committee inserted extensive provisions requiring audit and oversight by the General Accounting Office, so that the GAO will continue to exercise responsibility for overseeing the financial activities of the Corporation.

At the same time, the committee went the other way in attempting to insulate the Corporation by first providing for a Board which could not be dominated by any political party. It prohibited the Corporation from engaging in political activities. It wrote in its committee report some very persuasive language which I would like to quote at this point. It said:

> One of the fundamental reasons for establishing the Corporation is to remove the program activity from governmental supervision. The educational stations