

tal with the medical school, municipal services with those of other cities, rural villages with the opera house, and each with the other—a network for knowledge which will eventually serve not only higher education but all of the health, education, and welfare needs of our Nation.

Furthermore, with the facilities provided by such a network and the presently available technology of the satellite, it should be possible and within the discretionary authority of the Commissioner to plan for the interconnection of this network with those of other nations in order to create the kind of world knowledge network to which the President made reference in his state of the Union message last January.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Meaney. Yours is a most helpful statement. There are three things that stand out in your statement to me. They are, first, your stress on the importance of software; second, your emphasis on careful planning; and third, your concern that institutions that are not necessarily colleges and universities be brought into the network.

I think this question of planning is especially important and I would hope, speaking for myself, that if we can get any money for this title, at the outset, we put stress on the planning.

In this connection, let me raise a couple of questions with you in rhetorical form. Would it not be essential for colleges and universities who are interested in taking part in such a network to make an inventory of their own resources in terms of faculty, in terms of curriculum, in terms of student body as well as in terms of equipment and facilities; not only at their own institutions but clear across the State or region which would participate in any proposed network?

I would have thought that kind of inventory or self-evaluation would be essential, otherwise, you would not know what it was you wanted to do.

Would you make any comment on that and then maybe make a comment on the extent to which this kind of planning is already going on in the hope that we will move in this direction?

Mr. MEANY. I can specifically for two States. Last year I was codirector of a feasibility survey for a State network, telecommunications network in Texas, and at the present time I am in the State of Indiana overseeing the development of this network.

In Texas I found that with a minimum amount of study funds from our coordinating board for higher education, only \$20,000, approximately, we could make only a very surface kind of survey to determine the interest of the institutions around the State, public and private, in such interconnection possibility.

The kind of in-depth survey that you are referring to that would get reactions from departments, from faculty, inventory equipment, on the local campuses, and so on, is exactly the kind of planning function that should be done but which requires more money than was available in this instance in Texas.

Now in the State of Indiana more funds were available. As you know, the legislature provided \$600,000 for the biennium to begin this telecommunications network. The leading thinkers in this development at Purdue, at Indiana University, have done more of an