

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 6

MARCH 29, 1966, TO APRIL 18, 1966

(PAGES 6873 TO 8284)

Our company observes its 50th birthday this year with a minimum of confetti but with a great deal of pride. We feel the problem of recognition and support of the maritime industry, of which we are a part, will someday be accepted and implemented because it is in the national interest. We will continue to speak out on this issue, work diligently, persevere, exercise ingenuity, and grow. We look forward eagerly to the opportunities of the future. We subscribe to the American dream of a contented and prosperous family of nations—and you may be sure that Todd will be ready, as always, to serve the ships of that community.

**FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM**

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the superintendent of schools of Baltimore City which well documents the reason that many of us, following the leadership of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] support the restoration of funds for the national school lunch program and the school milk program.

In this letter, Superintendent Paquin demonstrates in dollars and cents the adverse impact which these cuts would have on the children in Baltimore public schools. He says:

Our present subsidized program has not only proved popular but has done much to encourage children to drink milk and eat balanced meals by making it available at a price they can afford.

I ask unanimous consent that Superintendent Paquin's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Baltimore, Md., March 18, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I would like to express my concern over the decrease in funds budgeted for the Department of Agriculture. The proposed cut in funds from the 1966 appropriation for the national school lunch program from \$202 to \$183 million and the cut in the special milk program from \$103 to \$21 million will hamper our school program.

Specifically, these reductions will reduce the lunch subsidy from \$.04 to \$.03 per lunch—a decrease of 25 percent. Furthermore, the reduction of commodities, when added to the reduced subsidy, will make a lunch cost rise necessary. Price increase would diminish the number of purchases and create even higher costs.

Cafeteria service in the Baltimore City Public Schools is operated on a nonprofit basis and at present, we are able to serve a balanced lunch for \$.30 to elementary pupils and \$.35 to secondary pupils. Our cafeterias serve between 27,000 and 30,000 lunches daily, and sell 30,000 bottles of milk in addition to those served with lunches. Schools without cafeterias are selling between 13,000 and 15,000 bottles of milk daily. In addition to these services, we operate a nutrition program for needy children. With funds given us by the local government, the present subsidy enables us to provide needy pupils with 5,386 bottles of free milk and 1,103 free lunches daily.

Our present subsidized program has proved not only popular but has done much to encourage children to drink milk and eat bal-

anced meals by making them available at a price they can afford. In addition to being an important means of improving the health and strength of the Nation, good nutrition is an essential factor in the learning process.

I urge you to do what you can to restore the proposed cuts. The national school lunch program and the special school milk program are two of the most valuable programs provided by the Federal Government for the children in our schools. At a time when schools are being given increased aid in many areas, it seems a questionable move to propose cuts in essential programs as basic as those involving nutritional needs.

Sincerely yours,  
LAURENCE G. PAQUIN,  
Superintendent.

**TWENTY-FIFTH AMENDMENT IS MAKING PROGRESS**

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate the progress made by the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

On July 6, 1965, Congress submitted this amendment to the several States after giving it overwhelming approval.

The amendment, which is designed to solve problems relating to Presidential inability and vacancies in the office of Vice President, has been making remarkable progress. The States have been acting upon it at a rate that now holds out a glimmer of hope that it may be ratified during this calendar year.

To date, 29 States have acted favorably upon the amendment. Nine more must still ratify the amendment before it becomes a part of our fundamental law.

For the information of my colleagues, let me list the States which have ratified in order of their actions.

Those ratifying during 1965 were: Nebraska, July 12; Wisconsin, July 13; Oklahoma, July 16; Massachusetts, August 9; Pennsylvania, August 18; Kentucky, September 15; Arizona, September 22; Michigan, October 5; Indiana, October 20; California, October 21; Arkansas, November 4; New Jersey, November 29; Delaware, December 7.

Those which have ratified the amendment in 1966 to date, include:

Utah, January 17; West Virginia, January 20; Maine, January 24; Rhode Island, January 28; Colorado, February 3; New Mexico, February 3; Kansas, February 8; Vermont, February 17; Alaska, February 18; Georgia, February 18; Idaho, February 25; Hawaii, March 3; Virginia, March 9; Mississippi, March 10; New York, March 14; and Maryland, March 23.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that a sufficient number of other States will act as quickly as possible on the amendment so that the potential dangers created by this gap in our Constitution may be permanently averted.

**NEW DEPARTURE IN FOREIGN AID**

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the President's proposal to create a binational educational foundation in India, endowed with U.S.-held excess Indian rupees, is an important innovation in U.S. economic assistance. It offers the most constructive solution to what was

promising to become an acute problem to the developing countries and to the United States—the problem of amassed U.S.-owned local currencies accumulated from sales of surplus U.S. agricultural products overseas. That problem in India, through the President's proposal, has been turned into a positive asset.

The balance of U.S.-owned Indian rupees reserved for U.S. uses amounted to \$576.5 million at the end of 1965. The United States uses for official U.S. Government purposes and programs only about \$40 million each year. Only a limited amount of the remaining funds can be converted into other currencies for programs in third countries without causing serious harm to the Indian economy.

The foundation would be established by agreement between the United States and Indian Governments. The President has proposed that \$300 million of the funds designated for U.S. uses be applied to the initial endowment of the foundation. In addition, funds would come from the Government of India and through contributions of foreign exchange from private sources. No U.S. dollar expenditures would be involved.

Each rupee will multiply in value many times over by the impact of such a foundation on the lives of the Indian people. Much like the educational opportunities opened to the people of this Nation by our major private foundations, it will support experimentation and innovation in basic educational development. It will place particular emphasis on the improvement of agricultural education and technology to meet India's pressing food needs.

As a private institution, directed by outstanding leaders of both the United States and India, the foundation will inject renewed direction into the Indian structure by encouraging private efforts to work toward the realization of India's fullest development capacity. It will be able to bypass political, economic, and social pressures which tend to inhibit the ability of the Indian Government to deal effectively with the present problems in education and agriculture.

The President has proposed an imaginative program which realizes many of the recommendations made by Congress and the executive branch over the past several years in studying the problem of U.S.-owned excess foreign currencies. I hope that this united effort with the people of India will serve as a model for future foreign assistance programs.

**THE INDO-AMERICAN BINATIONAL FOUNDATION**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's proposal yesterday for the establishment of an Indo-American binational foundation is wonderful news for all supporters of Indian development and Indian-American cooperation.

And it is a landmark step forward in our efforts to use our vast holdings of Indian rupees in ways which will benefit both India and the United States, by investing them in the development of the agricultural, educational, and scientific

resources of the world's largest democracy.

Since my trip to India, I have become increasingly concerned with the problem posed by these American rupee holdings. As of December 31, 1965, the U.S. Government owned a total of \$586.2 million in rupees in the fund reserved for U.S. uses. In addition, we held \$732 million in an account from which we make development loans to the Indian Government. If we add these two amounts together, we presently hold better than \$1.3 billion in rupees, or more than 15 percent of India's total supply of money.

And this amount has been rapidly growing. Chester Bowles, our brilliant Ambassador to India, has estimated that by the end of 1966 our U.S. uses fund would grow to \$675 million. Since he made this calculation, it has become evident that the need for expanded Public Law 480 sales to meet India's famine will make rupees flow into our hands ever faster, and it has now been calculated by the Treasury Department that by July 1967, our U.S. uses balance will grow to \$845 million. This means that, even if our country uses balance did not grow at all, we would have a total of \$1.6 billion in rupees by the middle of next year if nothing was done.

These massive holdings have made the United States a juicy political target for Communists and other anti-American groups. In a recent Indian Parliament debate, the Communist leader of the upper house, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, attacked the present Indian Government for "mortgaging India to the United States." Others joined in this charge; one outspoken Member of Parliament reportedly said:

Not another ounce of American wheat. They are trying to enslave us. We would rather starve first.

India's outstanding Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Subramaniam, blunted this attack by replying:

If the honorable member will provide the example, I am sure that the people will be glad to follow.

But still our large rupee holdings remain an acute embarrassment to the Indian Government, and to all Indians who want to make cooperation with the United States a major tenet of their foreign policy.

The binational foundation announced by the President yesterday evening is a bold, progressive step which strikes at the heart of this problem, and transforms \$300 million of our rupees from an unwanted curse to an undiluted blessing.

The President has announced that we will take \$300 million in rupees from our U.S. uses fund and invest it in the future of India and Indo-American cooperation. These rupees will provide the endowment for a foundation which will, in the President's words, "be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning—to advance science—to encourage research—to develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory—to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems."

I think it is fitting that our Nation should join with the largest democracy in the world in this joint undertaking, a new effort to attack the problems of poverty, hunger, and deprivation which plague this great friend of ours.

I had proposed the creation of such a foundation in my bill S. 2826, the World Hunger Act. I had proposed that the Congress provide specific legislative authorization for the organization of binational foundations for the improvement of agriculture in countries where we have excess currency holdings. However, if the same purpose can be accomplished by administrative action, then I am wholeheartedly in favor of this approach. For what counts is not how we act, but whether we act to invest our rupee holdings in the future of India and the future of cooperation between our two countries.

I am particularly pleased that the President has made the promotion of agricultural progress one of the main purposes of this foundation. The work of American foundations in India in support of the intensive agricultural district program there is clear evidence that such a foundation can act as a catalyst to spark needed innovations in Indian agriculture.

The Indo-American Foundation will bring the United States and India together in a joint endeavor, which will involve not only the Governments of the two countries but the private sectors of their economies as well.

It will be chartered under Indian law and its principal offices will be in India. However, the plan wisely provides for a joint governing board of 18 persons—9 Indian and 9 American. These people will be men and women of stature and broad experience, drawn particularly from the ranks of education, science, and the professions.

In its first 5 years, the Foundation will have an Indian chairman of the board and an American chief executive officer. Thereafter, one of these offices will be filled by an Indian and one by an American.

The governing Board will decide most questions by a majority vote. In other words, it will be a democratic organization in the best tradition, with every safeguard to insure that the views of both cooperating nations are reflected in its decisions and actions. The result should be programs which meet public and private needs on a truly binational basis.

Because of its unique nature, the impact of an institution of this nature could be far greater than the size of its budget would indicate. The \$300 million in rupees will be invested in 3½ percent Indian Government bonds, so that the Foundation will have something over \$10 million to spend each year. We have seen in the United States that our large foundations, because of their freedom to experiment, have often led the way in designing programs to meet major American social and economic problems. We have every reason to hope that this can be the case in India as well.

It would be wrong, however, to believe that creation of this Foundation provides the whole answer to the problem of our excess currency holdings in India. When the Foundation comes into existence later this year, there will still be well over \$300 million in rupees remaining in our U.S. uses fund. This account is presently growing by about \$150 million a year—we spend about \$40 million annually for our Government expenses and certain special projects, while money is flowing in from new Public Law 480 sales and loan repayments at a rate of about \$190 million a year. And with the increased food assistance to India brought on by the catastrophic drought, our rupees will pile up even faster.

So even with the binational Foundation in operation, we will have by the middle of next year close to \$1.3 billion in rupees once again. Most of these will be in the country uses account, from which we make regular economic development loans. But a large amount—about \$545 million by current estimates—will still remain in our U.S. uses account in June of next year, which is just about what we had last December.

And the excess currency problem is not limited to India. In Pakistan, for example, we also own about 15 percent of the money supply; we hold \$250 million in Pakistani rupees, half of this in the U.S. uses account. In the United Arab Republic we own 18 percent of the currency; in Burma, 8 percent; in Tunisia, 5 percent; in Ceylon, 4 percent.

In Pakistan, funds are flowing into our U.S. uses account at the rate of \$38 million a year, but we are only spending \$14 million.

In all of these countries, and in India as well, we must continue our efforts to find constructive uses for our foreign currency holdings. We should consider setting up similar binational foundations in other countries. Perhaps, after the Indo-American Foundation gets underway, we can increase its endowment.

I hope also that serious consideration will be given to my proposal, incorporated in my World Hunger Act, that some of the money that would normally flow into the U.S. uses funds, as well as money from the country uses funds, be used for special grants and low-interest loans to support agricultural improvement.

For self-help in agriculture remains vital if poor countries are to avoid catastrophe on an unprecedented scale, and this would be one useful way of encouraging such self-help.

Let me express once again, Mr. President, my admiration for the bold step the President has taken in setting up this Indo-American Binational Foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that the following be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks: President Johnson's statement announcing the creation of the Foundation; a summary statement I have drawn up entitled "U.S. Holdings in Local Currencies"; the editorial in this morning's Washington Post, "An Inspired Act"; and an article in this

morning's New York Times, "United States Gets Rupees in Sale of Food."

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

TEXT OF JOHNSON PROPOSAL FOR UNITED STATES-INDIA FOUNDATION

(Following is the text of President Johnson's toast tonight at a White House dinner for Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.)

Madame Prime Minister: I have heard—and do in part believe—that Queen Victoria—speaking in a different age and under different circumstances—once gave the following estimate of two of her Prime Ministers.

"Mr. Gladstone," said she, "talks to me as if I were a public meeting—but Mr. Disraeli speaks to me as if I were a woman."

Tonight I am pleased to tell our friends assembled here that we have spoken to our gracious visitor not only as a woman with an understanding heart—but also as a leader with a matchless sense of vision—and a builder with a valued view of faith.

India is a vast and varied land. The roots of freedom and justice run deep in the Indian past. Its culture was full and strong centuries before the dawn of the Christian era.

The world has listened to the wisdom of India spoken through the voice of an eloquent leader.

Once years ago he said: "Democracy demands discipline, tolerance, and mutual regard. Freedom demands respect for the freedom of others. In a democracy changes are made by mutual discussion and persuasion and not by violent means."

STRONG IN SACRIFICE

These were the words of Prime Minister Nehru. This was the belief of Prime Minister Shastri. Their fidelity to freedom's cause created, with Mahatma Gandhi, a new nation—conceived in struggle, grown strong in sacrifice.

Now, Prime Minister Gandhi comes to this house and this table, custodian of her nation's hope, and the steward of her nation's dreams.

Today we talked about the work and the sacrifice needed to make those dreams a modern reality. We discussed practical ways India and the United States can help build a world where life is hopeful and happier for all our peoples, and indeed the people of all lands.

Prime Minister Gandhi's goal is to weld the Indian nation into a land where the words of its founding fathers come true and their views of its future are real.

There is much that binds India and the United States together. Both our nations have the deep-felt obligation to the basic dignity of man—the conviction that people can solve their problems by free choice far better than they can under an arrangement by force. There is in India and this country the strong tradition.

I remember clearly my visit to India in 1961.

IMPATIENT TO KNOW

I remember what I saw and felt and heard in India. The thousands of students along the roads and in the cities—each of them impatient to know and learn—the teachers and the scholars—the public servants—the people, searching, discovering, hoping. I think of our young people here—what we have done in the last year to achieve a new revolution in education—beyond the wildest dreams of a decade of two ago.

How can we bring into closer union the spirit and the courage of both our countries?

Tonight I propose we mark the visit of Prime Minister Gandhi with a lasting en-

dowment for the benefit of inquiring young minds in the Indian nation.

May we, Prime Minister, with your Government's permission—and that of the American Congress—launch a new and imaginative venture: an Indo-American foundation.

I propose this foundation be established in India and endowed with \$300-million in Indian currency owned by the United States. Other foundations all over the world will cooperate, I am sure, with this new enterprise.

I suggest this foundation be organized as an independent institution—with the distinguished citizens of both our countries on its board of directors.

I further propose that the new foundation be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning—to advance science—to encourage research—to develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory—to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems.

The journey to the future is over a long, winding road, every mile tested by challenge and doubt.

Together, Prime Minister, we can avoid the detours that intrude on our safe journey toward a time when—as your father promised—life will be better for all our people.

Ladies and gentlemen—let us honor the chief of state whose Prime Minister we welcome so warmly tonight.

Join me in a toast—to the President of India.

U.S. HOLDINGS IN LOCAL CURRENCIES

There are 10 countries in which the Treasury Department has determined that U.S. uses balances are in excess of foreseeable U.S. requirements through fiscal year 1967. Below is a table listing these countries, together with our balances in U.S. uses and country uses currencies as of December 31, 1965 (preliminary Treasury Department figures). These have been accumulated largely, but not exclusively, through Title I sales under Public Law 480.

	[In millions]		
	United States uses	Country uses	Total
Burma.....	\$23.7	\$15.3	\$39.0
Ceylon.....	2.1	12.8	14.9
India.....	586.2	732.0	1,318.2
Israel.....	25.9	29.4	55.3
Pakistan.....	125.4	124.9	250.3
Poland.....	492.8	.....	492.8
Tunisia.....	6.7	15.4	22.1
United Arab Republic.....	121.3	134.9	256.2
Yugoslavia.....	41.7	90.9	132.6
Guinea.....	4.5	19.6	24.1
Total (10 countries).....	1,430.3	1,180.2	2,610.5
Total (all countries).....	1,495.0	1,421.5	2,916.5

How our U.S. uses balances build up can be shown from Treasury Department figures. They estimate that, on June 30, 1965, our U.S. uses balances in India were \$503 million. At that time, it was estimated that in the present fiscal year the following amounts would flow into this fund: \$54.6 million from new title I sales; \$41.3 million from the payment of rupee loans for economic development under Public Law 480; \$60.5 million in repayment of Mutual Security Act and development loan fund soft loans (loaned in dollars but repaid in rupees); and \$18.5 million from other sources, including interest. (Apparently interest from all accounts—U.S. uses and country uses—goes into the U.S. uses balance.)

These figures, when added to the original \$503 million, come to \$677.9 million at the end of fiscal year 1966. From this we can subtract the \$38 million that Ambassador

Bowles estimates we spend every year from U.S. uses funds, and get \$640 million as an estimate for what the U.S. uses balance would be on June 30. And Bowles estimates that, by the end of 1966, our U.S. uses balance will be \$675 million. This would seem, if anything, to be a conservative estimate.

This gives some idea of how rapidly this balance is piling up.

Present law restricts our ability to use the U.S. uses money (and to a lesser extent the country uses money) in the following ways:

1. Virtually all money spent out of U.S. uses funds (except for that sold to tourists for dollars) must be appropriated by the Congress. Our agencies see this money as part of their total budget which must be approved, rather than an extra resource they might be able to draw on.

2. As amended in 1964, Public Law 480 requires that 20 percent of currencies which accrue under title I agreements must be reserved for appropriation; that is, must go into the U.S. uses fund. Therefore, this 20 percent cannot be available for country uses; in India and a number of countries, it simply piles up beyond our ability to spend it.

3. Any proposal to grant any foreign currencies, or to use any of the principal or interest from loan repayments (which go into the U.S. uses fund), must be presented to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, and they are given from 30 to 60 days to veto any such proposal.

4. Concerning country uses funds, no loans can be made at a lower rate than the cost of funds to the Treasury (now about 4.5 percent) unless the President specifically establishes a different rate.

S. 2826 seeks to make this situation easier by providing a lower interest rate, and grants as well, for use of local currencies for agricultural purposes. These grants would be exempted from the appropriations process; from the requirement that 20 percent of currencies be reserved for U.S. uses; and from the requirement that any grants or uses of loan repayments be required to come before the Agriculture Committees.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1966]

U.S. GETS RUPEES IN SALE OF FOOD—YIELD ON SURPLUS MOUNTS TOO FAST TO BE SPENT

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The rupees that will be used to establish an educational foundation in India, a project announced by President Johnson tonight, are part of the U.S. holdings of foreign currencies accumulated chiefly from the sale of surplus U.S. food under the food-for-peace program.

About 80 percent of the local currency proceeds of such food sales are normally lent back to the buying country for economic development purposes, such as public works, with the United States retaining the remainder for its own use.

In most countries of the world, the Embassy and other direct U.S. needs absorb all the U.S. share of the proceeds. But in 10 countries, of which India is the chief example, the United States has piled up far more local currency than it can possibly use.

The other countries in the category are Burma, Ceylon, Guinea, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia.

HOLDINGS AHEAD OF SPENDING

Although the numbers of countries is small, the amount is huge. President Johnson's budget estimated that the total of excess currencies in the 1967 fiscal year would be \$1.84 billion, including \$840 million in rupees. The present excess holding of rupees is \$575 million and heavy food shipments this year will raise the total.

Only about \$40 million in excess rupees had been expected to be used in the 1967 fiscal year before today's announcement.

As an example of the problem, in India only about \$40 million had been expected to be used in the 1967 fiscal year before today's announcement.

Apart from sales of surplus food, the United States also acquires local currency from repayment of loans. Under a program now discontinued, many of these loans were repaid in local currencies.

Local currencies also pile up as the excess deposits earn interest.

Although deposits in only 10 countries are classified as "excess," U.S.-owned holdings of local currencies have piled up in 11 other countries to the point where they are now classified as "near-excess." They are Brazil, Colombia, the former Belgian Congo, Finland, Indonesia, Morocco, the Sudan, Syria, Taiwan, Turkey, and Uruguay.

Sales of surplus food for local currencies, the chief source of the buildup of U.S. holdings began in 1954. Under the administration's proposals for a new program, sales for local currencies would gradually be phased out and the food would be sold for dollars on long-term credit.

In countries where there are excess currency holdings, one use found for them has been to pay some of the expenses of visits by congressional delegations.

In India, in addition, the Government has authorized the sale of excess rupees to American tourists. However, the initiative for this must come from the tourist, who gets no better rate than in his hotel or a bank. Thus this device has not proved very useful.

Local currency holdings are not the same as "counterpart funds," a term used in the days of Marshall plan aid for Europe and now discontinued. These were local currencies set aside by the aid-receiving country to match the amount of the aid. These funds were at no time owned by the United States, but the United States had some control over how they could be spent.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1966]  
AN INSPIRED ACT

Use of \$300 million of the U.S. rupee accounts to set up a permanent binational educational institution in India is an imaginative and constructive piece of statesmanship. It will make available for the purpose of encouraging innovations in both child and adult education in India around \$10 million a year by an ingenious plan for investing the principal in the bonds of India.

The President must have been delighted to disclose this scheme in his remarks welcoming to this country Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. It begins her visit here with the announcement of a joint venture that is at once a symbol of the present friendship of the two nations and an earnest of their mutual confidence in the future. For such an investment in education is an investment in the future.

Because the funds come from rupee accounts accumulated through the provision of Public Law 480 shipments of food, this venture happily combines present aid and future good. The 20 percent of the rupee credits for grain shipments have been set aside to the accounts of the United States, and the fund, already amounts to \$575 million. This fund is for expenses of the U.S. Government in India. It could not be put to better purposes than this. The President has only to exercise the waiver provisions in the law and the transfer of rupees will take place unless Congress negatives the allocation. It certainly will not do so, and the educational effort—so like the work undertaken by some of our great American foundations—will go forward.

Half of the administrators of this great fund will be American citizens and half Indian citizens—drawn mostly from private life. The vision and generosity of Government will put into the hands of these educators an incredible opportunity for good works

and great deeds. A century from now, men and women in India will look back upon this day as one most memorable in the annals of education and in the history of two friendly peoples.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have always been concerned, as have a number of others, that money under the poverty program has not filtered down enough to those that need it most.

In view of this, I would like to submit this resolution adopted by the Shelby County community action program in Texas, and request that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity, operating under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was organized to alleviate poverty; and the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity was organized to assist in the formation of local organizations to conduct and operate antipoverty programs on the local level; and

Whereas representatives of the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity informed local citizens in the counties of Shelby, Sabine, and San Augustine of the availability of funds to assist the local community in alleviating poverty by the conducting of work training programs for youth, community action programs to organize a communitywide attack on problems of poverty, adult basic education programs for illiterate education training, Headstart child development training, day nurseries for children of working mothers, programs for health education, elderly poor assistance, etc.; and

Whereas acting upon the recommendation of the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity open public meetings were held explaining assistance available to benefit the poor, and an organization was formed consisting of 150 citizens of Shelby, Sabine, and San Augustine Counties, representing all economic, social, and racial groups, all business, governmental, educational, and civic groups, for the purpose of assisting the lower income groups of the area in improving their lot, through the assistance of money available through the various programs; and

Whereas an application for a program development grant was filed in July 1965 requesting a grant for an organization to examine the cause and effect of poverty in the tricity area, and recommended solutions for the problems; and

Whereas 6 months later the application was approved providing a staff to process applications for recommended programs, after thorough examination of the program development application, governing body, and the area to be served by representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity, both at the regional office and in the area to be served, and after satisfying themselves of the honest intentions of the organization to use the group for the purpose of attempting to raise the economic level of the poverty families in the tricity area; and

Whereas although the staff has worked diligently to provide applications for programs to assist in the alleviation of poverty, the only results thus seen have been the employment of 17 staff members, only about half of which are from low-income families. Applications which should be of benefit to the poor have become bogged down in red-tape to the extent that approval of any project which should be of direct benefit to the target area population is nonexistent at this time; and

Whereas a vast difference exists in information presented by the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity, information presented by the Office of Economic Opportunity, including the CAP guide, and actual experience in attempting to negotiate the approval of projects through the regional office of economic opportunity, where different approaches and answers to the same question or procedure are often required, even to the extent that the recommendations of one staff member are rejected by another staff member of the same department to the extent that local agencies do not know what procedure, guideline, or recommendation to follow; and

Whereas the CAP guide is said to be obsolete, but no replacement for information contained in it has been received; and

Whereas consultation with other community action agencies throughout the State indicate that the problems faced by this local organization are not unique, but rather are indicative of those faced in practically all of the other agencies; and

Whereas we recognize that the entire organization of the Office of Economic Opportunity is new, and as such requires a time to become efficient in operation, but that it should by this time be fully operative and functional, with the potential of speedily approving requests for assistance in the war on poverty; and

Whereas members of the board of directors and local citizenry, representing both target area and affluent groups, are losing interest in the community action program because of its failure to fulfill stated objectives of alleviating poverty and because more money is being spent for organizational purposes than is being spent for purposes intended.

Furthermore, recognizing the vast need for programs of the type recommended in the war on poverty and the potential good to be gained by raising the economic standards of the poor of all races, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity has devised the best procedure to date for assistance in these areas, but has failed to implement the procedure with practical, workable policies and to keep local agencies informed on changes of procedures, policies, and guidelines; and

Whereas even officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity have recommended that the only way to secure action necessary for proper utilization of funds allocated to the war on poverty is to bring political pressure to bear on all levels of government, national and regional office of economic opportunity: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the executive committee of the Shelby County Community Action Program, Inc., representing the counties of Sabine, San Augustine, and Shelby, respectfully request that all levels of operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity be examined and investigated to determine why money allocated for the alleviation of poverty is not being used for that purpose, why such difficulty exists in getting the approval of projects, and why officials of that agency cannot agree among themselves on the proper procedures to be followed, much less issue correct guidelines to local agencies to assist local groups in carrying out to the letter the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Passed this 21st day of March, 1966.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHELBY COUNTY  
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,  
INC.

By JAMES E. CAMPBELL,  
Chairman of the Board.

Unanimously passed by the executive committee.

#### SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the last session, I intro-