

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 6

MARCH 16, 1967, TO APRIL 4, 1967

(PAGES 6867 TO 8332)

There is, however, support for this proposal throughout the country, and I hope that eventually it will receive approval of the Senate.

A wire which I received from Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business indicates the support which that organization has for this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the contents of that telegram and also a column from the New York Times of February 7 relating to this amendment might be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. WINSTON PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your consistent fight to bring about long overdue legislative relief for the small businessmen in this nation. I am referring to your Resolution, S. Res. 30, that would give legislative authority to the present Senate Small Business Committee. You hit the nail on the head in the debate on the floor of the Senate yesterday in support of your resolution when you said, "The corporate giants are forcing the nation's small businessmen to the wall at a constantly accelerated rate. If these small enterprises are not permitted to grow and prosper, the nation will suffer an irreparable loss in job opportunities and economic growth." Almost daily we are witnessing that trend in the small business structure nationwide. It is our hope and trust that the Congress will recognize this serious situation which is facing small business before small business is eventually eliminated in the free enterprise system. You are privileged to make known the contents of this wire to your colleagues.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National
Federation of Independent Business.

SENATE DEFEATS COMMITTEE PLAN—REJECTS A STRONGER ROLE FOR SMALL BUSINESS PANEL

WASHINGTON, Feb. 6.—The Senate defeated today, 58 to 27, an attempt to permit its Select Committee on Small Business to send legislation to the floor for action, as do regular and standing committees.

Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican of Vermont who offered the proposal, said that it had the support of many small businessmen.

Under current rules, the committee may only investigate matters, hold hearings and make recommendations on proposals affecting small business.

Mr. Prouty offered his plan as an amendment to the Congressional reorganization bill now being debated by the Senate.

The proposal was killed on a tabling motion by Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat of Oklahoma, chief sponsor of the reorganization bill. Mr. Monroney contended that the needs of small business were now fully considered in the Senate Banking and Finance Committees.

Mr. Prouty replied, "The corporate giants are forcing the nation's small businessmen to the wall at a constantly accelerated rate. If these small enterprises are not permitted to grow and prosper, the nation will suffer an irreparable loss in job opportunities and economic growth."

The Senate debated the reorganization bill today for the eighth day with no end in sight. About 70 amendments have been filed.

MORE AMENDMENTS BEATEN

The Senate defeated by voice vote eight additional amendments by Senator Joseph

S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, designed to reform or recodify the Senate's floor procedures. Only Mr. Clark voted for the changes; in each, four to seven senators voted no. Clark's proposals included:

Explicit recognition of the right of the majority and minority leaders to have precedence in being recognized to speak. This is the practice now but is not in the rules.

Rewriting of the point-of-orders rule to make it clear that a Senator can be interrupted for raising of such a point in certain circumstances.

Elimination of the right of an individual Senator to call for a quorum unless he is willing to have a vote on the pending question once the quorum is obtained.

Also defeated was a provision limiting debate on points of order to one hour.

DEATH OF VICTOR JOHNSTON

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise at this time to bring to the Senate the unfortunate news of the passing of a man well known to many of us, who served the Republican side and the Republican senatorial committee for many years, Mr. Victor Johnston.

Vic suffered a heart attack last Sunday and, unfortunately, passed away last night. Funeral arrangements are being made. The funeral will be held in Washington.

Senators may feel free to call my office. We will have all information as quickly as arrangements can be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair joins in expressing regret.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Chair.

EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 73, House Joint Resolution 267.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Joint resolution (H.J. Res. 267) to support emergency food assistance to India, which was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 3, line 4, after the word "should", to insert a comma and "subject to the requirement of section 401 of Public Law 480 with respect to the availability of the commodity at the time of exportation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, concerning the amendment, the House added an amendment to its original joint resolution. The original joint resolution expresses the sense of Congress that to avoid price-depressing uncertainty, the administration, in carrying out the program, should make announcements of intention, purchases, and shipments on schedules and under circumstances designed to strengthen farm market prices to the maximum extent possible. Since the joint resolution in no way changes existing law, any such announcement would necessarily be subject to the requirement of section 401 of Public Law

480 regarding the availability of the commodity at the time of exportation.

The amendment referred to makes it clear that its adoption is subject to that understanding.

EXPLANATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to put both the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government on record on the subject of food aid to India. It sets forth a recommendation that our Government provide, in calendar year 1967, \$25 million of emergency food relief for distribution by CARE and other American voluntary agencies under title II of Public Law 480, as amended, and not to exceed 3 million tons of food grain, at an estimated cost of \$190 million, also under title II. This 3 million tons would be in addition to 3.6 million tons already furnished or in process of being furnished so far this year under the policy established by the India food aid resolution approved April 19, 1966.

Under the guidelines of this resolution, it will be seen that we would be on record in support of furnishing up to 6.6 million tons of food grains to India during calendar year 1967. This would be considerably less than the 8 million tons furnished during calendar year 1966, and it could represent approximately two-thirds of the 10 million tons estimated by the Department of Agriculture to be required by India from outside sources this calendar year. However, from roughly mid-May on, the 3 million tons recommended in this resolution would amount to only 50 percent of the estimated requirements for outside food aid.

The point should be made that the bulk of food aid to India will continue to be furnished by the United States until May; but thereafter we propose that Congress endorse a policy of the President that the United States furnish one half, with the Government of India having to look to the rest of the countries of the world for the other half. This other half could be contributed by other countries in the form of food grains themselves, in the form of cash to enable India to buy food grains in world markets, or, possibly, in the form of fertilizers and seed—which are only one crop period removed from food grains.

I believe the mid-May time for moving to a 50-50 sharing of food aid is a reasonable one. To do so sooner might well cause a break in the pipeline of food aid, which would mean hardship to many people. It would be very difficult for the Government of India to work out arrangements with other countries so that their deliveries would come in before mid-May in order to keep the pipeline filled. And time is needed for other countries, including those forming an India food aid consortium, to work out their program.

On the other hand, it is believed that the time is at hand for the United States to reduce its food aid to a 50-50 basis. No longer do we have the reserve stocks available to do more. And with the tragedy of a terribly costly war on our hands, the people of the United States cannot at the same time continue to do for others as much as they could do otherwise. Many other nations are not

sharing in the cost of this war, and it is only right for them to shoulder their share of the food problem which drought has visited upon the people of India.

You may note that the resolution is couched in terms of a self-help approach on the part of India in achieving food self-sufficiency, under terms and conditions set forth in the 1966 Food for Peace Act. It should not be implied from this that India is not making great strides in agricultural production. While it is true that there was an unfortunate delay in assigning priorities to agricultural production from her limited resources, India has finally done so. Needed policy changes have been made to encourage outside capital investment in fertilizer plants. Great emphasis is being placed on family planning clinics throughout the nation, with a view to moving toward a balance between population and food resources. The tragedy of two successive droughts in several parts of the country has caused a temporary crisis. Food aid is needed to enable a large democratic country, moving along the right road, to continue its progress and to prevent hunger, malnutrition, and possible starvation to millions of people. We should join with other nations in helping to meet this need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table from the committee report, bearing on this subject.

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

Calendar year 1967:	Million tons
Food grain requirement to prevent famine in India as determined by World Bank, United States, and Indian officials.....	10.0
U.S. allocation last year to be delivered in 1967.....	.7
U.S. allocated in 1967.....	.9
U.S. interim allocation pursuant to President's message of Feb. 2, 1967	2.0
U.S. proposed addition to be appropriately matched by other countries pursuant to H.J. Res. 267, up to	3.0
Proposed U.S. supply subtotal, up to.....	6.6
Additional food grain aid from other countries pledged to date:	
Canada18
Australia15
U.S.S.R.20
Commercial purchases by India.....	.20
Expected additional contribution by other countries to multilateral food grain aid program.....	2.67
Other countries and Indian commercial purchases subtotal	3.40
Summary:	
Total proposed U.S. supply, up to...	6.6
Total other country supply.....	3.4
Grand total.....	10.0

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. This resolution re-

quested by the administration does not call for additional authority. It is a resolution of limitation—not of increased authorization. The Food for Peace Act of 1966 provides considerably more authorization for food assistance than is envisioned in the pending resolution.

The proposed resolution seeks to place certain limits on our food assistance to India in 1967 to accomplish two purposes: first, to bring about a greater effort by other nations to match U.S. food contributions to India; and second, to encourage greater efforts by the Indian Government and her people to increase their capacity to feed themselves.

Those are worthwhile objectives. I have been concerned, however, that the resolution might have the effect of painting us into a corner so that we would be unable to meet additional Indian food needs if present estimates are in error.

I have been assured, however, by Under Secretary of State Rostow and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that there is enough leeway in the resolution and in the administration's position so that we can meet unforeseen food needs in India should the present estimates be in error. On the basis of these firm assurances by top-ranking administration officials, I have decided not to oppose the resolution.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I fully support this resolution declaring our support for continuation of food assistance to the famine-stricken people of India.

We have decided in the past that an attack on the specter of starvation—through sharing our agricultural abundance—is a matter of high national policy. This resolution continues that policy and reaffirms it.

The resolution also clarifies the cornerstone of our policy on food assistance to agriculturally underdeveloped nations. That cornerstone is our emphasis and insistence upon self-help and the development of self-sufficiency in those countries where population growth is outstripping food production.

We do insist on self-help because we know that in the long run the United States cannot feed the world alone. But until agricultural sufficiency is reached in India and other nations, we cannot and will not hoard our grain while those peoples starve.

One aspect of the resolution does raise problems, however. On its face it gives every appearance of limiting U.S. food aid to India to a maximum of 3 million additional tons of grain and only if matched by other nations.

I fully support our Government's desire to maintain a strong negotiating position in seeking to bring other nations into the war against hunger. The United States should not bear the burden alone. Others who can must also help.

But if our efforts to find additional food aid from other countries end in failure, and if the Indian famine continues, this resolution must not stand as a barrier to further U.S. assistance. During the hearings in the Senate Agriculture Committee, we received assurances that this resolution was flexible enough to permit us to feed those who

are starving, despite what others might do.

I have received additional assurances, as has Senator McGOVERN, that our Government will not deny food aid to those who need it because of this resolution. With those assurances, I do intend to vote for the resolution as our committee has reported it.

We have asked our farmers to provide us the food in the war against hunger. I have said in the past, and say again, that we must pay them a decent and adequate return for the food produced for these donational programs. Our food aid programs cost money, and the cost must fall equally on all of us—not more heavily on the farmer. If this is truly a national policy, we cannot ask the farmer to carry the greatest share of the load.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in my opinion, we are engaged here in an extremely healthful exercise of critical examination.

There is an old saying that "Charity sees the need, not the cause," and I might accept this saying if we were talking about aid to India as a once-only-and-done-with-it proposition. But India will need a helping hand, from us and many others, for a long time to come. And it is both appropriate and necessary that we become thoroughly familiar with both the need and the cause. Only this way can our assistance be fully effective.

From my own examination of India's need and the cause of her need, I have concluded that it is imperative that we continue for some time to provide food assistance in substantial amounts—though here I equally support the thought that India must do much more to improve her ability to feed herself and other developed countries must join with us, much more than they have done, in lending a hand.

I support the joint resolution and I hope my distinguished colleagues will see fit to do so, too.

I call attention to an excellent editorial on the subject of "Wheat for India" which appeared in the Washington Post on March 11. It summarizes the views held by many of us, and I would like to quote these two paragraphs which I think closely relate to our discussions today:

The joint resolution which sailed through the House on last Thursday by an overwhelming 310-to-63 vote, is an admirable compromise, all things considered. It calls for a United States contribution of an additional 3 million tons of wheat on top of the 3.6 million tons this country has already furnished for the current year, and ties this new shipment to an equivalent 3 million ton contribution from other donors. This effort to encourage others to help meet India's needs—and to encourage India to get busy soliciting this help—makes good sense. This country can't hope to go on supplying a major portion of India's food needs indefinitely, without artificially expanding surplus production far beyond present levels. Others, including the Russians as well as the French and the Canadians, must get the habit of pitching in more heavily.

"While the resolution is reasonably strict on this count, this will not exclude an Administration request for further shipments if India's food crisis worsens—and any additional American contribution would not be subject to the 50-50 ratio between our help

and that of other countries. It is to be hoped that the Senate will follow the example of the House in combining firmness with a measure of flexibility.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post of March 11, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHEAT FOR INDIA

With just a little less largeness of spirit all around, the Administration's wheat-for-India legislation could have been badly mauled in the House of Representatives. Conservative elements were insistent on a hard line towards other potential donors, even at some risk that sufficient grain might not be forthcoming from this country to help fill an expected demand in India for at least 10 million tons of imported food grain this year. The liberals were just as concerned that no strings be attached which might inhibit this country from doing whatever might be needed to head off the threat of widespread famine.

The joint resolution which sailed through the House on last Thursday by an overwhelming 310-to-63 vote, is an admirable compromise, all things considered. It calls for a United States contribution of an additional 3 million tons of wheat on top of the 3.6 million tons this country has already furnished for the current year, and ties this new shipment to an equivalent 3 million ton contribution from other donors. This effort to encourage others to help meet India's needs—and to encourage India to get busy soliciting this help—makes good sense. This country can't hope to go on supplying a major portion of India's food needs indefinitely, without artificially expanding surplus production far beyond present levels. Others, including the Russians as well as the French and the Canadians, must get the habit of pitching in more heavily.

While the resolution is reasonably strict on this count, this will not exclude an Administration request for further shipments if India's food crisis worsens—and any additional American contribution would not be subject to the 50-50 ratio between our help and that of other countries. It is to be hoped that the Senate will follow the example of the House in combining firmness with a measure of flexibility.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure there is little doubt in the minds of my colleagues, that India is in critical need of our food aid. And I see great merit in the reasons—economic, political, and humanitarian—that have been advanced here for our assuring food aid to the Republic of India.

But in the same way that I would expect a neighbor to whom I had given a helping hand to take advantage of that help and improve his condition, I would expect India to take advantage of this food aid and attempt to solve her food production problems so that she may move toward becoming self-sustaining. I believe that India with her critical food problems will do this.

I support fully the proposed allocation of food to India. Partly stimulating my support is a recent commitment by the Government of India to give high priority to planning for food self-sufficiency. I am happy to list the major agriculture targets of the Indian Government for 1967-68:

First. A 4-billion-rupee—\$533 million—investment in agriculture;

Second. Fertilizer production of 535,000 nutrient tons of nitrogen, 150,000 tons of phosphate;

Third. Fertilizer imports of 850,000 nutrient tons of nitrogen; 350,000 tons of phosphate, and 300,000 tons of potassium;

Fourth. A total of 15 million acres under new varieties of seed;

Fifth. One hundred and twenty-five million acres sprayed for crop protection;

Sixth. Increase of 3 million acres in minor irrigation and concentration on use of irrigation for intensive production;

Seventh. An increase of 1 billion rupees—\$133 million—in Government rural credit; and

Eighth. Increase of total commodity storage capacity by 1.35 million tons.

The Indian Government also plans to make a timely announcement of price support levels to encourage greater production; increase end-of-year government grain stocks through price supports; develop a national food distribution policy; and accelerate domestic production capacity for fertilizer and other agricultural inputs.

Mr. President, these are as yet plans. But they are plans which I believe can be carried out. They are plans which must be carried out if India expects to improve its food production after food-for-aid from developed nations such as the United States becomes scarce.

With present crop yields measured against the current population explosion, the increasing scarcity of food in the future seems to me a very real, however frightening, possibility.

I have spent some time in India. It is one of the few countries in the world which not only has established democratic institutions, but which practices democracy. In a country of a half billion people, the pressures on its borders require India to spend far too much for defense. With all the demands on its resources to progress economically and socially, its capacity to increase food production rapidly is limited. As a result, millions of its people are undernourished and in times of drought or flood thousands perish.

This resolution is founded on the purpose to assist India in time to become self-sufficient in food production. But immediately it carries also a high humanitarian purpose.

A REALISTIC POLICY ON INDIA

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if I thought that food aid to India were to turn into an exercise in perpetual motion, I could not in good conscience support the joint resolution. But I do not think this need be or will be the case.

I believe that India is moving ahead. I believe that India can eventually become a self-supporting Nation. If we refused to lend a hand, India could not make it. But as we do extend our assistance, I think India can pull through.

In saying this, I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that we open the door of every American granary on behalf of India. This is a case where it is necessary that we extend our food aid on a measured basis and with some specific

qualifications attached—including more self-help by India itself and more help from the outside by the other developed countries. The President, in my opinion, is acting wisely in insisting on these qualifications.

I wish to lend my own support to the joint resolution on food aid to India, and I hope that my distinguished colleagues will see fit to join with me.

HOPE FOR STABILITY IN INDIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as we consider the joint resolution on support for India food aid, there is a certain amount of reassurance in the fact that the Congress Party won, even though by a slim margin, in the recent elections and in the fact that Mrs. Indira Gandhi will stay on as Prime Minister.

While we have sometimes wondered whether Mrs. Gandhi was not using too much of a velvet glove, at the same time we have known her to be intelligent, keenly aware of India's problems, and seriously devoted to solving them. As an Indian politician, she has had to be highly discreet in revealing any special friendship toward the United States—but we have suspected that behind the nationalistic image she projects there is a genuine feeling of warmth and friendship toward the West.

There seems to be general approval in the United States of the way the elections have turned out. The Washington Post on March 14 commented:

The re-election of Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister is a mark of the continued vitality of democracy in India. . . . India's political fabric has been strong enough to hold together during a period of savage economic and social difficulties, and during a period of vigorous politicking too.

Mrs. Gandhi demonstrated considerable skill and verve in rescuing her own position from the debris of the elections. But to the extent that the country's prospects hinge on the demonstrated political strength of its leadership, the outlook is unsure. India's difficulties have yet to induce an appropriate spirit of crisis unity. Mrs. Gandhi will need the active support of all Indians, and of all of India's foreign friends, in the five years ahead.

American food aid to India is, of course, a gamble—but it is a gamble we must take. If India can win her fight against poverty and hunger, we will be rewarded many times over in many ways for our investment. But if India does not win, and particularly if she should fail to win because her friends did not help enough, it will go down in history as one of civilization's greatest tragedies.

The recent elections have given me renewed hope for stability and progress in India. I urge that we endorse the President's program for India food aid by giving our strong support to the joint resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Mrs. GANDHI WINS

The re-election of Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister is a mark of the continued vitality of democracy in India. Next to the current convulsions in Peking, the order and consensus evident in New Delhi are particularly

impressive. India's political fabric has been strong enough to hold together during a period of savage economic and social difficulties, and during a period of vigorous politicking too. That a number of heretofore sacrosanct politicians received a come-uppance at the hands of voters can hardly please those politicians. But it suggests a new and mature disposition among the electorate to demand high performance from its elected officials, regardless of who they are.

Mrs. Gandhi's position, as she begins a new five-year term, is, nonetheless, unenviable. Her Congress Party lost a hundred seats in Parliament. A formidable number of ministers and party leaders failed of re-election. Congress lost its majorities in seven of the 15 states it previously controlled. It remains to be seen if Mrs. Gandhi's leading political rival, the 72-year-old Morarji Desai, will be entirely helpful and cooperative in his new post as Deputy Prime Minister.

Mrs. Gandhi demonstrated considerable skill and verve in rescuing her own position from the debris of the elections. But to the extent that the country's prospects hinge on the demonstrated political strength of its leadership, the outlook is unsure. India's difficulties have yet to induce an appropriate spirit of crisis unity. Mrs. Gandhi will need the active support of all Indians, and of all of India's foreign friends, in the five years ahead.

AMERICA HOPES TO AID INDIA SOLVE ITS FOOD CRISIS—PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND SECRETARY FREEMAN REALISTIC IN TREATMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I support the India food aid resolution. This measure is true to the American tradition—the tradition of helping a neighbor who finds himself in trouble through no real fault of his own and who is striving to solve his problems.

India is in trouble. With our good neighbor tradition, we cannot turn deaf ears to her appeal for help.

Despite the frustrations of successive droughts, India's continued determination to help herself is evident to the administration and to the Members of Congress.

An editorial in the March 2 issue of the Baltimore, Md., Sun carried the following comment on this point:

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman points out that Indian public investment in agriculture in the new five-year plan is to be doubled, with allocations in this fiscal year up by 43 percent. Our purpose as well as India's, Mr. Freeman says, is to speed the time when massive outside help will no longer be necessary.

India is striving to extricate herself from the current food crisis, but she needs help.

When an individual is confronted with a sudden deprivation emergency, he has two options: he can mortgage his future by buying what he needs to meet the emergency with funds he cannot afford to spend; or he can turn to his neighbors for aid in the crisis. Countries beset by unforeseen emergencies are much like individuals. They, too, may have only two options.

The Baltimore Sun editorial examined the first of those options:

One of the conditions (for U.S. assistance) is that India make every effort to increase the efficiency and volume of its own agricultural production. On this point, Eugene V. Rostow, Under Secretary of State for political affairs, tells the House Agricultural Committee that dramatic steps have been taken, only to be "masked" by the temporary

misfortune of two successive years of severe draught. Nobody would be helped, Mr. Rostow says, if the Indian Government were forced, because of the drought, to spend its scarce foreign exchange resources for emergency food and therefore to postpone agricultural and economic development already programmed.

Our investment in the future of India's agricultural and economic development is so substantial that it is not reasonable to abandon that investment now.

The Sun editorial noted this commitment:

From the American point of view the large fact is that, when we look at Asia as a whole, we have an important stake in the fate of the Indian democracy, whose success depends on the attainment of economic viability. For humanitarian reasons, in the present season of distress, we are acting toward India as we should act. For reasons of long-range policy, we must support the Indian striving toward self-sufficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution, as amended.

The joint resolution, as amended (H.J. Res. 267), was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves the participation of the United States in cooperation with other countries and with multilateral organizations, including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and others, in urgent international efforts designed to—

(a) develop a comprehensive self-help approach to the war on hunger based on a fair sharing of the burden among the nations of the world;

(b) encourage and assist the Government of India in achieving food self-sufficiency; and

(c) help meet India's critical food and nutritional needs by making available agricultural commodities or other resources needed for food procurement or production.

Because uncertainty in connection with Public Law 480 transactions tends to depress market prices, it is the sense of Congress that, in carrying out this Aid to India program, the Administration should, subject to the requirement of section 401 of Public Law 480 with respect to the availability of the commodity at the time of exportation, make announcements of intention, purchases and shipments of commodities on schedules and under circumstances which will protect and strengthen farm market prices to the maximum extent possible.

The Congress endorses the President's policy of equal participation on the part of the United States with all other nations, under terms and conditions set forth in Public Law 480, as amended, in assisting the Government of India to meet these needs.

Further, the Congress recommends, on the basis of estimates now available, that the United States provide an additional amount of food grain not to exceed three million tons at an estimated cost of \$190,000,000 as the United States share toward meeting the India food deficit, provided it is appropriately matched, and specifically extends its support to the allocation of approximately \$190,000,000 of funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation in calendar year 1967 which will be required to accomplish this purpose.

The Congress further recommends that the President provide an additional \$25,000,000 of emergency food relief for distribution by CARE and other American voluntary agencies.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(At this point, Mr. Byrd of Virginia took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

INVESTMENT CREDIT, YES; SURTAX, NO—BUT LET US PLAY FAIR WITH CONSUMERS, TOO

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the House Ways and Means Committee has ordered reported, and the House is expected to pass at any time now, H.R. 6950, a bill to restore the 7-percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation requested by the President on March 9. This indeed is welcome news and I concur in the need for the reinstatement of both incentives, particularly since several of my colleagues and myself have contended before their suspension that to eliminate them would increase the softness of those sectors of the economy which were even then slowing down.

The reinstatement of these incentives, as recommended by the administration, should make obvious the fact that their suspension was certainly not a revenue measure nor even a needed imposition of fiscal restraint. Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, in his statement before the House committee, states that the demand for capital goods remains at a point of "healthy buoyancy" and is not now indicative of "the excessive, threatening, boom conditions that prevailed last summer."

Mr. President, I maintain, as I did in my August 19, 1966, speech, that the economy did not then need a suspension of these business incentives, that the existing conditions did not constitute a threatening "boom," and that any action to suspend the credits would harm the smaller businessman while not affecting substantially the industrial giants. Then leaders in industry, despite expensive interest rates and no tax credit, continued on their planned path of expansion, well aware that their 14- or 15-percent net return on investment makes the payment of a higher interest rate relatively inconsequential to them, that removal of the tax credit was bothersome but certainly not fatal to their expansion of productive capacity. The rush of money to banks for certificates of deposit and the record high-interest rates created a severe depression in the housing industry as funds available to the prospective homeowner were siphoned from savings and loan associations.

Who had all the money, Mr. President? The industries that were supposed to be cutting back as a result of the suspension of the tax credit and accelerated depreciation. Those who were penalized were those least able to afford it. There was indeed a slowing down of net capital investment, though their aggregate may be