

1284

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

January 27, 1966

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings on legislation to permit transportation of mail by common carrier motor vehicle. The hearings were in connection with H.R. 6472, a bill which I introduced on March 18, 1965. The purpose of that legislation was to allow the Post Office Department to ship mail between cities by truck on the same basis it now ships mail by train and plane.

During the course of last year's hearings, everyone concerned with the transportation of mail was given an opportunity to be heard. The hearings on H.R. 6472 cleared the air and, I believe, were very helpful. They demonstrated to me the urgent need for new legislation and paved the way for the introduction of a more practical legislative vehicle which I am introducing today. This legislative proposal would give the Postmaster General the authority to use regulated motor carriers on exactly the same basis as he now uses railroad service.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a means by which the Post Office Department can improve its lagging transportation services and of equal urgency to end a particularly onerous discrimination in the transportation of mail.

Motor carriers have been regulated by the Federal Government for over 30 years. In that 30-year time span, they have grown to be a vital and important part of our transportation system. The value of their service to private shippers in carrying a wide range of goods and commodities is an accepted fact of life. There can be no legitimate question raised as to their capability to handle the mail. It seems somewhat absurd that the Post Office Department is the only major entity using transportation services in the United States which cannot use regulated motor carriers in the manner which they are best suited to serve the needs of that Department.

The Post Office Department is seeking greater flexibility in the transportation of mail in order to improve its service to the people of the United States. It seems to me that legislation of the kind I am introducing, would be an important element in their being able to achieve the widest latitude of flexibility. As a matter of fact, the representative of the Post Office Department closed his testimony last year with this kind of statement:

I would like to emphasize the fact that it has been the position of the Department that a change in the law which would increase the flexibility of our management to cope with the complex matters we face today is what we would favor.

I should like to emphasize that the proposal put forth today would not require the Post Office Department to use any particular form of transportation. It would not favor one mode of transportation over another as has been the case for so many years. What it would do is to widen the Department's choice of available transportation service and, in so doing, would also wipe out the long-

standing bar to the use of regulated motor carrier service—a service which the Post Office Department needs if it is to achieve its objective of better postal service for the American people.

## IMPACT SCHOOL AID IN PERIL AGAIN

(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, America's impact school aid program, authorized under Public Law 874, is in peril once again.

This program, as my colleagues know, provides supplementary funds for public schools in communities having Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel. Because these installations and people contribute relatively little to local tax revenues, their presence imposes a special burden on local school districts. For nearly two decades, Public Law 874 has eased this burden, in many cases enabling heavily impacted school districts to remain solvent.

Despite the logic and fairness of this system, the periodic renewal of Public Law 874 has often encountered tough sledding in the executive branch and in Congress. During the 88th Congress, it will be recalled, many local school boards skirted bankruptcy before being saved by a 2-year extension of the program.

Like the beleaguered heroine of silent film serials, our impacted school districts are again being pushed to the edge of the cliff. I am informed that the Office of Education estimates a need for \$416 million to maintain present levels of assistance during fiscal 1967. Against this estimate, the Budget Bureau proposes to allocate exactly \$183 million.

I predict that at least half the Members will be hearing about this as frantic school superintendents begin to realize the impending crisis. Part of our problem stems from a recent change in criteria for eligibility which has qualified roughly a dozen more large cities to participate in impact aid. This occurs because the new standard qualifies school districts having 3 percent of its children from Government families, a sharp drop from the earlier requirement of 6 percent.

Yet in some highly concentrated defense areas, of which my San Diego County district is one, the impact may be nearer 20 percent. Obviously, if Public Law 874 aid is reduced by more than half, the result can only be catastrophic. School boards will be compelled to shorten their academic year—as indeed some were preparing to do late in 1964, when the impact funding was last in doubt. Curtailed building plans or faculty reductions could mean double sessions. Many boards would be forced to cut teacher pay—this, at a time we seek to make the teaching profession more attractive.

Clearly, this must not be allowed to happen. Yet if we let the Budget Bureau set our levels of assistance—if the

Bureau's present plans are implemented—it is exactly what will happen.

We shall doubtless hear it said that Vietnam war expenditures impel budget reductions all down the line. In viewing today's opulent society, I say we are not yet reduced to paying for this war out of the schoolrooms of America—especially the schoolrooms serving those very communities with the most families engaged in defense-related activity.

To the Budget Bureau I say, look elsewhere with your computers and sharp pencils. Do not cheat children.

## JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, authorization has been sought in the Senate to investigate the impact of the Central Intelligence Agency on U.S. foreign policy. In addition, a proposal has been introduced in the Senate to establish a joint Senate-House committee on a permanent basis to oversee CIA operations.

In line with these recent proposals, I want to call to your attention that in 1952, I first saw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities; as a result, in 1953 I authorized the initial legislation proposing the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters.

I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who so ably worked toward the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator McMahon's words of advice along with much able legal assistance, aided me in writing House Concurrent Resolution 168, which I introduced on July 20, 1953. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in congressional archives. It was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress.

Since the time of my introduction of this legislation, hundreds of Congressmen and Senators have adopted the resolution as their own. However, regrettably, a Congress has yet to act upon it. As a result, it is evident to me that there has been a lack of information on many critical issues until it has been too late. By way of example, lack of information has contributed importantly to the tragic incidences of the Hungarian revolution and the fall of the Diem regime.

I believe very strongly that the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters is long overdue. Had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today.

January 27, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

285

I cannot state emphatically enough my belief in the need of such committee. For this reason, I have again written to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the Committee on Rules, to consider the number of similar resolutions introduced and to give their approval in order that this legislation may be brought to the floor.

Therefore, I urge that each and every one of my colleagues look into the need for such a resolution and act upon it in this 2d session of the 89th Congress.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT FORESHADOWS ANOTHER YEAR OF PROGRESS

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable performance of our national economy in recent years was not an accident. It represents a victory for all Americans. It is a particular victory for the administration, and a well-earned reward for its faith in the productive capacity and flexibility of the American economic system.

The President's strategy for invigorating the American economy received cheers from most Americans right from the start, 2 years ago. But skepticism and doubts were also heard. The faint-hearted warned us that there was no room for expansion in an already prosperous economy. They saw bottlenecks in every industry. They saw the destruction of our price stability. They saw deterioration in our balance of payments. They were sure that the millions of unemployed were permanently unemployable.

Now the President's Economic Report brings us ringing proof that the skeptics were wrong. Unemployment has fallen from 5 1/2 percent of the labor force in late 1963 to near 4 percent today. Millions who once spent their time on hiring lines are now contributing to progress on the production line. The gains in employment have been especially marked for the less skilled and the disadvantaged members of our labor force. Two hundred and seventy nonwhites and 560,000 teenagers were added to the employed last year. Businessmen are using their ingenuity to train and hire labor. Bottlenecks are so rare as to be remarkable. Our workers are taking full advantage of new opportunities for training and better jobs.

Industrial production has risen 15 percent in the past 2 years and is still not straining our productive capacity. As the Council's report makes clear, backlogs of orders have remained moderate, operating rates are generally staying within levels of peak efficiency, and businessmen now have the incentives and the funds to expand capacity to meet growing demand. Thus, we added \$47 billion to our production last year while holding price increases below 2 percent. And we scored great gains in our balance of payments.

The President is predicting a repeat performance of last year's record gains in output and employment, and last year's price moderation. There will be doubters again. But most Americans will share the President's judgment, which has proved so right in the past 2 years. There is no reason to expect a retreat from the brilliant record of 1964 and 1965.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues legislation I have introduced to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. My proposal would extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of our Nation to receive assistance with public works and development projects deemed essential to accelerate their future growth. Timing is a major factor, since many of the areas covered by this amendment stand to lose their eligibility for aid before their applications for assistance can be carefully examined and processed.

As you will recall, before this important act was passed by the House last August, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) was successful in his effort to have the bill amended so that areas having a history of substantial unemployment during the preceding calendar year would be eligible for benefits under title I. This action served as a stimulant to nearly 100 areas of our Nation which were not seriously depressed, but nevertheless not in the prosperous category and therefore in need of some outside help if their overall development plans were going to materialize in the not too distant future.

The approach of the so-called Sisk amendment made sense and received the support it deserved. I was enthusiastic in my response because I have long maintained that it is wrong for us to get so absorbed in our efforts to assist the chronically depressed areas that we neglect to make some provision to assist what I consider to be fringe areas; that is, those areas which, through the hard work, sound planning, and determined efforts of their people, have advanced from the designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and have their goals set even higher.

It is my strong belief that these areas on the move will reach the higher plateaus they are seeking if we will not suddenly withdraw our support as soon as we see signs of progress. As we all know, a kite rapidly ascending into the sky may experience a pronounced reversal in direction once the impetus of an outside force, beyond its control, disappears. The analogy is valid.

To illustrate the need for the amendment being discussed, I wish to relay to you the situation as it applies to the Utica-Rome labor market area within my congressional district. Let me hasten to add that many other areas,

from the Atlantic to the Pacific are faced with a near-identical situation. This matter is being thoroughly researched and I expect to have a list of these areas in the near future.

The Utica-Rome labor market, encompassing Oneida and Herkimer Counties, has had its share of hard knocks over the years, the most recent of which was the loss of several thousand jobs as a result of a Department of Defense decision to phase out a major mission located at Griffiss Air Force Base. Our people have a resiliency in them and although they do not easily accept action that has an adverse effect on the local economy, rather than continually lamenting about past misfortunes they are searching for new and broader horizons. This is as it should be.

When the Public Works and Economic Development Act was passed, I received many telephone calls and letters from leaders in my district. They were pleased with the manner in which the bill was so amended because they could envision their plans for future progress receiving a shot in the arm in the form of Federal assistance for industrial parks and other such projects designed to attract new industry and additional jobs to boost the economy.

In comparison to some other areas of the country, Utica-Rome certainly could not be classified as depressed. Our leaders knew this and had just about ruled out the possibility of receiving aid from Washington for many proposals already on the drawing boards. However, they also knew that they must proceed with these plans if they were going to avoid the dark and dismal fate that had overtaken less fortunate areas of the Nation. They were faced with a dilemma that was less than encouraging when suddenly a key amendment to a major bill gave them new hope. Here, they thought, might be a partial solution to some of their financing problems. What happened?

Since the Department of Labor's review of the average annual unemployment statistics for the Utica-Rome labor market for 1964 revealed that the area had indeed had substantial unemployment for that year, classification as a title I area was automatic. As a result, the type of project approved and the amount of assistance authorized by the newly formed Economic Development Administration, would be dependent upon the merits of the particular project and whether or not the community or county or other body making application did so in accordance with EDA regulations.

At this point, it is important to explore some significant facts:

First, the Sisk amendment stipulated that the Department of Labor conduct an annual review to determine if the areas covered continue to meet the eligibility requirements for title I assistance. For example, all areas covered under title I will be reviewed by June of this year. If the unemployment figures for 1965 do not reveal that a given area remains in the substantial unemployment category, that area will lose its title I eligibility. In other words, the door for EDA assistance will be closed to those