

nevertheless the United States also trails the Soviet Union in supersonic transport development.

I certainly recognize the complexities of such a development program. There are many problems which must be resolved. Apparently we have been approaching this program with timidity.

It is difficult to understand the administration's stretchout of the development phase in view of the market potential outlined by the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

We are told there is a market potential among commercial airlines for 400 to 800 aircraft. The national impact of the production program based on such potential would be approximately \$10 to \$20 billion over a 20-year period. Approximately 60 percent of the production effort will be distributed among approximately 10,000 subcontractors, suppliers and vendors in some 40 States.

The FAA administrator has reported that nearly \$10 million in deposits have been received for 96 delivery positions based on a delivery deposit of \$100,000 per aircraft ordered.

A study made by the Stanford Research Institute revealed that it will cost America \$2¼ billion in lost revenues if we decide not to build the supersonic transport. It will yield a profit of \$2¼ billion if we do.

Beyond the financial benefits, we must remember the free world continues to look for leadership in the field of Aviation to the United States.

In his testimony before the Appropriations subcommittee, General McKee said that this 18-month development phase would not preclude action on the part of the Government to speed this program up. I believe it is important that every effort be made to do so.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to comment on one item in this bill of which I strongly disapprove, namely, the item on page 22 of the bill, in chapter VII, legislative branch, which would appropriate \$300,000 for an extension of the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we would be making a very serious mistake, both historically and esthetically, to spend any money at all in furtherance of the present plans and proposals of the Architect of the Capitol regarding the west front.

You can say what you like about the earlier decision to extend the east front. I was not in the House when that decision was made. But at least there was some merit to moving the east front out to balance the overhanging dome. And we were short of office space when the extension was authorized.

But neither argument, Mr. Chairman, applies in the case of the west front. The balance along the west front is perfect. The proposal of the Architect would completely disrupt that balance and destroy a view of the Capitol that has been familiar for over 150 years. Besides that, we certainly have no need of additional office space, some 4½ acres of it. We have all we need and more now in the three office buildings. While space in the Capitol might be more convenient it certainly does not warrant destroying

the character and balance of this important and historic building.

But most of all, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this extension because if it goes through it means that the last remaining exterior facade of the original Capitol Building, dating back to 1800, will be forever covered from view. We ought to preserve our historic shrines and buildings, not cover them up with garish imitations. This country went to great expense to preserve the original walls of the White House when reconstruction was undertaken in 1948. I believe we should do no less in the case of the U.S. Capitol, seat of the world's greatest deliberative body.

Oh I will be told that the present sandstone walls are crumbling. Of course they are. I have seen them. They need to be shored up and strengthened. And I have seen the engineering report which says that the only way you can save these walls is to cover them up. But, Mr. Chairman, engineering reports are like lawyers' briefs. You can get them to prove either side you want. You get what you pay for. I just do not believe that this great Nation, so technically advanced that we can orbit 2 men for 8 days in space, cannot find it possible to preserve the west front of the Capitol without destroying its historic integrity.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware the committee report indicates this \$300,000 is only for preliminary studies, that we must still approve the final plans and appropriate the construction money. Nevertheless the cat is out of the bag. The plan is plainly indicated. The time to stop it is now, not 2 years hence.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, that I had the eloquence of the poet Oliver Wendell Holmes who with his pen saved that great American ship that lies tied up and still commissioned in Boston Harbor, the U.S.S. *Constitution*, "Old Ironsides."

Aye, tear her tattered ensign down.
Long has it waved on high,
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky.

Holmes saved "Old Ironsides" from destruction and death with those historic lines. We here in this House could write even more eloquent poetry today by defeating this appropriation and making it crystal clear that no one, not even the Architect of the Capitol, shall tear down the walls of the historic U.S. Capitol which have proudly proclaimed our liberty for 165 years.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, with exceptions, I support this bill. I have reservations, for example, about the foundation for the arts and the supersonic transport and have voted against them in the past. The Congress has spoken, however, and I cannot vote against the bill because of these two items.

It was unfortunate that administration requests for appropriations for the Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act and the Water Quality Act were not before the Committee in time to include them in this supplemental appropriation. Rather than delay acting on supplemental appropriations, and to ex-

pedite the business of the House, today's bill was reported with no provision for funds for these very important programs. However, it is my understanding that such requests will be made to the Senate Appropriations Committee in time for inclusion in their bill. I am confident that there will be no problem in accepting such an inclusion.

I note that today's bill provides only one-half of the sum authorized in title VII of the Housing Act for basic water and sewer facilities. I hope that this is not a precedent, and that the requests made to the Senate Appropriations Committee are for the entire authorization; \$150 million for the Water Quality Act, and \$50 million for the Rural Sanitation Act. There is absolutely no excuse, under any circumstances, to tolerate the further pollution of our rivers and streams for lack of adequate sewage facilities. This is one problem where we know the need, the solution, and the deplorable consequences of our failure to act.

The administration should have requested and the Congress should appropriated, regardless of the absence of such a request, the full authorized amounts for waste disposal and water facilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the budget estimates that were considered by the subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies were practically all the direct result of legislation that has recently been enacted. In 11 instances this legislation passed the House by large majorities. In several instances the requests are below the amounts authorized to be appropriated. In view of these facts and in view of the important nature of these programs the committee has made very few cuts and the cuts which have been made are relatively small.

The first item included in this chapter is \$2,727,000 to enable the Food and Drug Administration to carry out the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. This is the full amount requested. The abuse of drugs used for nonmedical purposes has become a major health and social problem. It has spread and intensified during the past decade and there has been increasing involvement of criminal organization. This legislation establishes controls for the depressant and stimulant drugs—the so-called pep pills and sleeping pills. It also provides better controls concerning counterfeit drugs which have increasingly become a problem in the drug industry.

For the Office of Education the bill includes the full amount of the request for \$4 million authorized by Public Law 89-105 for additional research and demonstration activities aimed at improving the programs for the education of handicapped children in this country. \$2 million was appropriated for this purpose in the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1966, however, the need for research in this area has been so great that this program has committed all but \$500,000 of the \$2 million just to support research which was begun prior to this year. Thus, this additional \$4 million will provide the funds desperately needed for new research

projects. Ten percent or more of the children in our schools have physical, intellectual, social, or communications handicaps of such severity that present educational procedures are not adequate to prepare them to assume their proper places in today's society. This inability to cope with the handicapped 10 percent of the school population also damages the schools effectiveness with the rest of their students. The additional funds will be used to support projects in all areas of the handicapped.

The appropriation of these funds represents the very serious determination of Congress that effective programs be developed and implemented for the benefit of handicapped children. But money alone will not suffice to bring about the new ideas and new programs so desperately needed right now. The effective use of these funds and the future of handicapped children will depend upon the way the funds are managed by the Office of Education. The Office of Education must determine the educational needs of handicapped children and invest the funds accordingly. Because of this need for a systematic determination of priorities and for sensitive and intelligent management of these funds, I firmly believe that a single unit within the Office of Education should be designated as the one to manage the funds and that such funds do not become a part of a common pool to be drawn from at random by a variety of units.

The bill includes funds for several extremely important activities in the Public Health Service. The committee has approved the full amount in each instance. The first of this group is \$2,835,000 for chronic diseases and health of the aged, of which \$2,750,000 is for grants to States. This appropriation is needed to carry out new authority, for assisting State programs for combating mental retardation, contained in the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Previous legislation and appropriations have provided funds for planning mental retardation facilities and services that are so desperately needed in practically every State in the Nation. This small amount of funds contained in the bill is to assist the States in implementing the plans drawn up under the previous program.

The next item in the bill under the Public Health Service is \$8 million for the community immunization program carried out by the Communicable Disease Center. This request was included in the original President's budget submitted to Congress in January but was disallowed at that time since authorization for the program had expired. This authorization has since been extended. Since the committee took technical credit for an \$8 million reduction in the budget in connection with the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill, this amount is shown in the report table as an increase in connection with this bill. Actually the new authorization is for \$11 million, and some members of the committee felt that more than the amount carried in the bill should be appropriated. However, no revision was made in the original budget request and the full amount of that request was ap-

proved by the committee. The main purpose of this appropriation is to carry out the revised authority which adds measles to the diseases for which vaccination assistance can be given. Measles is the most infectious of the childhood diseases, attacking about 4 million children each year, leading to many serious complications, and causing about 500 deaths. Fortunately, we now have vaccines to prevent the disease, but unfortunately, the extent of utilization is quite low. Under this program grants will be made to States and communities to assist them in conducting comprehensive immunization programs against this disease, and will continue the old program against polio, diphtheria, whoopingcough, and tetanus.

The bill carries an item of \$3 million under "Community health practice and research" which was also carried in the President's budget submitted last January and denied because of the expiration of authority for the migrant health project grant program. The authorization for this program has since been extended and expanded to provide an authorization of \$7 million. As in the immediately preceding item there are some who feel that the full authorization should be provided, however, the budget has not been revised and the full amount of the budget is contained in the bill. Also, as with respect to the previous item, the committee took credit for a reduction in the budget in connection with the regular annual bill so this is shown as a plus in the committee's report on this bill.

There are also two other items in connection with "Community health practice and research," which are directly connected with the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The first is \$9 million for formula grants to States for an accelerated program of developing home health services. Beneficiaries under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 will be entitled to 100 home health visits in any calendar year after a period of care in a hospital or extended care facility. It is a sad commentary on our Nation's health services, but it is a fact, that the availability of such home services is exceedingly limited in almost all communities and is totally lacking in many. I am not sure that \$9 million is going to be sufficient to make a real start in correcting this problem but there is real hope that, with the cooperation of the States and communities, significant progress can be made. Our committee will certainly make a careful reevaluation of this program when we act on the next annual appropriation bill.

The last item under "Community health practice and research" is \$2,100,000 which is a transfer from the social security trust funds to provide for the administrative expenses necessary for the Public Health Service to carry out its responsibilities related to the professional health aspects of the program of health insurance for the aged.

The last Public Health Service item is an appropriation of \$19,700,000 to the National Institutes of Mental Health to carry out the new authorization for Federal assistance in staffing mental health

centers. The Mental Health Centers Act has been widely hailed as providing for the greatest advance in the treatment of mental diseases of any program yet devised. While this act has served as a stimulus toward establishment of a nationwide community based program of services for the mentally ill, it quickly became obvious that the majority of the Nation's communities, and especially the less affluent communities, would have to have help in financing the initial staffing of the new centers while local financing was being arranged to support continuing operations. The important legislation authorizing this Federal assistance passed the House by unanimous vote.

There are several items in the bill for the Social Security Administration and the Welfare Administration all of which were authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 or are for the necessary costs of administering these new programs. These have been so thoroughly discussed in connection with the authorizing legislation that was passed this session of Congress that I will not go into them in detail. I would like to point out, however, that the amount carried for "Grants for maternal and child welfare" is another item where the authorization exceeds the amount of the request. The request was for \$25 million which is the amount contained in the bill. This will provide \$15 million to initiate a new and very much needed program of project grants to provide health screening, diagnosis, preventive and treatment services for children, particularly in areas with a concentration of low-income families. It also provides a \$5 million increase for the grant program for maternal and child health services, and \$5 million for the grant program for services for crippled children. These were all authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and, in addition, a \$5 million increase for the grant program for child welfare services was so authorized. I personally cannot understand why there was no request for the additional \$5 million for welfare services since there is such an obvious need for at least this additional amount.

One of the items reduced somewhat by the committee was the request for \$326,000 for the Office of the Secretary. There is no doubt that the considerable amount of recently enacted legislation, adding new programs and expanding old programs of the Department, has added substantially to the responsibilities and workload of the Office of the Secretary. For fiscal year 1965, appropriations provided for 101 positions in his immediate office. In recognition of the additional workload, Congress provided for 12 additional positions in the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for 1966. The supplemental request was for an additional 36 positions. In view of the fact that 12 positions had already been allowed in connection with the regular bill the committee felt that an additional 18 would be sufficient to permit the Secretary to adequately discharge his responsibilities.

The increase provides eight additional positions for the Assistant Secretary for health and medical affairs. In this

broad field involving some 40 appropriation items and a vast array of activities, there has been a substantial amount of new legislation during the last year. The other 10 additional positions were allowed to establish a new Assistant Secretary, and provide the necessary staff, to be available to carry out responsibilities in any areas where the Secretary determined staff assistance was most needed. The committee denied the request for an Assistant Secretary for special programs and staff. A similar request was contained in the President's budget submitted in January and was denied by Congress in connection with the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1966. The committee also denied the request for a new assistant to the Secretary for water pollution and staff. A new organization is to be established in the Department to administer the water pollution program. A majority of the committee felt that the establishment of a new Assistant Secretary for the same purpose should at least be postponed until more is known regarding the details of the organization to be established to administer the program. There was also some feeling that it is unwise to establish assistant secretaries for individual programs such as this. It could be opening Pandora's box and inviting the supporters of a great many individual programs, that such supporters would consider just as important as water pollution, to insist on assistant secretaries to lend equal stature to their programs.

Mr. Chairman, the last item in this chapter is also by far the largest. The bill includes \$1½ billion, the amount of the request, for the economic opportunity program. While this is a very large sum, it is certainly conservative. Both the House and the Senate passed authorization bills in excess of this amount. It is \$285 million less than the authorization finally enacted, and is \$400 million less than the amount that this House passed just a few months ago. Compared to the potential of the program in 1966 as measured by the estimated demand from the States and communities, even the authorization is conservative and the amount carried in the bill is short by at least \$500 million.

As the committee report states, this agency has shown a remarkable ability to get a complex, multifaceted program moving expeditiously and in an efficient manner. The committee report goes on to point out that just in the first 10 months of this program 1.3 million poor persons directly benefited. When you consider that the families of these persons also benefited in most cases, the total of people benefited directly and indirectly will approach 5 million.

The almost 400 pages of hearings on this program are full of specific examples of benefits derived from the many programs and subprograms this agency administers. A few examples—the committee was told that the average enrollee in the conservation camps gains 15 pounds during the first month of training. In the short time that the conservation centers have been in existence, enrollees have spent 1,821 man-hours in firefight-

ing and building firebreaks; they built 250 family units for picnicing and camping; they laid 1,280 yards of pipe and tile lines; put up 640 signs; built 2,000 yards of diversion ditches; built and maintained administrative facilities, including 809 equipment and supply stores, 80 service and repair shops, and so on. As a result of counseling efforts and special programs worked out cooperatively with the schools, 300 of the 1,200 out-of-school neighborhood youth corp enrollees in Cleveland are expecting to return to school this fall. The Salt Lake City neighborhood youth corp director reports that between 30 and 40 percent of the dropouts in that out-of-school program are returning to school. A sample of the medical examinations given headstart children shown that dental referrals were made for 56 percent of the children, 5 percent had been exposed to tuberculosis, 3 percent had hearing problems, 4 percent had visual problems, and 1 percent of the children had speech defects. Formal requests have been received for more than 6,500 VISTA volunteers in excess of those that have already been placed. This is just a sampling of the many examples of accomplishment and successes in connection with this program.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been maligned in newspapers, magazines, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During the course of our hearings many of the specific instances involved in these newspaper and magazine stories and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were brought up for discussion. In all but one instance these stories proved to be completely erroneous or so distorted and exaggerated as to constitute untruths. Satisfactory explanations were given for every one of them except an instance brought to the committee's attention by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] involving the use of small purchase orders to contract for personal services of individuals. When it was confirmed that this procedure had been followed in the one instance, Director Shriver immediately agreed that this was a very poor practice and assured the committee that it would be discontinued. He also had a complete search made of the OEO's records and advised the committee that this procedure had been utilized for similar purposes in 10 instances, totaling \$20,000. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this comes about as close to a perfect record as any program of this size in the Federal Government could come. For an agency to undergo the searching questions which were raised in our hearings and come up with about one three-hundred-and-fiftieth of 1 percent of their funds having been spent in a doubtful manner is about as good as it is humanly possible to get.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed here some very worthwhile programs that greatly benefit either directly or indirectly all of the people of our Nation. In closing, I ask the indulgence of this body to speak briefly about a somewhat personal matter. As chairman of the subcommittee that handles appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and the

antipoverty program, I am continually frustrated and embarrassed by the fact that my own State of Rhode Island does not take advantage of these programs as it should. Frankly it is one of the more backward States in the Nation in this regard. I am not going into great detail at this time, but I would like to have in the RECORD at least one good example that will only take 2 or 3 minutes of the Members' time.

During the past 3 years, this Congress has brought about a revolution in the area of mental health and mental retardation. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 is a landmark in the history of our humane national concern for those afflicted with these maladies. But the Congress found it was not enough to provide all the impetus that was needed; thus, this year we added amendments to the act to allow for staffing assistance for mental health centers and we authorized even greater expenditures than had originally been planned for mental retardation.

I personally take great pride in the fact that as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives I participated in the actions of the 88th and 89th Congresses to enact these laws to provide funds that will stimulate the construction of mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

As you know, this legislation was designed as a stimulus. We in Congress had no intention of supplanting local or State programs with Federal programs. We left the next step up to each State itself. Federal funds were available, but they provided only enough to interest communities and States in attempting to find additional methods of financing.

The act, and its amendments, require that State plans for the use of allotted funds be prepared, opening the way for individual communities to develop their own local plans for participation in the program. And, as I see it, this is true cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

It is, therefore, with a great deal of sadness that I have observed the slowness with which the Governor of my own State of Rhode Island has moved to avail us of this Federal assistance. Our citizens have suffered from a lack of leadership in a field where dynamic leadership is vital.

In the area of mental health, for example, our Governor's comprehensive State mental health plan recommends a permanent Governor's council on mental health with full-time professional and clerical staff. The plan also emphasizes the distinctive features of the State: its small geographic size and the comparatively easy geographical accessibility to mental health services developed within our State.

Because of these features, Rhode Island is in a position to establish specialized units providing centralized services for the entire State, while continuing the support of basic mental health services required by the Federal program under local mental health boards.

But comprehensive planning in Rhode Island has not yet led to a practical plan of action for participation in the Federal program for community mental health center construction. And I must confess that it is a mystery to me why Rhode Island has not been in the forefront of this movement nationally.

Already, seven States have submitted center plans that have been approved; four others are pending. These States with approved plans include the two with the largest populations—California and New York. If these two, with their immensely complex problems and their broad geographic variations, can act to take advantage of Federal assistance in the center construction program—so too can Rhode Island.

Specific recommendations regarding sources, methods and levels of financing a mental health program are lacking altogether in the Rhode Island comprehensive plan. These must be provided, and soon, by the responsible State officials.

The comprehensive plan also recommends the development of a model mental health law for Rhode Island to be submitted to the general assembly at its 1966 session. This must be done; Rhode Island cannot continue to lag behind the 25 States that have already enacted such legislation.

An extensive program for expanding mental health facilities in Rhode Island has been recommended by the Governor's council on mental health in a report that also called for the establishment of several new institutions. The council said an estimated 86,000 persons in the State were in need of some form of psychiatric care in 1960, and that number could increase to 94,200 by 1970. Last year, approximately 32,800 persons were treated in Rhode Island.

It is just unbelievable that Rhode Island is dragging its feet in this area.

Although the council did not give a specific estimate of the cost of the expanded program, it said that treatment for Rhode Islanders would cost a great deal of money. The council also recommended public subsidies for some patients referred to private psychiatrists.

Costly or not, the council's goals are clearly reasonable—these goals are urgent. Failure to provide care can result in more profound, more intractable illness. Each year of delay in providing such services produces its own harvest of despair, and makes recovery and rehabilitation more difficult and expensive.

In my duties as a Member of the Congress I have sought on many occasions to promote national programs built on the sound principle that mental health is public health, and thus must include both preventive and rehabilitative resources to reduce the burden of disability which individuals and communities must suffer. I urge attention to this principle upon the officials of my own State.

In the area of mental retardation, the situation is somewhat better although here too the lack of leadership in finding the financial ways and means for an ac-

tive program is handicapping local efforts.

Rhode Island has submitted its mental retardation facilities plan to the Public Health Service, and in this plan 13 facilities are projected for the State, based on a division of the State into four regions.

Region No. 1 includes Providence, Cranston, and East Providence. For this region there are five facilities planned to serve the retarded, with two facilities in Providence, two in Cranston, and one in East Providence.

Region No. 2, which includes Burrillville, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket, has planned three facilities. Burrillville already has facilities, and two would be added in Pawtucket, and one in Woonsocket.

In region No. 3, including Exeter, Warwick, and Westerly, three new facilities are planned, with one for Warwick, and two for Westerly. Exeter already has some facilities.

Region No. 4 includes only Newport, where two facilities are planned.

Mr. Chairman, our State officials have been guilty of sins of omission—they have not pushed ahead to take advantage of the opportunity available to them.

In Rhode Island, I cannot understand this attitude. It seems to me that one of the qualities needed for true leadership is the ability to recognize opportunity when it arises. Federal assistance in mental health and mental retardation programs provides an opportunity for those of our citizens who have suffered without the help they deserve.

I, for one, would like to see the qualities of leadership put on display in my home State.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to several items in this bill. I am not going to take time to discuss them all but there is one quite confused situation, that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] touched on briefly, that I think should be discussed in more detail.

For fiscal year 1965, appropriations available to the immediate office of the Secretary supported a total of 101 positions. In the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1966, Congress allowed an additional 12 positions. The supplemental request was to add still another 36 positions, as follows:

First. To increase from 8 to 16 the number of positions for the Assistant Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs.

Second. Ten additional positions to establish a third assistant secretary and staff.

Third. Ten additional positions to establish an assistant secretary for special programs and staff.

Fourth. Eight positions to establish a new assistant to the Secretary for Water Pollution and staff.

The hearings were very vague when it came to any details concerning the request. The witnesses also were unable to explain why the President's budget submitted in January contained a re-

quest for five positions for a new assistant secretary for special programs and staff; then, after this was turned down in connection with the regular bill, it was resubmitted in the supplemental, but for 10 positions rather than 5.

During the hearings on the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] asked:

Do you think water pollution is more important than your farflung education and training programs?

After which the following colloquy took place:

Mr. COHEN. Are you talking about the Office of Education or are you talking about Manpower Development and Training?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, an assistant secretary.

Mr. COHEN. I think there is a lot of merit to that.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that they were so anxious that this was not to be used as an argument against an Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution that, within days after the hearings, the Secretary announced that he was establishing a new position of Assistant Secretary for Education. I am glad that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] confined his comparison to just water pollution and education. If he had asked if they consider water pollution to be more important than education, vocational rehabilitation, air pollution, mental retardation, alcoholism, and a few others, we might have a dozen or 15 new Assistant Secretaries by this time.

The bill includes the requested increase for the Assistant Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, and the requested increase for the third Assistant Secretary. Now I would like to quote what the justifications to the House committee said about the duties of the third Assistant Secretary:

The third Assistant Secretary is expected to perform those special functions which are assigned to him by the Secretary. The Secretary wishes to have an Assistant Secretary to whom he can make special assignments such as evaluation of particular program areas, assisting the Secretary with special White House matters, including White House conferences, and numerous other unanticipated responsibilities which are constantly being placed on the Secretary and for which the Secretary needs a small staff headed by a top-level official.

They convinced a majority of the committee that 10 additional positions were needed for these purposes and the funds were included in the bill. Now I have just received a copy of the justifications that went to the Senate for the third Assistant Secretary. These read as follows:

The third Assistant Secretary will advise the Secretary on educational policy matters which are best handled at the Department level. He will review and coordinate intradepartmental policies affecting fellowships, student loans and related matters to insure Departmentwide consistency. He will have responsibility for the educational television program and DHEW responsibilities in the manpower development and training program, including liaison with the Department of Labor. He will act as liaison with other Federal agencies and institutions of

higher learning to improve consistency of approach to educational policy.

The Department has a relatively new Secretary who obviously has not had time to make a thorough study of the needs of his office. Since the President's budget was submitted, the Department has completely changed its mind regarding the needs for an Assistant Secretary for special programs. Just since the House held hearings on this supplemental, they have completely changed their minds on the functions to be performed by the third Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is safe to assume that they will have changed their mind about other things in connection with the Office of the Secretary by the time these funds could be appropriated. It appears to me that the only reasonable thing to do is to postpone making any additional appropriations to the Office of the Secretary and reconsider this matter in January when we have something firmer to act upon. After all, the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill gives the Secretary an increase of over 10 percent in the number of positions above those available for fiscal year 1965 and I am sure the Department would not be crippled by delaying further increases for just a very few months.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

RENT SUPPLEMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago when the Housing bill was under consideration, I opposed the rent supplement program because it was the most controversial part of the entire bill.

The main reason for my objection was that this program—a social planner's dream disguised in housing terminology—would give the Housing Administrator a blank check to federalize American residential patterns and subsidize forced economic integration. This is what we were afraid of—and we were right. That is what the Housing Administrator is trying to do.

I am sorry to say that the Administrator admits his objective. He is not concerned with helping poor people to find housing. He is after so-called economic integration. He says so right in his instructions to local FHA office directors. In a letter of September 28, numbered NF letter 63, the Administrator states that criteria for approval of a rent supplement project "will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting

in integrating economic groups." He stands condemned out of his own mouth as a man up to no good.

This program has been full of deceit. It was initially called an experiment, yet it was to be given \$8 billion over a 40-year period. Some experiment.

If you will recall, when the Administrator realized that this program was doomed to defeat, there was a sudden retreat—the program was watered down and a compromise was offered to save it. It passed the House on a 208-to-202 vote.

So instead of asking for \$50 million for this year, the compromise asked for only \$30 million. Of course, this was still too much.

I am glad to see that the distinguished Committee on Appropriations has slashed the rent supplement appropriation from \$30 to \$6 million. I can understand the reluctance of the committee to completely eliminate appropriations for this worthless program, but they have made their feelings perfectly clear by almost doing so. Now it is our turn.

We ought to make our feelings perfectly clear by throwing out the last \$6 million appropriation for this study in trickery. The rent supplement program is not worth a penny.

I say this because this program is an insult to the Congress. We warned the Members of this House that this program was a Trojan horse. We said that it would be as full of abuses as a swiss cheese is full of holes. We said this, and some of you did not believe us. We knew that the regulations would be chock full of the loopholes that the Administrator needs for his forced economic integration. We told you, and we were right.

The regulations are out now. They just came out recently. The Administrator held them up for a while until the Appropriations Committee had finished its hearings. The Administrator has no more respect for the committees of the Congress than he has for the Congress itself. He delayed issuing his rent supplement regulations until 20 days after the Appropriations Committee hearings. You have heard about these regulations already. They make a mockery of the rent supplement program.

Let me mention the worst regulations. First, rent supplements can be used to pay up to 70 percent of a tenant's rent. This degree of subsidy is gross paternalism. Secondly, a family may qualify for rent subsidies even though it has assets of as much as \$25,000. Those of you who thought that this program is for the poor are wrong. Nobody concerned with the poor would implement a regulation like this.

Another bad regulation allows a family with four children to collect payments for a four-bedroom apartment. What percentage of our American families with four children have four-bedroom housing? This is not equity—this is trickery and luxury.

As I said, the Appropriations Committee was not allowed to know about these regulations while their hearings were going on. The Housing Administrator has

pulled every trick he knows to keep his program from being blasted on its merits.

From start to finish, this program has been an insult to the Congress and its committees, and the guiding hand behind these insults has been the Housing Administrator. Some of you may remember the special Banking and Currency Committee print that was written downtown to attack the committee minority as liars for minority report statements which have turned out to be true.

Rarely in congressional history has one man downtown sought so often to pull so much wool over the eyes of so many as the Housing Administrator.

I am sorry that this infamous rent supplement program is in the lawbooks, but if it has to be on the books, I urge you to have it there without 1 red cent of appropriations.

When the rent supplement survived a recomittal vote by a bare six votes, it did so under false pretenses. Many Members supporting it had been convinced that possible abuses would not occur. They were wrong. I hope they know it. I hope they know that the Housing Administrator tried to make suckers out of them. This is their chance to redeem themselves. This is their chance to vote right on rent supplements. This is everybody's chance to vote to tell the Housing Administrator that he cannot bamboozle the Congress of the United States and get away with it.

Some here may say that \$6 million is chickenfeed, and that we ought to let the rent supplement program starve to death in peace. This would be a mistake. This \$6 million is not \$6 million at all. It is \$6 million worth of commitment to run 40 years, and that is just about a quarter of a billion dollars, and once the contracts are made this year for \$6 million, we are stuck for 40 years.

Nor do I think it is a question of respecting the \$6 million figure the committee set. The committee had not seen the regulations. Besides, I think they had the goods on the rent supplement. I think that they would have liked to knock it out completely, but they left that up to us. A vote to knock out the remaining \$6 million is a vote for the honor and integrity of this House—and it is also a vote for commonsense.

I urge your support of the motion to strike out this \$6 million for the rent subsidy program.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I take a few minutes to say that I am very pleased the Appropriations Committee has unanimously decided to grant \$12 million in additional funds to the USIA for stepping up and increasing their informational activities in Vietnam, Thailand, and southeast Asia generally. I am sure we agree that although military victories are important, we really will win or lose in southeast Asia depending upon whether we can compete for the minds of the uncommitted people of the world.