dustry where freight rates are from $4 to $7 a ton higher than on other points on the eastern seaboard and in the Southeast.

Last winter through the efforts of many New England leaders, modest reductions of grain freight rates were announced. Ignoring the economic urgency of freight rate relief, the General Freight Traffic Committee, Eastern Railroads, later rescinded even this modest reduction. Harsh mileage rates have been retained instead of across-the-board rates originally used.

To illustrate the plight of poultry raisers in my State of New Hampshire and other areas of New England, I include here in the RECORD a letter I received from Wentworth Hubbard, president of the New Hampshire Poultry Growers' Association:

HUBBARD FARMS,
Walpole, N.H., May 12, 1964.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND: Thank you for forwarding the clipping concerning the recent insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your testimony in reference to the freight rate reduction dilemma we are faced with. Actually, the issue of survival of the New England poultry industry has reached such critical proportions that the attitude of the railroads seems inconceivable in light of the tonnage they will lose by pursuing this policy.

No doubt you are well aware of the fact that other points on the eastern seaboard and in the Southeast are receiving shipments of corn at rates which are $4 to $7 per ton below the cost charged to this area. Given this advantage in shipping rate differentials the poultry industry in the Middle Atlantic States and the Southeast is in a most favorable position to compete for our own local markets with their products.

I know that you have been most receptive to our concern over this problem and I hope and trust that you may be able to continue to use your good office to aid us in the struggle for relief from the discriminatory rate structure that now exists. Survival of the New Hampshire and New England poultry and livestock industries is now at stake.

Sincerely yours,
WENTWORTH HUBBARD,
President, New Hampshire Poultry Growers' Association.

The author of this letter, Mr. Wentworth Hubbard, and the Hubbard family, are well known to me personally, and indeed they are outstanding New England citizens. The Hubbard Farms at Walpole, N.H., have established many world records in producing fast-growing chickens, the most recent record having just been announced. Mr. Hubbard is not the type of person to become unduly alarmed and for this reason when he states that survival of the New Hampshire and New England poultry and livestock industries is at stake, the situation is indeed grave.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SPENDING CUTS ARE PHONY

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, next week the Committee on Ways and Means will begin hearings for an increase in the debt ceiling. Sooner even than expected the administration is going to ask us to approve upping the debt ceiling to $325 billion. The President is also going to oppose any reduction or elimination of Korean wartime excise taxes, yet used the tax cut bill to show his interest in cutting taxes.

At the same time the American people are being bombarded with presidential statements and through the newspapers, television and radio daily that Federal spending is being cut. Yet here is the demand for a new debt increase. I wonder how long it will be before the people will admit they are being kidded?

Oh, the President may have turned off a few lights in the White House, but there has been no real cut in spending. Our cash budget this year may run as high as $340 billion. The money sought for the poverty campaign alone will run into billions and this merely as a vote getting gimmick in an election year. Only yesterday the President asked for an additional $125 million for carrying on his war in Vietnam with the promise that much more will be needed. The administration is demanding Federal pay increases across the board, especially for the top bracket political appointees. While much is made of the number of Federal employees cut off the payroll, nothing is said about how many have been hired so that Federal employment levels are not being reduced.

No, Mr. Speaker, the President is not cutting Federal spending. There is no balanced budget in the making. So let us be honest with those we represent by either forcing the administration to live within its income by refusing to increase the debt ceiling or by taking it off altogether and do away with the subterfuge that we are attempting to hold down spending. Furthermore, throwing more money at the problems does not solve them.

WHO AUTHORIZED THE WAR IN VIETNAM?

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution plainly states that only Congress can declare war. Yet, American men are dying in a war in South Vietnam to which they were committed by the President without congressional approval. We are now being asked to okay an additional $125 million to continue the conduct of that war in spite of the fact that no action has ever been taken by Congress to authorize the war.

In addition, the Secretary of State is promising to send American troops to Laos to save a country which was sold out when a Democrat administration forced a coalition government on that country assuring an eventual Communist takeover. Even the Korean war, although initiated by the U.N. and President Truman, was immediately approved by the Congress when asked by the President. Not to be forgotten, as time passes there is more reason to believe that this war was fought in vain. Are we going to repeat our mistakes?

The off-again, on-again policy of the Democrat leadership which sends Americans to fight Communists in some areas while we play footsie with the top Reds in the Kremlin is making an utter shambles of any real effort to save the world from Communist aggression.

Fighting a halfhearted war with worn-out equipment is not a policy designed to win victory over the Communists. When the American people are convinced that the President supports a policy of strength and determination against communism, he can come before Congress in the proper way and ask for a declaration of war when it is necessary to take such action against Red imperialism. Until he abides by the Constitution the President has no right to ask for money and the Congress has no authority to appropriate money for an undeclared war.

The extent of the confusion of our policy in Asia is related in the following column written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 19, 1964.

UNITED STATES AND THE HOT WAR: SOUTHEAST ASIAN TINDERBOX SIZZLES WHILE ADMINISTRATION HOLDS FIRE

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress are rubbing their eyes as they awaken to the fact that the United States is engaged in a hot war in southeast Asia. Yet not a single resolution or law has been passed authorizing the use of America's Armed Forces in the conflict 7,000 miles away from our shores.

The Constitution of the United States provides that only Congress can declare war. The Executive has occasionally used military forces to safeguard American lives and property in foreign lands. But usually when such an affair takes on large proportions, the Chief Executive asks Congress for specific authority.

Today the administration is requesting more money under the "foreign aid" program to assist in achieving its objectives in Vietnam, but the purpose, in reality, is to help fight a war.

Perhaps even more striking is the lack of explanation from the administration as to why American forces are in Vietnam. More than 200 American lives have been lost there. The Secretary of Defense and the chief of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff periodically visit the South Vietnam battle zones, but still there is a hesitancy not only to declare a state of war officially but also to tell the American people just who is doing the fighting against the United States. The assumption is that it is a "local war." But certainly the arms and ammunition and supervisory military officers for the North Vietnamese are being provided from outside Vietnam.

On top of the Vietnam situation, now comes an attack upon the Government of Laos by the Communist forces. In fact, the whole of southeast Asia appears to be crumbling under the pressure of the Communists. One American military man says that originally the Russians were supplying most of the military and financial aid to southeast Asia, but that later on they turned the task over to the Red Chinese. If the Peiping Government is responsible for the war, surely the American people ought to be told. There are, moreover, areas in which the Red Chinese interests could be made the

target for some kind of counteroffensive which would assist the cause of South Vietnam. There is, for example, an army of Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, many of whom would gladly enter the war in southeast Asia if the United States furnished arms and supplies.

Certainly the United States is not using all its facilities—including a trade embargo by Western Powers—in the battle against the Red Chinese in Vietnam and Laos.

The United States faces a serious situation also in Thailand, which is supposed to be protected against Communist invasion as a consequence of the 14-nation agreement reached in 1962 in Geneva.

One wonders what the United Nations is doing while all the fighting is going on in southeast Asia. For a long time the United Nations has been represented as the instrumenality which can maintain peace in local areas. The experiment in the Congo was acclaimed in many quarters as an example of a successful effort with an internationalized army. The war to repel Communist aggression in Korea was under the auspices of the United Nations. But all through that conflict, Russia supplied arms and ammunition to the North Korean forces.

If the United Nations is to be the means through which international peace is to be maintained, then southeast Asia would seem to be a region in which its influence should be brought to bear. Certainly there should be an investigation as to who is behind the military movements in southeast Asia so the facts can be disclosed at least for discussion in the General Assembly. Many people in this country do not feel that American boys should be sent to southeast Asia. But if there were an international expedition, the American Government would unquestionably play its part and continue to contribute its share of the cost of the war.

Oddly enough, the whole subject of southeast Asia has not been brought formally before the United Nations. Possibly this is due to the feeling that action in the Security Council would be blocked by the Soviet Government. Even a discussion there, however, would be constructive. because it could mobilize world opinion and would fix the responsibility for warmaking clearly on Red China and the Soviet Government.

Although the war in southeast Asia appears at the moment to be local, it could spread. The Charter of the United Nations declares, in effect, that it is the function of that organization to intervene in any situation that might develop into a larger war. But the problem in southeast Asia has not been tackled effectively by the United Nations, and hence this country is bearing the burden of a hot war against Red China.

The hour of decision now is approaching, and certainly the continued loss of American lives in a war in which the best equipment has not been furnished and military support has not been adequately extended is bound to be an issue in the coming presidential campaign.

WASHINGTON POST FIGHTS FEP CLAUSE IN CONTRACT

(Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the both-sides-of-the-mouth positions of the Washington Post are well known to those of us who have no other morning newspaper to read, but the rest of the Nation seldom has an opportunity to catch them at their duplicity.

The latest example to come to my attention is the fact that they have no FEP clause in their contract with the Washingon Newspaper Guild and have bitterly opposed it when the union has fought for it. This is the same newspaper, mind you, which sheds mountainous waves of crocodile tears because there are others who oppose the FEP clause in the current civil rights bill.

The fact that the Post has fought the union to a standstill on this issue was reported to me by Mr. Harris Monroe, administrative officer of Local 35, American Newspaper Guild, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Monroe also informs me that the equally pious Scripps-Howard paper in Washington, the News, has also consistently rejected the Guild's demand for an FEP clause.

There can be little wonder why the Post is held in such low regard by those who see examples of this kind of two-faced philosophy.

Consistency, as Emerson put it, is the hobgoblin of little minds.

No one will ever be able to accuse the little minds at the Washington Post of consistency, of that we can be sure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall No. 127. If present I would have voted "yea."

H.R. 11236, THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT OF 1964

(Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 11236, the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1964, which will lead, hopefully, to the solution of a problem which is rapidly becoming a national disgrace.

The storage, collection, treatment, and disposal of solid wastes from our municipalities, industries, and agricultural activities are posing problems of increasing complexity and mounting urgency as the urbanization and industrialization of our country soars.

The urban sprawl—a postwar phenomenon which has revolutionized our concepts of urban life—is making the unpleasant sights, the noxious smoke, the insect and rodent infestations, and the menace to health created by open dumps less and less tolerable to people living in neighborhing residential areas.

Rats flourish on the exposed garbage and harbor in the trash, rubbish, and debris. Swarms of flies and other insects from dumps have been known to deface the walls of nearby homes. Pleasant suburban residential neighborhoods are often afflicted with the problems associated with the transportation and disposal of solid wastes from central urban districts.

Traditionally, solid waste handling has been regarded as a problem of a purely local nature, but when densely populated residential suburbs surround the central city and merge with residential areas of adjacent communities, all governmental units in the greater metropolitan complex find that their freedom to choose methods of waste handling is severely restricted by the disappearance of suitable land areas.

The annual financial outlay by our communities for public collection and disposal services—over $1.5 billion—is exceeded only by community expenditures for schools and roads. It has been estimated that annual expenditures for private sanitation services are over $1.3 billion. In other words, we, as a nation, are spending about $3 billion a year—and some say more—to have the domestic, industrial, and agricultural residue of our society picked up, hauled away, and disposed of either by burning, burying, or dumping in the open.

It is evident today that solid waste management has taken on a community-wide dimension involving all sectors of the modern community—urban, suburban, and rural—and that the community has generated problems of solid waste management faster than research and development have been able to provide answers. Although expenditures for solid waste handling are high, the corresponding expenditures for research in this field are pitifully small, constituting only a fraction of 1 percent. By comparison, the funds spent annually for research on liquid wastes are at least 50 times greater. This level of research has not provided a strong technology on which to base improved practices.

H.R. 11236 contains provisions for action to begin overcoming this disparity.

It is not necessary to look into the future to find reasons for worry about solid waste disposal problems. They are with us today. Fortunately, we have a test area—California—particularly along the Pacific coast where the westward migration comes to a halt. There each traveler to the golden West must find himself a place in the teeming cities or in what is left of the fast-diminishing open space.

Each day 1,500 new people are added to California's population—enough to occupy a small town; one-half million people a year, almost enough to occupy another San Francisco. By 1980, California's population of 16 million will have almost doubled—enough to occupy the 13 major cities of the State, with enough people left over to create a new San Francisco bay area—if an uninhabited area could be found by then.

What does this fulminating, land-consuming urbanization mean to farm lands and other open spaces? With every daily increase of 1,500 people, 375 acres of farm land must be changed to subdivisions, roads, public and private facilities, and all the nonagricultural uses of land which accompany urbanization of once rural areas.

The result? More sources of solid wastes and less land on which to dispose of them.

Ten years ago, it was estimated that refuse collection in California amounted to only 2.2 pounds per capita per day. Today it is about 4 to 4½ pounds per