

We recognize the world need for more food, but when the American farmer is asked by the Agriculture Department to increase production, he should at least have the assurance that his cooperative efforts do not result in a price decline.

Having first raised the subject of increased production versus farm prices last summer when the Department announced that wheat acreage would be increased, I now ask: Does this news wire service story herald another attempt to keep farm prices down? Is the Agriculture Department willing to use tactics to encourage production without assurances to farmers that the price structure will be improved?

With the most unfortunate development that farm parity recently dropped to 75 percent, I have written the Agriculture Department to obtain more information on the new farmer-persuasion campaign as reported by Associated Press, and its impact on American agriculture.

This news item also reported that those farmers ignoring Government production goals "face loss of Government subsidies."

Exactly what "subsidies" are the farmers going to lose? Does the Department view diversion payments and price supports as merely devices in its compliance effort?

THE CIA AND NSA

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. CARTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure that the Central Intelligence Agency has been subsidizing various activities of the National Student Association is indeed shocking. This organization supposedly represented or purported to represent a segment of student opinion in this country on various political issues.

This is but one more indication that the CIA is obviously getting out of control. These revelations may gravely damage our national prestige. The large-scale cloak and dagger activities of the CIA and the often ridiculous extremes taken in the name of national security are clearly against the principle of an open society which we hold ourselves to be. No great power can exist without a well-organized intelligence service, and certainly not in the cold war era. But the gathering of secret information in the military, economic, and—above all—political fields is one thing. The manipulation of this country's foreign policy and the intrusion of CIA activities in legitimate functions of a university or private organization is something entirely different.

I am preparing legislation, the adoption of which I believe will greatly strengthen congressional control over the activities of this agency. I am proposing that the CIA come before the Congress each year for annual authorization in order that its activities may be more closely scrutinized. Under this procedure the Congress would have two avenues for review: first, the authorization and, second, appropriation.

At the same time the congressional "watchdog" committees for the CIA should be broadened to include by law members of the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committee along with members of the Armed Services Committees. The CIA operation is clearly related to this country's foreign policy as well as its military posture. Indeed it may well be that the agency's influence on foreign policy is greater than it is on defense policy. It therefore seems logical that members of the committee which handle foreign policy legislation should be included on the watchdog committees.

In view of the revelations concerning CIA's financial support of what most Americans had believed to be a completely private student group it is essential that Congress bring this agency under control. The American people may reasonably wonder how much subterfuge is financed by the Government right here at home.

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. CARTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FINDLEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE DRAFT STIMULATES YOUNG MEN TO ENLIST

(Mr. SCHWEIKER (at the request of Mr. CARTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my proposal for draft reform, which I outlined February 7, I would like to point out that the draft stimulates young men to enlist and about one man enlists for every one actually inducted through selective service. The effect of my proposals would not be to cut enlistments, but simply to force young men to enlist sooner than they do now. They would have to decide before 18½ whether to enlist, risk being drafted, or enter college on a student deferment with liability for the draft after college.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT OF 1954

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. CARTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill which I believe is of vital importance to every American consumer and offers protection that is long overdue. I am referring to a measure to strengthen the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1954. The purpose of my bill is to reduce the danger of injury and loss of life by providing, on a national basis, standard methods of testing and rating the flammability of textiles and textile products for bedding use, thereby discouraging the use of any dangerously flammable bedding textiles.

Specifically, my bill prohibits the manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale in commerce, or the importa-

tion into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce or for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce, of any article of bedding which under conditions and in the manner prescribed in a commercial standard is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when used by individuals. All of these activities shall be deemed unlawful and shall be unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The term "bedding" is defined to mean sheets, covers, blankets, comforters, pillowcases, quilts, bedspreads, mattress pads, the outer covering of pillows, mattresses, and box springs, and all other products used or intended to be used on or about a bed or other place for reclining or sleeping, but shall not include furniture.

Where the prescribed commercial standards—originally set up to test items of wearing apparel in a vertical position—are inadequate for proper testing of the flammability of bedding, provision is made for the Department of Commerce to be given full and continuing authority to revise and strengthen the current standards of flammability and to develop new standards in the interests of the reasonable safety of the consuming public.

The Flammable Fabrics Act was created in 1954 as a result of the so-called explosive sweater incidents. These sweaters were brushed viscose rayon, a very inflammable fabric, and the same fiber that is going into millions of brushed blankets today. For some strange reason, the act applied to apparel only and never covered such vital items as sheets, covers, blankets, comforters, pillowcases, quilts, bedspreads, and so forth.

At the same time this bill was passed, most of the new synthetic fibers were just in the process of being developed and introduced to the American market. This includes all of the acrylic fibers such as Orlon, Acrilan, Creslan, Zefran; the modacrylics such as Verel and Dynal; the polyesters such as Dacron and a host of other less-known synthetics. Since that time, many of these fibers which are not only quite flammable but also productive of a dangerous hot melting liquid that may result in serious or possibly fatal burns have been adapted and are in widespread use today. Especially when used for bedding, these fabrics are potentially dangerous to the user because of the speed and the intensity of flame with which they burn and their ease in ignition. Millions of homes are being filled with many fabrics of this description with no consideration to the flammable qualities. The situation is most critical because the public is generally under the impression that the Flammable Fabrics Act protects them against all significant flammable fabrics. In many cases the impression of protection is an illusion and I feel that protective legislation should be updated and made genuinely effective.

Let me cite a few examples: take the case of blankets—where millions of consumers own highly flammable viscose rayon blankets and blankets made of