

by people going over to Guam; we just passed a bill relative to their quota.

I would think we would find a number of people who have put people to work building plants in the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico—there are a lot of small industries going up there. But I take the Senator's word for it that there is one company for sure which has invested

[P. 27593]

some money and put people to work down there. I understand that is the Harvey Aluminum Co. My only regret is that they did not do it in Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator mentions the watch company. This is another red herring. It makes no difference whether they own a company in Guam or anywhere else; the investment credit has been suspended as of October 9, 1966. No one can question but that this amendment is tailor-designed to fit one company, the Harvey Aluminum, which stands to receive about \$2 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator, but I do not want him later to be saying that I delayed the adoption of the conference report because I am yielding to him all the time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is most kind. This amendment is not tailor made to fit one company. In general, any company, as I understand it, that builds a building in those American possessions gets the same type of consideration as far as investment credit is concerned that it would get if it had built it in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not argue with the Senator whether it is tailored designed or not. I will say most emphatically that the date selected fits exactly that one case. It would be a series of strange coincidences if all of that just accidentally happened exactly that way. I repeat: It did not leave them out.

Mr. President, I see no need to pursue the question any longer. We have discussed it in detail. This was to be a Foreign Investors' Tax Act. I cite just a few other examples of special treatment. Increased depletion allowances for clam and oyster shells, gravel and slate, and certain types of alumina-bearing clay are all in this grab bag. Those are examples of many presents in this bill, every one of which is tailor designed to fit specific cases. Such matters do not belong in general legislation; they should be handled as private bills, if at all, and voted on as such.

When I objected to these extraneous matters during the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate I was described as the most hardhearted individual in the Senate. The Senator

from Louisiana asked how one could oppose a measure which would do so much for the old people. For a while I thought we were going to turn the Senate into an old folks home, so many examples were brought forth of these elderly people, starving to death, needing doctors, medicine, drugs, and unable to get them without the original bill then before us. That was the argument then.

Mr. President, what happened? They deleted every one of these items in the bill. Even the provision dealing with the elderly people was deleted. The conferees kept every item in the bill that takes care of some special individual or company, such as the gift of \$2 million to the Harvey Aluminum Co. and other such special group amendments.

This is a special bill for special groups. I guess that the elder citizens will have to wait until another election approaches, and then they will hear more concern expressed for them, or perhaps if we adjourn between now and election day they will hear much said on the campaign trail about how the administration wanted to do something for them. Such promises and expressions are a political farce.

They traded off and deleted every item that would benefit the elderly people in return for the acceptance of these grab bag amendments. The conferees brought back every item that takes care of some special interest or some special group by way of a tax reduction. Such hypocrisy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that when the Senator offered his amendment to strike from the bill all of the titles except title I, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I believe, suggested that he carry that amendment into effect except that he allowed to remain in the bill the section providing aid to the aged in the purchase of drugs and medicines, and that in pursuance to that suggestion the Senator from Delaware persisted in his amendment but agreed to allow the provision for the aged to remain in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. My first proposal was to strike the three titles which did not deal with the Foreign Investment Tax Act. However, after I had heard all the eloquent pleas to take care of these elderly people and after I had seen so many crocodile tears shed, I thought perhaps the situation was so bad that we ought to yield and permit them to keep in the provision for the elderly people.

Accordingly my amendment was amended to strike out all except that part pertaining to the elderly people. We lost on that amendment. The measure went to conference, and, lo and behold, the conferees took out all the provisions benefitting the elderly, which they had argued for, and they retained all of the special privilege amendments. I re-