Aside from the action of S. 1974. regulate one limited aspect of the foreign excess programs this hill objections to the inclusion of foreign excess property in S. 1974 remain the same as those we have expressed for domestic excess property acquired and held by AID; namely, the maximum Federal utilization should be made of Government-owned excess property, and that Federal agencies should have first priority on such property, whether foreign or domestic.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat the assurances previously given the subcommittee that GSA is in full accord with the principles and objectives of the donable property program. GSA continues to work closely with the other agencies, Federal and State, for the vigorous promotion of the donation program, which provides significant benefits to our schools, hospitals, and other eligible institu-

tions and organizations throughout the country.

That concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad, and my associates will be glad, to answer any questions you

may have.

Senator Gruening. Now, on page 185 of your statement you say that inasmuch as transfers of excess property to AID for its statutory program uses constitute a Federal agency utilization in excess of Ismir and Istanbul. Such equipment includes a madverse impact on one ment to maintain the cities' streets, trucks to help in garbage collection, equipment for the cities firefighting services, and electric generators to light the homes of the residents in these cities.

## DISCRIMINATION AGAINST OWN PEOPLE

Your statement seems to contend that when excess property is acquired by AID and given to the cities of Ismir and Istanbul-those are merely illustrative; there are other cases, too-it is a Federal program which should be given priority over the donation of the same kind of equipment to the cities of our own people back home. I have had many requests from remote communities not only in Alaska but