

Mr. O'MALLEY. Congressman, in some of these instances I am sure you are aware that the applicant withdraws his project and does not want it kept in reserve status. He wants to pursue some other avenue of financing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I think that some of the questions already point up the fact that besides the EDA being perhaps a little lax in keeping us informed, I think to be candid we have to admit we have been a little lax in holding hearings.

Now, as we all know, the bells are going to ring in about 3 or 4 minutes. We all know that there is very important legislation on the floor, that we are going to have to leave, and I know this comes as good news to at least some of the witnesses. But I want to get it on the record now that we are going to have more hearings, and as soon as possible.

It is my understanding from the chairman and other people that perhaps next week may not be a very heavy week, but again that is in the spirit of Thanksgiving, and the witnesses may be pleased; but I think the week following that, we should make it clear that we are going to have hearings. I want to make it clear that if we have those hearings—and I urge those hearings—that I am going to be asking representatives from EDA questions with reference to the 702 section. I am going to be asking them about the *Clay Pipe* case, with which I know they are familiar. I am going to be asking them about a more recent case, which is the *Blue Ridge Nursery* case in North Carolina. I am also going to repeat, to the extent that time permits, the observations made on page 40—questions raised by the observations on page 40 of our first interim report, House Report No. 82.

I am going to expect the people from EDA to be fully prepared to discuss those observations and questions and particularly the two cases: the *Clay Pipe* case and the *Nursery* case. And I believe that Congressman McCarthy also has a case, and I think for the record he ought to mention the name of his case, because I am convinced that the clear legislative intent of 702 is being ignored by EDA.

I am also convinced that you are insulating yourselves behind procedures that you have not made public, so that the general public has no way even to enforce the clear legislative intent of 702.

This is one reason, Mr. Chairman, why I urge that we do schedule continued hearings of this committee in the week immediately following the Thanksgiving period.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to place something into the record here, so that you gentlemen when you return, will be able to supply this committee with additional information on a specific case. I refer to the Fiber Insulation Board industry.

The information I have is from the Insulation Board Institute, the industry association. In a letter dated August 7, 1967 to the Secretary of Commerce, they note the long-range trend of overcapacity in this industry. They point out that within the last few years the Armstrong Cork Co. and Johns-Mansville Co. have discontinued all production of insulation board production at their plants at Pensacola, Fla., and Natchez, Miss., and plants in Hawaii, Oregon, and New Jersey have been completely dismantled.