

U.S. ATTORNEY

Kenneth G. Bergquist, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho for a term of 4 years, vice Ben Peterson, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

Dudley G. Skinker, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years, vice Carlton G. Beall, resigned.

William K. Holt, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia, vice Billy E. Carlisle, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Acts 11: 24: *He was a good man, and full of the holy spirit and of faith.*

God of all grace and goodness, constrain us now by Thy love to open widely the doors of our minds and hearts to the peace and power of Thy holy spirit.

We humbly confess that daily we are confronted by needs which we cannot supply, problems we cannot solve, questions we cannot answer, and tasks which are too great for our unaided strength.

Impart unto us those qualities of faith and fortitude which will lift and liberate us from the fears and anxieties, the moods of complaint and self-pity, which so often assail and seek to enslave us.

Grant that in all the human relationships of life we may be true to one another, dealing honestly, showing kindness, and seeking the health and happiness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentleman, Monday is George Washington's birthday. There is no legislative business. George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

On Tuesday the supplemental appropriation bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1960, and the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill for 1961.

Wednesday and the balance of the week is undetermined. Any further program will be announced later. Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what the gentleman has said—and I thank him for his response—it is possible that there will be a veto of a measure now at the White House. If it is vetoed, I think it will be vetoed before the President leaves. I wonder if I might discuss with the acting majority leader some arrangement by which we can fix a definite time to vote. Say on Wednesday, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. ALBERT. I will be happy to discuss it with the gentleman and come to a decision as early as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Very well.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, February 19, 1960, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 5, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, and to also include therein a minority report and certain individual and supplemental views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because of an editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington newspaper. The editorial stated, concerning the Committee on Un-American Activities, that "the committee has succeeded in persuading a great many who are gullible that any organization which seeks social justice or racial equality or freedom of expression or restraints on police authority has been infiltrated by Communists." This is the line the Communists have been handing out for years and is completely false.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the Guide to Subversive Organizations, and I call now on the writer of this editorial to point out which of the organizations

set forth in this guide have as their true purpose the seeking of "social justice or racial equality or freedom of expression or restraints on police authority," and are not controlled by members of the Communist Party.

The guide reads as follows:

GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AS OF JANUARY 2, 1957

(Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

ORGANIZATIONS

Abolish Peonage Committee.
Abraham Lincoln Brigade or Battalion.
Abraham Lincoln School (Chicago, Ill.).
Academic and Civil Rights Committee.
Academic and Civil Rights Council of California.
Action Committee To Free Spain Now.
Actors' Laboratory.
Actors' Laboratory Theater.
Alabama Peoples Educational Association.
All-American Anti-Imperialist League.
All-California Conference for Defense of Civil Rights and Aid to Labor's Prisoners.
Allied Labor News.
Almanac Singers.
Ambijan Committee for Emergency Aid to the Soviet Union.
American Association for Reconstruction in Yugoslavia, Inc.
American Branch of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions.
American Christian Nationalist Party.
American Committee for a Free Indonesia.
American Committee for a Free Yugoslavia (The).
American Committee for a Korean People's Party.
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.
American Committee for European Workers' Relief (see also Socialist Workers' Party).
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
American Committee for Russian Famine Relief (L.A. and S.F.).
American Committee for Spanish Freedom.
American Committee for Struggle Against War.
American Committee for the Settlement of Jews in Birobidjan, Inc.
American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc.
American Committee for Yugoslav Relief of the War Relief Fund of Americans of South Slavic Descent.
American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives.
American Committee To Aid Korean Federation of Trade Unions (S.F.).
American Committee To Aid Soviet Russia.
American Committee To Save Refugees.
American Committee To Survey Labor Conditions in Europe.
American Committee To Survey Trade Union Conditions in Europe.
American Continental Congress for Peace (September 5-10, 1949, in Mexico City) (see also Committee for U.S. Participation in the American Continental Congress for Peace).
American Council for a Democratic Greece.
American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations. (See Institute of Pacific Relations.)
American Council on Soviet Relations.
American Croatian Congress.
American Federation for Political Unity.
American Federation of Labor Trade Union Committee for Unemployment Insurance and Relief.
American Friends of Spanish Democracy.
American Friends of the Chinese People.
American Friends of the Mexican People.
American Friends of the Spanish People.
American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund).
American Jewish Labor Council.

- American Labor Alliance.
 American Labor Party.
 American League Against War and Fascism.
 American League for Peace and Democracy (see also China Aid Council, National People's Committee Against Hearst).
 American Lithuanian Workers Literary Association (also known as Amerikos Lietuviu Darbininku Literaturos Draugija).
 American National Labor Party.
 American National Socialist League.
 American National Socialist Party.
 American Nationalist Party.
 American Negro Labor Congress.
 American Patriots, Inc.
 American Peace Appeal.
 American Peace Crusade (during Stalin-Hitler Pact).
 American Peace Crusade (organized in January 1951, with national headquarters at 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N.Y.) (see also Northern California Peace Crusade, San Diego Peace Forum, Southern California Peace Crusade).
 American Peace Mobilization (see also Washington Peace Mobilization).
 American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace.
 American People's Fund.
 American People's Meeting.
 American People's Mobilization.
 American Poles for Peace.
 American Polish Labor Council.
 American Polish League.
 American Relief Ship for Spain.
 American Rescue Ship Mission.
 American-Rumanian Film Corp.
 American-Russian Fraternal Society.
 American-Russian Institute (New York) (also known as American-Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union).
 American Russian Institute (Philadelphia).
 American Russian Institute of San Francisco.
 American Russian Institute of Southern California (Los Angeles).
 American-Russian Trading Corp.
 American Serbian Committee for Relief of War Orphans in Yugoslavia.
 American Slav Congress.
 American Society for Cultural Relations With Russia.
 American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy.
 American-Soviet Science Society.
 American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the Second World Peace Congress.
 American Student Union.
 American Students Repudiate Aggression in Korea.
 American Technical Aid Society.
 American Veterans for Peace (see also Veterans for Peace).
 American Women for Peace.
 American Workers Party (December 1933-December 1934).
 American Writers Congress.
 American Youth Congress.
 American Youth for a Free World.
 American Youth for Democracy.
 American Youth Peace Crusade.
 Amerikadeutscher Volksbund. (See German-American Bund.)
 Amerikos Lietuviu Darbininku Literaturos Draugija. (See American Lithuanian Workers Literary Association.)
 Amtorg Trading Corp. (See American-Russian Trading Corp.)
 (Angelo) Herndon Defense Committee.
 Armenian Progressive League of America.
 Artists and Writers Guild.
 Artists' Front To Win the War.
 Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council. (See Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.)
 Asociacion Nacional Mexico-Americana. (See National Association of Mexican Americans.)
 Associated Film Audiences.
 Associated Klans of America.
 Association of Georgia Klans.
 Association of German Nationals (also known as Reichsdeutsche Vereinigung).
 Association of Internes and Medical Students.
 Association of Lithuanian Workers.
 Associazione Nazionale Combattenti Italiano, Federazione degli Stati Uniti d'America. (See Federation of Italian War Veterans in the U.S.A., Inc.)
 Ausland-Organization der NSDAP (overseas branch of Nazi Party).
 Baltimore County Committee For Peace.
 Baltimore Forum.
 Bay Area Committee To Save the Rosenbergs.
 Bay Area Rosenberg-Sobell Committee.
 Beikoku Chuo, Nipponjin Kai. (See Central Japanese Association.)
 Benjamin David Freedom Committee.
 Black Dragon Society.
 Book Union.
 Boston Committee to Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
 Boston Labor Conference for Peace.
 Boston School for Marxist Studies (Boston, Mass.).
 Boston School of Social Science.
 Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee. (See also Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges, Harry Bridges Defense Committee, Harry Bridges Victory Committee.)
 Briehl's Farm (near Wallkill, N.Y.).
 Bronx Victory Labor Committee.
 Brookwood Labor College (Katonah, N.Y.).
 Bulgarian American People's League of the United States of America.
 California Committee for Political Unity.
 California Conference for Democratic Action (also known as Conference for Democratic Action).
 California Emergency Defense Committee. [California] Federation for Political Unity.
 California Labor School.
 California Legislative Conference. [California] State-Wide Civil Rights Conference.
 [California] State-Wide Legislative Conferences.
 California Youth Legislatures. (See also Model Youth Legislature of Northern California.)
 Cambridge Youth Council.
 Camp Arcadia.
 Camp Kinderland (Hopewell Junction, N.Y.).
 Camp Lakeland (Hopewell Junction, N.Y.).
 Camp Timberline (Jewett, N.Y.).
 Camp Unity (Wingdale, N.Y.).
 Camp Woodland (Phoenicia, N.Y.).
 Carpatho-Russian Peoples Society.
 Central Council of American Croatian Women. (See Central Council of American Women of Croatian Descent.)
 Central Council of American Women of Croatian Descent.
 Central Japanese Association (Beikoku Chue, Nipponjin Kai).
 Central Japanese Association of Southern California.
 Central Organization of the German-American National Alliance (Deutsche-Amerikanische Einheitsfront).
 Cervantes Fraternal Society.
 Chelsea Jewish Children's School (Mass.).
 Cherry Association. (See Cakura Kai).
 Chicago Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact. (See Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact).
 Chicago Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
 Chicago Sobell Committee.
 China Aid Council.
 China Welfare Appeal, Inc.
 Chinese Cultural Cabaret.
 Chinese Democratic Youth Chorus.
 Chinese Workers Mutual Aid Association.
 Chopin Cultural Center.
 Citizens Committee for Better Education.
 Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges (see also Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee, Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges, Harry Bridges Defense Committee, Harry Bridges Victory Committee).
 Citizens' Committee for the Defense of Mexican-American Youth.
 Citizens' Committee for the Motion Picture Strikers.
 Citizens' Committee for the Recall of Councilman McClanahan (13th Los Angeles District).
 Citizens' Committee of the Upper West Side.
 Citizens' Committee to Aid Locked-Out Hearst Employees (L.A.).
 Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder.
 Citizens' Committee to Support Labor's Right.
 Citizens Emergency Defense Conference.
 Citizens Protective League.
 Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges (see also Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee, Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, Harry Bridges Defense Committee, Harry Bridges Victory Committee).
 City Action Committee Against the High Cost of Living.
 Civil Liberties Sponsoring Committee of Pittsburgh.
 Civil Rights Congress (see also Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee, Veterans Against Discrimination of the Civil Rights Congress of New York).
 Civil Rights Congress for Texas.
 Civil Rights Congress, Milwaukee Chapter.
 Civil Rights Congress of Michigan.
 Civil Rights Council of Northern California.
 Civil Rights Division of Mobilization for Democracy.
 Civil Rights Federation (Michigan). (See Michigan Civil Rights Federation.)
 Cleveland Committee to Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
 Columbians.
 Columbus Peace Association.
 Comite Coordinador Pro Republica Espanola.
 Comite Pro Derechos Civiles (see also Puerto Rican Comite Pro Libertades Civiles).
 Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (see also National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East).
 Committee for Citizenship Rights.
 Committee for Civil Rights for Communists.
 Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts.
 Committee for Constitutional and Political Freedom.
 Committee for Defense of Public Education.
 Committee for International Student Cooperation.
 Committee for Justice.
 Committee for Nationalist Action.
 Committee for Peace and Brotherhood Festival in Philadelphia.
 Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation.
 Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (see also Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, Continuations Committee of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, Mid-Century Conference for Peace, Northern California Committee for Peaceful Alternatives).
 Committee for the Crisis, The. (See Jik-yoku Iin Kai.)
 Committee for the Defense of Mexican-American Youth. (See Citizens' Committee for the Defense of Mexican-American Youth.)

- Committee for the Defense of the Pittsburgh Six.
 Committee for the First Amendment.
 Committee for the Negro in the Arts.
 Committee for the Protection of the Bill of Rights.
 Committee for United States Participation in the American Continental Congress for Peace.
 Committee for World Youth Friendship and Cultural Exchange.
 Committee of One Thousand.
 Committee of Philadelphia Women for Peace.
 Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford.
 Committee on Election Rights.
 Committee to Abolish Discrimination in Maryland (see also Congress Against Discrimination; Maryland Congress Against Discrimination; Provisional Committee to Abolish Discrimination in the State of Maryland).
 Committee To Aid the Fighting South.
 Committee To Defend America by Keeping Out of War.
 Committee To Defend Angelo Herndon.
 Committee To Defend Marie Richardson.
 Committee To Defend the Rights and Freedom of Pittsburgh's Political Prisoners.
 Committee To Uphold the Bill of Rights.
 Commonwealth College (Mena, Ark.).
 Communist Information Bureau (Cominform). (See Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties.)
 Communist International (Comintern).
 Communist Labor Party of America (September 1919 to May 1920).
 Communist League of America (opposition).
 Communist League of Struggle.
 Communist Party of America (Sept. 1919 to Apr. 1923).
 Communist Party of Panama. (See Partido Del Pueblo of Panama).
 Communist Party, U.S.A. (March 1929 to May 1944; July 1945 to present).
 Communist Party, U.S.A. (Majority Group).
 Communist Party, U.S.A. (Opposition).
 Communist Political Association (May 1944 to July 1945).
 Community Unitarian Fellowship.
 Conference for Democratic Action. (See California Conference for Democratic Action.)
 Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (see also Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, Continuations Committee of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact).
 Conference for Progressive Labor Action.
 Conference for Social Legislation.
 Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America.
 Conference on Pan-American Democracy (see also Council for Pan-American Democracy).
 Congress Against Discrimination (see also Committee To Abolish Discrimination in Maryland).
 Congress (First) of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States.
 Congress of American Revolutionary Writers.
 Congress of American-Soviet Friendship.
 Congress of American Women.
 Congress of the Unemployed.
 Connecticut Committee To Aid Victims of the Smith Act.
 Connecticut State Youth Conference.
 Consumers' National Federation.
 Consumers Union.
 Contemporary Theater.
 Continuations Committee of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (see also Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact).
 Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo.
 Coordination Committee of Jewish Landsmanschaften and Fraternal Organizations (see also United Committee of Jewish Societies and Landsmanschaft Federations).
 Council for Jobs, Relief and Housing.
 Council for Pan-American Democracy (see also Conference on Pan-American Democracy).
 Council of Greek Americans.
 Council of U.S. Veterans.
 Council of Young Southerners.
 Council on African Affairs.
 Croatian Benevolent Fraternity.
 Croatian Educational Club.
 Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace.
 Dai Nippon Butoku Kai (Military Virtue Society of Japan or Military Art Society of Japan).
 Daily Worker Press Club.
 Daniels Defense Committee.
 Dante Alighieri Society.
 Defense Committee for Eugene Dennis. (See Dennis Defense Committee.)
 Defense Committee for Gerhardt Eisler. (See Eisler (Gerhardt) Defense Committee.)
 Defense Committee for Victims of the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.
 Dennis Defense Committee.
 Descendants of the American Revolution.
 Detroit Bill of Rights Defense Committee.
 Detroit Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
 Detroit Youth Assembly.
 Deutsche-Amerikanische Einheitsfront. (See Central Organization of the German-American National Alliance).
 Down River Citizens Committee (Detroit, Mich.).
 Downtown Forum.
 East Bay Arts, Sciences and Professions Council.
 East Bay Civil Rights Congress.
 East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs.
 East Bay Peace Committee (Oakland, Calif.).
 East Bay Youth Cultural Center.
 East Harlem Women for Peace.
 East Meadow and Westbury Rosenberg Committee.
 Eisler (Gerhardt) Defense Committee.
 Elizalde Anti-Discrimination Committee.
 Elsinore Progressive League.
 Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.
 Emergency Committee of the Arts and Professions To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
 Emergency Conference To Aid the Spanish Republic.
 Emergency Conference To Halt the Blackout of Civil Liberties in California.
 Emergency Conference To Save Spanish Refugees.
 Emergency Peace Mobilization.
 Emergency Trade-Union Conference To Aid Spanish Democracy.
 Estonian Women's Club (of Massachusetts).
 Estonian Workers' Clubs.
 Ethiopian Defense Committee.
 Eugene Dennis Defense Committee. (See Dennis Defense Committee.)
 Exiled Writers Committee of the League of American Writers.
 Everybody's Committee To Outlaw War.
 Families of the Baltimore Smith Act Victims.
 Families of the Smith Act Victims.
 Farm Research.
 Fatherland Society. (See Sokoku Kai.)
 Federated Press.
 Federation of Greek Maritime Unions. (See American Branch of.)
 Federation of Italian War Veterans in the U.S.A., Inc. (Associazione Nazionale Combattenti Italiani, Federazione degli Stati Uniti d'America).
 Festus Coleman Committee.
 Film and Photo League.
 Film Audiences for Democracy.
 Films for Democracy.
 Finnish-American Mutual Aid Society.
 Finnish Federation.
 Finnish Women's Clubs (of Massachusetts).
 Finnish Workers' Clubs.
 First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States. (See Congress (First) of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States.)
 First World Congress of the Defenders of Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
 First World Congress of the Partisans of Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
 First World Peace Congress. (See World Peace Congress.)
 First World Student Congress. (See World Student Congress.)
 Florida Press and Educational League.
 Frederick Douglass Educational Center.
 Free Italy Society.
 Freedom From Fear Committee.
 Freedom of the Press Committee. (See National Committee for Freedom of the Press.)
 Freedom Stage, Inc.
 Freunde des Neuen Deutschlands. (See Friends of the New Germany.)
 Friends of Chinese Democracy.
 Friends of Freedom.
 Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.
 Friends of the Campus.
 Friends of the New Germany (Freunde des Neuen Deutschlands).
 Friends of the Soviet Union (see also American Technical Aid Society).
 Frontier Films.
 Galena Defense Committee.
 Garland Fund (see also American Fund for Public Service).
 Garibaldi American Fraternal Society.
 George Washington Carver School.
 German-American Bund (Amerikadeutscher Volksbund).
 German-American Republican League.
 German-American Vocational League (Deutsche-Amerikanische Berufsgemeinschaft).
 Deutsche-Amerikanische Berufsgemeinschaft. (See German-American Vocational League).
 Great Fujii Theater, The. (See Nichibei Kogyo Kaisha).
 Great Neck Rosenberg Committee.
 Greater New York Committee for Employment.
 Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (see also New York Conference for Inalienable Rights).
 Greek-American Committee for National Unity.
 Greek-American Council.
 Guardian Club.
 H.O.G. (Armenian Group).
 Harlem Trade Union Council.
 Harry Bridges Defense Committee (see also Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee, Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges, Harry Bridges Victory Committee).
 Harry Bridges Victory Committee (see also Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee, Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges, Harry Bridges Defense Committee).
 Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee.
 Hawaii Civil Rights Congress.
 Hawaii Committee for Smith Act Defendants.
 Heimuska Kai, also known as Nokubel Neieki Gimusha Kai, Zaibel Nihonjin, Heiyaku Gimusha Kai, and Zaibel Heimusha Kai (Japanese residing in America, Military Conscripts Association).
 Heiyaku Gimusha Kai. (See Heimuska Kai.)
 Hellenic-American Brotherhood.
 Hempstead Rosenberg Committee.

- Herndon Defense Committee. (See Angelo Herndon Defense Committee.)
- Hinode Kai (Imperial Japanese Reservists).
- Hinomaru Kai (Rising Sun Flag Society—a group of Japanese war veterans).
- Hokubel Ziago Shoke Dan (North American Reserve Officers Association).
- Hold the Price Line Committee.
- Hollywood Actors' Laboratory School. (See Actors' Laboratory Theater.)
- Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.
- Hollywood Arts, Sciences and Professions Council. (See Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.)
- Hollywood Community Radio Group, Inc.
- Hollywood Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.
- Hollywood Democratic Committee.
- Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.
- Hollywood League Against Nazi-ism. (See Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.)
- Hollywood League for Democratic Action.
- Hollywood Mooney Defense Committee.
- Hollywood Motion Picture Democratic Committee.
- Hollywood Peace Forum.
- Hollywood Theatre Alliance.
- Hollywood Writers Mobilization For Defense.
- Holyoke Book Shop.
- Honolulu Chapter, Inter-Professional Association.
- Hungarian-American Council for Democracy.
- Hungarian Brotherhood.
- ILWU Book Club.
- Idaho Pension Union.
- Illinois People's Conference for Legislative Action.
- Imperial Military Friends Group. (See Nanka Teikoku Gunyudan.)
- Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.
- Independent Communist Labor League of America.
- Independent Labor League of America.
- Independent Party (Seattle, Wash.) (see also Independent People's Party).
- Independent People's Party (see also Independent Party).
- Independent Progressive Party.
- Independent Socialist League (see also Workers Party, 1940-48).
- Indusco, Inc. (See American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives.)
- Industrial Workers of the World.
- Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties.
- Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Inter-Professional Association. (See Honolulu Chapter, Inter-Professional Association.)
- Intercontinent News Service.
- International Association of Democratic Lawyers.
- International Book Shop (Boston).
- International Book Store (San Francisco.)
- International Committee of Intellectuals for Peace. (See International Committee of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace.)
- International Committee of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace.
- International Democratic Women's Federation. (See Women's International Democratic Federation.)
- International Juridical Association.
- International Labor Defense (see also Galena Defense Committee, Trade Union Advisory Committee).
- International Liaison Committee of Intellectuals for Peace. (See International Committee of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace.)
- International Music Bureau.
- International Organization of Democratic Journalists.
- International Publishers.
- International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations. (See Institute of Pacific Relations.)
- International Union of Students (see also World Student Congress).
- International Workers Order.
- Intourist, Inc.
- Irving Peace Theater.
- Italian Anti-Fascist Committee.
- Italian Black Shirts. (See Lictor Society.)
- Japanese-American Committee for Democracy.
- Japanese Association of America.
- Japanese Association for Democracy (JAAD). (See Nichibel Minshu Kyokai.)
- Japanese Overseas Central Society (Kaigai Dobo Chuo Kai).
- Japanese Overseas Convention, Tokyo, Japan, 1940.
- Japanese Protective Association (recruiting organization).
- Jefferson School of Social Science (New York N.Y.).
- Jewish Blackbook Committee of Los Angeles.
- Jewish Culture Society.
- Jewish People's Committee.
- Jewish People Fraternal Order.
- Jikyoku Iin Kai (Committee for the Crisis, The).
- John Reed Clubs of the United States.
- Johnson-Forest Group (see also Johnsonites).
- Johnsonites (see also Johnson-Forest Group).
- Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (see also Spanish Refugee Appeal).
- Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights.
- Joint Council of Progressive Italian-Americans, Inc.
- Joseph Weydemeyer School of Social Science (St. Louis, Mo.).
- Kaigai Dobo Chuo Kai. (See Japanese Overseas Central Society.)
- Karl Marx Society of Brooklyn College.
- Kibel Seinen Kai (association of U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry who have returned to America after studying in Japan).
- King-Ramsey-Connor Defense Committee.
- Knights of the White Camellia.
- Korean Culture Society.
- Korean Independent News Co.
- Ku Klux Klan.
- Kyffhaeuser, also known as Kyffhaeuser League (Kyffhaeuser Bund), Kyffhaeuser Fellowship (Kyffhaeuser Kameradschaft).
- Kyffhaeuser War Relief (Kyffhaeuser Kriegshilfswerk).
- Labor Council for Negro Rights.
- Labor Lyceum.
- Labor Research Association.
- Labor Youth League.
- Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain.
- Lawyers Committee To Keep the United States Out of War.
- League Against Yellow Journalism.
- League for Common Sense.
- League for Democratic Control.
- League for Mutual Aid.
- League for Protection of Minority Rights.
- League of American Writers (see also American Writers Congress, Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, Exiled Writers Committee of the League of American Writers).
- League of Struggle for Negro Rights.
- League of Women Shoppers.
- Lehigh Valley Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
- Lictor Society (Italian Black Shirts).
- Lincoln Book Store (Hollywood).
- Lithuanian Women's Club (Massachusetts).
- Los Angeles Chapter of the National Negro Labor Council.
- Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born.
- Los Angeles Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
- Los Angeles Educational Association, Inc. (See People's Educational Center.)
- Los Angeles Emergency Committee To Aid the Strikers.
- Los Angeles Youth Committee Against Universal Military Training.
- Macedonian-American People's League.
- Manhattan Citizens Committee.
- Manhattan Committee To Serve Justice in the Rosenberg Case (also known as Manhattan Clemency Committee).
- Mario Morgantini Circle.
- Maritime Book Shop.
- Maritime Labor Committee To Defend Al Lannon.
- Marshall Foundation. (See Robert Marshall Foundation.)
- Martinsville Seven Committee.
- Marxist Study Club of the City College of New York.
- Maryland Committee for Peace.
- Maryland Congress Against Discrimination (see also Committee To Abolish Discrimination in Maryland.)
- Mass Action for Peace.
- Massachusetts Committee for the Bill of Rights.
- Massachusetts Minute Women for Peace.
- Massachusetts Youth Council.
- Maurice Braverman Defense Committee.
- May Day Committees. (See United May Day Committee, United May Day Conference, United May Day Provisional Committee.)
- May Day Parade (see also United May Day Committee, United May Day Conference, United May Day Provisional Committee).
- Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.
- Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy.
- Memorial Day Youth Peace Parade (1938).
- Merrick Rosenberg Committee.
- Methodist Federation for Social Action.
- Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples Congress. (See Congress (First) of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States.)
- Michigan Civil Rights Federation.
- Michigan Committee for Peace.
- Michigan Council for Peace.
- Michigan Labor Committee for Peace.
- Michigan School of Social Science.
- Mid-Century Conference for Peace.
- Military Art Society of Japan. (See Dal Nippon Butoku Kai.)
- Military Virtue Society of Japan. (See Dal Nippon Butoku Kai.)
- Milwaukee Committee in the Rosenberg-Sobell Case.
- [Milwaukee] Provisional Committee To Commute the Death Sentence of the Rosenbergs.
- Mimi Kagan Dance Group.
- Minneapolis Civil Rights Committee.
- Minute Women for Peace.
- Mobilization for Democracy.
- Model Youth Legislature of Northern California (also referred to as Second Annual California Model Legislature).
- Modern Book Shop.
- Modesto Defense Committee.
- Motion Picture Artists' Committee.
- Motion Picture Democratic Committee. (See Hollywood Motion Picture Democratic Committee.)
- Murray Defense Committee.
- Musicians Committee To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
- Musicians' Congress Committee.
- Musicians' Democratic Committee.
- Musicians' Open Forum.
- Nanka Teikoku Gunyudan (Imperial Military Friends Group or Southern California War Veterans).
- National Assembly Against UMT.
- National Association of Mexican Americans (also known as Asociacion Nacional Mexico-Americana).
- National Blue Star Mothers of America.
- National Civil Rights Federation.
- National Committee for Freedom of the Press.
- National Committee for People's Rights.
- National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.

- National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill.
- National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act.
- National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case.
- National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case (and local affiliates).
- National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims.
- National Committee To Win the Peace.
- National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East.
- National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance.
- National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (see also American-Soviet Science Society; Congress of American-Soviet Friendship).
- National Council of Americans of Croatian Descent.
- National Council of Croatian Women. (See Central Council of American Women of Croatian Descent.)
- National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (see also Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace).
- National Delegates Assembly for Peace.
- National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching.
- National Emergency Conference.
- National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.
- National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (see also Oklahoma Federation for Constitutional Rights; Washington Committee for Democratic Action).
- National Free Browder Congress.
- National Labor Committee for Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
- National Labor Conference for Peace.
- National Lawyers' Guild.
- National Negro Congress.
- National Negro Labor Congress.
- National Negro Labor Council.
- National People's Committee Against Hearst.
- National Rosenberg-Sobell Committee.
- National Student League.
- Nationalist Action League.
- Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico.
- Nature Friends of America.
- Negro Labor Victory Committee.
- Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.
- New Century Publishers.
- New Committee for Publications.
- New England Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.
- New England Council for Protection of Foreign Born.
- New England Labor College.
- New England Labor Research Association.
- New Foundations Forums.
- New Jersey Committee for Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
- New Theater Group (Boston).
- New Theater League.
- New York Committee for Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
- New York Conference for Inalienable Rights (see also Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights).
- New York Conference on Civil Rights.
- New York Peace Institute.
- New York State Conference on Legislation for Democracy.
- New York State Conference on National Unity.
- New York Tom Mooney Committee.
- New York Trade Union Committee To Free Earl Browder.
- Newark Peace Action Committee.
- Nichibei Koguyo Kaisha (Great Fujit Theater).
- Nichibei Minshu Kyokai, Waipahu Chapter (JAAD).
- Nokubel Neleki Gimusha Kai. (See Heimuska Kai.)
- Non-Partisan Committee for Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
- Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio.
- Non-Sectarian Committee for Political Refugees.
- North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.
- North American Reserve Officers Association. (See Hokubel Ziago Shoke Dan.)
- North American Spanish Aid Committee (see also Emergency Conference To Save Spanish Refugees).
- North Philadelphia Forum.
- North Westchester Rosenberg Committee.
- Northern California Civil Rights Council. (See Civil Rights Council of Northern California.)
- Northern California Committee for Peaceful Alternatives.
- Northern California Peace Crusade.
- Northern California Rosenberg-Sobell Defense Committee.
- Northwest Japanese Association.
- Oahu Servicemen's Committee for Speedier Demobilization.
- Ohio Bill of Rights Conference.
- Ohio Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
- Ohio Freedom of the Press Association.
- Ohio Labor Conference for Peace.
- Ohio School of Social Sciences.
- Oklahoma Committee To Defend Political Prisoners.
- Oklahoma Federation for Constitutional Rights.
- Oklahoma League for Political Education.
- Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union.
- Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges.
- Open Letter to American Liberals.
- Original Southern Klans, Inc.
- Ormsby Village for Youth (Topanga Canyon, Calif.).
- Pacific Northwest Labor School (Seattle, Wash.) (see also Seattle Labor School).
- Pacific Publishing Foundation, Inc.
- Palo Alto Peace Club.
- Partido Del Pueblo of Panama (operating in the Canal Zone).
- Patriotic Society. (See Sakura Kai.)
- Pax Productions.
- Peace Committee of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.
- Peace Information Center (New York, N.Y.).
- Peace Movement of Ethiopia.
- People's Drama, Inc.
- People's Educational and Press Association of Texas.
- People's Educational Association. (See People's Educational Center.)
- People's Educational Center.
- People's Institute of Applied Religion.
- People's Peace.
- Peoples Programs (Seattle, Wash.).
- People's Radio Foundation, Inc.
- People's Rights Party.
- People's School. (See People's Educational Center.)
- People's University. (See People's Educational Center.)
- Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress.
- Philadelphia Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
- Philadelphia Labor Committee for Negro Rights.
- Philadelphia Rosenberg-Sobell Committee.
- Philadelphia School of Social Science and Art.
- Philadelphia Women for Peace. (See Committee of Philadelphia Women for Peace.)
- Photo League.
- Pittsburgh Arts Club.
- Political Prisoners' Welfare Committee.
- Polonia Society of the IWO.
- Polska Partja Komunistyczna.
- Prestes Defense Committee.
- Prisoners' Relief Committee.
- Professionals for Clemency.
- Progressive Book Shop (Boston).
- Progressive Book Shop (Los Angeles and Sacramento).
- Progressive Citizens of America (California branches).
- Progressive Committee to Rebuild American Labor Party.
- Progressive German-Americans.
- Progressive Labor School (Boston).
- Progressive Party.
- Progressive Party of Massachusetts.
- Progressive Students of America.
- Progressive Trade Union School.
- Progressive Women's Council.
- Proletarian Party of America.
- Prompt Press.
- Protestant War Veterans of the United States, Inc.
- Provisional Committee of Citizens for Peace, Southwest Area.
- Provisional Committee on Latin American Affairs.
- Provisional Committee To Abolish Discrimination in the State of Maryland (see also Committee To Abolish Discrimination in Maryland).
- Provisional International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers.
- Provisional Western Regional Sobell Committee.
- Public Use of Arts Committee.
- Puerto Rican Comite Pro Libertades Civiles (CLC) (see also Comite Pro Derechos Civiles).
- Puerto Ricans United (also known as Puertorriquenos Unidos).
- Puertorriquenos Unidos. (See Puerto Ricans United.)
- Quad City Committee for Peace.
- Queens Rosenberg Committee.
- Queensbridge Tenants League.
- Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign.
- Reichsdeutsche Vereinigung. (See Association of German Nationals.)
- Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee.
- Repertory Playhouse.
- Reserve Officers Association, Los Angeles. (See Suiko Sba.)
- Revolutionary Workers League.
- Rising Sun Flag Society. (See Hinomaru Kai.)
- Robert Marshall Foundation.
- Robotnik Polski (Polish Labor).
- Romanian-American Fraternal Society.
- Rosenberg Committee of the Bronx.
- Roslyn Rosenberg Committee.
- Russian American Industrial Corp.
- Russian American Society, Inc.
- Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc.
- St. Louis Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell.
- St. Louis Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.
- Sakura Kai (Patriotic Society, or Cherry Association—composed of veterans of Russo-Japanese War).
- Samuel Adams School (Boston, Mass.).
- San Diego Peace Forum.
- San Francisco Labor Conference for Peace.
- San Francisco Rosenberg-Sobell Committee.
- Santa Barbara Peace Forum.
- Schappes Defense Committee.
- Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee.
- School for Democracy.
- School of Jewish Studies (Los Angeles).
- School of Jewish Studies (New York).
- Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace. (See Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace.)
- Scottsboro Defense Committee.
- Seattle Labor School (see also Pacific Northwest Labor School).
- Second Annual California Model Legislature. (See Model Youth Legislature of Northern California.)
- Second World Congress of the Defenders of Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
- Second World Congress of the Partisans of Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
- Second World Peace Congress. (See World Peace Congress.)
- Second World Student Congress. (See World Student Congress.)

- Serbian-American Fraternal Society.
Serbian Vidovdan Council.
Shinto Temples.
Silver Shirt Legion of America.
Simon J. Lubin Society.
Slavic Council of Los Angeles.
Slavic Council of Southern California.
Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee.
Slovak Workers Society.
Slovene National Benefit Society.
Slovenian-American National Council.
Socialist Workers Party (see also American Committee for European Workers' Relief).
Socialist Youth League (see also Workers Party, 1940-48).
Sokoku Kai (Fatherland Society).
South Westchester Rosenberg Committee.
Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.
Southern California Emergency Committee for Clemency for the Rosenbergs.
Southern California Peace Crusade.
Southern California War Veterans. (See Nanka Teikoku Gunyudan.)
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Southern Negro Youth Congress.
Spanish Refugee Appeal.
Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign.
Spanish Speaking Peoples Congress.
Springfield Citizens' Protective League.
Springfield Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.
State-Wide Civil Rights Conference. (See California State-Wide Civil Rights Conference.)
State-Wide Legislative Conference. (See California State-Wide Legislative Conferences.)
Stockholm Peace Petition. (See World Peace Appeal.)
Straight Arrow Camp (Golden's Bridge, N.Y.).
Student Congress Against War.
Student Councils for Academic Freedom.
Student Rights Association.
Students for Wallace.
Sulko Sha (Reserve Officers Association, Los Angeles).
Sweethearts of Servicemen.
Syracuse Women for Peace.
Teen-Age Art Club.
Territorial CIO Political Action Committee.
Tom Mooney Labor School.
Tom Paine School.
Tom Paine School for Social Science.
Toumaylan Club.
Town Meeting of Youth.
Trade Union Advisory Committee.
Trade-Union Committee for Free Spain.
Trade-Union Committee for Peace (see also Trade Unionists for Peace).
Trade Union Committee for the Repeal of the Smith Act.
Trade-Union Committee on Industrial Espionage.
Trade-Union Committee To Put America Back to Work.
Trade-Union Educational League.
Trade-Union Unity League.
Trade Union Women's Committee for Peace.
Trade Unionists for Peace (see also Trade Union Committee for Peace).
Tri-State Negro Trade Union Council.
Twentieth Century Book Shop (Oakland, Calif.).
Twentieth Century Book Store (Berkeley, Calif.).
Ukrainian-American Fraternal Union.
Unemployed Councils.
Unemployed Workers' Organization of Hawaii.
Union of American Croatsians.
Union of Concerted Peace Efforts.
Union of New York Veterans.
Union of Progressive Veterans.
United American Artists.
United American Spanish Aid Committee (see also American Rescue Ship Mission).
United Committee of Jewish Societies and Landsmanschaft Federations (see also Coordination Committee of Jewish Landsmanschaften and Fraternal Organizations).
United Committee of South Slavic Americans.
United Communist Party (May 1920 to May 1921).
United Defense Council of Southern California.
United Farmers League.
United Harlem Tenants and Consumers Organization.
United May Day Committee.
United May Day Conference.
United May Day Provisional Committee.
United Negro and Allied Veterans of America.
United States Congress Against War.
United States Service & Shipping, Inc.
United States Veterans Council. (See Council of United States Veterans).
United States Youth Sponsoring Committee, World Peace Appeal.
United States Peace Committee.
United TOLLERS.
United Youth Committee Against Lynching.
Valley Stream Rosenberg Committees.
Vanguard Press.
Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York.
Veterans For Peace (see also American Veterans for Peace).
Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.
Victory Book Store.
Virginia League For Peoples Education.
Voice of Freedom Committee.
Walt Whitman Book Shop.
Walt Whitman School of Social Science.
Washington Book Shop (Association). (See Washington Cooperative Bookshop.)
Washington CIO Committee To Reinstate Helen Miller (District of Columbia).
Washington Committee For Aid To China (District of Columbia).
Washington Committee For Democratic Action (District of Columbia).
Washington Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg Case (Washington State).
Washington Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights.
Washington Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case (District of Columbia).
Washington Commonwealth Federation.
Washington Cooperative Bookshop (District of Columbia).
Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy (District of Columbia).
Washington Peace Mobilization (District of Columbia) (see also American Peace Mobilization).
Washington Pension Union.
West Side Rosenberg Committee.
Western Council for Progressive Labor in Agriculture.
Western Writers Congress.
Wingdale Lodge (Wingdale, N.Y.).
Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation.
Women's International Democratic Federation.
Workers Alliance.
Workers (Communist) Party of America (Aug. 1925 to March 1929).
Workers Library Publishers.
Workers Party (1940-48) (See also Independent Socialist League; Socialist Youth League).
Workers Party of America (December 1921 to August 1925).
Workers Party of the United States. (See American Workers Party.)
Workers School (Boston).
Workers School (Los Angeles).
Workers School (New York City).
Workers School (San Francisco).
Workmen's Educational Association.
World Congress Against War.
World Congress for Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
World Congress of Intellectuals.
World Congress of Partisans of Peace. (See World Peace Congress.)
World Federation of Democratic Women. (See Women's International Democratic Federation.)
World Federation of Democratic Youth.
World Federation of Scientific Workers.
World Federation of Trade Unions.
World Peace Appeal (also known as Stockholm Peace Petition).
World Peace Circle of Hollywood, Calif.
World Peace Congress.
World Peace Council.
World Student Congress.
World Tourists, Inc.
World Youth Congress.
World Youth Festival.
Yanks Are Not Coming Committee.
Yiddisher Kultur Farband.
Young Communist League.
Young People's General Assembly For Peace.
Young Progressives (California).
Young Progressives of America (Ohio).
Young Progressives of Massachusetts.
Young Workers League.
Yugoslav-American Cooperative Home, Inc.
Yugoslav Seamen's Club, Inc.
Zaibel Heimusha Kal. (See Heimuska Kal.)
Zaibel Nihonjin. (See Heimuska Kal.)

WHAT IS A COMMUNIST FRONT?

The following historical sketch of Communist-front organizations, plus formulas for detecting them, is reprinted from a report issued by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944:

"Communist-front organizations are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel, and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement, their essence is deception.

"During the first few years of the Communist International, immediately following the stimulus of the Russian revolution, its international appeal was stridently revolutionary. As world economic conditions improved following the First World War, the international revolutionary movement began to wane. The Hungarian and German Communist revolutions failed and the Communist International began to lose strength. Hence it was deemed necessary to moderate the earlier revolutionary appeal, to adopt middle-of-the-road slogans, and to build so-called united-front organizations, as bridge and supporting organizations in the interest of the International Communist movement.

"One of the leading organizers of these 'innocent' organizations on an international scale was Willi Munzenberg, a prominent German Communist, whose organizing ability won him the sobriquet of the 'Henry Ford of the Communist International.' Munzenberg was engagingly frank in describing the real purpose of these organizations:

"1. To arouse the interest of those millions of apathetic and indifferent workers * * * who simply have no ear for Communist propaganda. These people we wish to attract and arouse through new channels, by means of new ways.

"2. Our sympathetic organizations should constitute bridges for the nonparty workers * * * who have not yet mastered the courage to take the final step and join the Communist Party, but who are nevertheless in sympathy with the Communist movement and are prepared to follow us part of the way.

"3. By means of the mass organizations we wish to extend the Communist sphere of influence in itself.

"4. The organizational linking up of the elements in sympathy with the Soviet Union and with the Communists. * * *

"5. We must build up our own organizations in order to counteract the increasing efforts of the bourgeois and social-democratic parties in this respect, and

"6. Through these sympathetic and mass organizations we should train the cadres of militants and officials of the Communist Party possessing organizational experience."

(Speech before the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, July 20 1928. International Press Correspondence, vol. 8, No. 42, Aug. 1, 1928, pp. 751, 752.)

"Transmission belts"

"In his 'Problems of Leninism,' a standard textbook and guide for Communists throughout the world, Joseph Stalin emphasized the need of these front or mass organizations which he called transmission belts:

"The proletariat needs these belts, these levers, and this guiding force [the Communist Party—Ed.] * * * Lastly we come to the party of the proletariat, the proletarian vanguard. Its strength lies in the fact that it attracts to its ranks the best elements of all the mass organizations of the proletariat, without exception, and to guide their activities toward a single end, that of the liberation of the proletariat."

"Stalin quoted Lenin in support of his argument:

"The dictatorship [of the proletariat] cannot be effectively realized without 'belts' to transmit power from the vanguard [the Communist Party—Ed.] to the mass of the advanced class, and from this to the mass of those who labor (pp. 29, 30)."

"We cite the instructions of Otto Kuusinen, secretary of the Communist International, in his report at the Sixth Plenum [plenary session] of the Executive Committee of the Communist International:

"The first part of our task is to build up, not only Communist organizations, but other organizations as well, above all mass organizations, sympathizing with our aims, and able to aid us for special purposes. * * * We must create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party, so to speak, smaller organizations working actually under the influence of our party." (Quotations taken from the Communist, May 1931, pp. 409-423.)

"The rise of Adolf Hitler to power created a new threat to the Soviet Union and to the international Communist movement. Hence the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, in 1935, gave an added impetus to the creation of front organizations under Communist initiative and leadership, the chief purpose of which was to protect and serve the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The ability of the Communists to ensnare large numbers and influential individuals, to serve as decoys in operating these fronts, reached its high point following the seventh congress in 1935.

"How Communist fronts are established"

"The methods employed by the Communists in establishing and operating these front organizations, methods demonstrated by the various organizations herein cited, have been well summarized by Benjamin Gitlow, a former high official of the Communist Party of the United States:

"A front organization is organized by the Communist Party in the following fashion: First, a number of sympathizers who are close to the party and whom the party knows can be depended upon to carry out party orders, are gotten together and formed into a nucleus which issues a call for the organization of a particular front organization which the party wants to establish. And generally after that is done a program is drawn up by the party, which this provisional committee adopts. Then, on the basis

of this provisional program, all kinds of individuals are canvassed to become sponsors of the organization, which is to be launched in the very near future. A provisional secretary is appointed before the organization is launched and in every instance in our day the secretary who was appointed was a member of the Communist Party. * * * And as president of the organization we would put up some prominent public figure who was willing to accept the presidency of the organization, generally making sure that, if that public figure was one who would not go along with the Communists, he was of such a type that he would be too busy to pay attention to the affairs of the organization. * * *

"On the committee that would be drawn together, a sufficient number of Communists and Communist Party sympathizers, who would carry out party orders, was included, and out of this number a small executive committee was organized * * * which carried on the affairs of the organization, so-called, and this small executive committee, with the secretary, really ran the organization. And this small committee and the secretary are the instruments of the Communist Party, with the result that when manifestos or decisions on campaigns are made, those campaigns are ordered by the Communist Party." (Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 7, pp. 4716, 4717, 4718.)

"Membership in front organizations"

"In judging the individuals associated with Communist-front organizations, to determine the degree of their responsibility for its activities and their closeness to the Communist Party, one should be guided by consideration of the following categories of individuals included within them:

"1. Members of the Communist Party who have openly avowed their affiliation.

"2. Members of the Communist Party not openly avowed, proven to be such on the basis of documentary or other proof.

"3. Those accepting Communist Party discipline, either secret party members or outsiders who accept such discipline and instruction. This category may be recognized by the regularity with which it follows the line of the Communist Party, throughout all its variations, by the number of different front affiliations, by the posts they occupy in these front organizations, and by the fact that they retain their affiliation after the organization has been publicly exposed.

"4. Those who have been attracted by the high-sounding aims of the front organization or organizations, by the prominence of its sponsors, or by a desire to be sociable. The judgment of such persons is certainly open to criticism just as much as if they aided in launching any other hoax."

"Does 'Yes' answer the following questions?"

"For the guidance of the American people in detecting Communist-front organizations, we present the following criteria:

"1. Does the organization have Communist Party members or those trusted by the Communist Party, in its posts of real power—on its executive board, as secretary, organizer, educational director, editor, office staff?

"2. Are meetings of the organization addressed by Communists or their trusted agents? Does its publication include articles by such persons?

"3. Does the organization follow the Communist Party line?

"4. Does the organization cooperate with campaigns, activities, publications, of the Communist Party or other front organizations?

"5. Is the address of the organization in the same building with other front organizations or within the cooperating vicinity?"

"6. Does the organization cooperate with Communist-controlled unions?

"7. Does the organization's official publication reflect the line of the Communist Party, publish articles by pro-Communists, advertise Communist activities, or those of other front organizations or of Communist vacation resorts?

"8. Are questions injected into meetings or in official publications, which have more to do with the current policy of the Communist Party, than with the professed purposes of the organization?

"9. Are funds kicked back directly or indirectly to the Communist Party or to other front organizations?

"10. Is printing done at a Communist printing house?

"11. Does the organization use entertainers associated with pro-Communist organizations or entertainments?

"12. Does the organization receive favorable publicity in the Communist press?

"13. Is the organization uniformly loyal to the Soviet Union?"

"Changes in party line"

"The line of the Communist Party on foreign policy is cited herewith. Its advocacy by an individual or organization, throughout all its variations, is a sound test of the loyalty and subservience of such an individual or organization to the Communist Party:

"Prior to August 1935: No distinction was made between Fascist and democratic governments. They were all capitalistic and had to be destroyed by a revolution and replaced by a proletarian dictatorship.

"August 1935 to September 1939: Adolf Hitler became a threat to the Soviet Union. Opposition to the Fascist governments. Support of collective security or a united front of the democracies and the Soviet Union against the Fascist nations.

"August 23, 1939, to June 21, 1941: The period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Opposition to the war as imperialist. Support of an isolationist position. Support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union. Demand that we pay attention to our own domestic problems first.

"June 22, 1941, to 1944: Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Support of the * * * war against fascism. Demand for a second front to aid the struggle of the Soviet Union. [Communist International dissolved in 1943 to strengthen Communist Party pose as local, patriotic organization.]"

Since the above-quoted sketch was written in 1944, the committee offers the following additions to bring the Communist Party line on foreign policy up to date:

"1945 to 1956: Return of overt Soviet hostility toward non-Communist powers; Communist Information Bureau formed in 1947 as modified version of Communist International. Revival of doctrine of inevitable conflict between two camps—the 'progressive' camp of the Soviet Union and its satellites and the 'imperialist' camp represented by the United States. Support of the Communist 'peace' offensive, which of course covered such 'peaceful' moves as the Communists' aggression in Korea.

"February 1956 to date: Return to united front policy of 1935. Support of Khrushchev and 'collective leadership' of Soviet Union, which desanctified Stalin and abolished the Communist Information Bureau. War with capitalist countries no longer inevitable (unless they resist). Cooperation among Communists, capitalists, Socialists, and neutrals demanded."

The extreme changes in the foreign policy line of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as outlined above, are the direct results of Soviet maneuvering to meet various exigencies of the U.S.S.R. There has never been a change in one basic Communist purpose from 1918 to the present date, however—the eventual

elimination of non-Communist governments and the establishment of world hegemony for the Soviet Union.

Front organizations as described by J. Edgar Hoover and former Attorney General Francis Biddle

The following is an excerpt from the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 28, 1947:

"For the most part, front organizations assumed the character of either a mass or membership organization or a paper organization. Both solicited and used names of prominent persons. Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign-language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

"The first requisite for front organizations is an idealistic sounding title. Hundreds of such organizations have come into being and have gone out of existence when their true purposes have become known or exposed, while others with high-sounding names are continually springing up.

"There are easy tests to establish the real character of such organizations:

"1. Does the group espouse the cause of Americanism or the cause of Soviet Russia?

"2. Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists, sympathizers, or fellow travelers?

"3. Does the organization shift when the party line shifts?

"4. Does the organization sponsor causes, campaigns, literature, petitions, or other activities sponsored by the party or other front organizations?

"5. Is the organization used as a sounding board by or is it endorsed by Communist-controlled labor unions?

"6. Does its literature follow the Communist line or is it printed by the Communist press?

"7. Does the organization receive consistent favorable mention in Communist publications?

"8. Does the organization present itself to be nonpartisan yet engage in political activities and consistently advocate causes favored by the Communists?

"9. Does the organization denounce American and British foreign policy while always lauding Soviet policy?

"10. Does the organization utilize Communist 'doubletalk' by referring to Soviet-dominated countries as democracies, complaining that the United States is imperialistic and constantly denouncing monopoly capital?

"11. Have outstanding leaders in public life openly renounced affiliation with the organization?

"12. Does the organization, if espousing liberal progressive causes, attract well-known honest patriotic liberals or does it denounce well-known liberals?

"13. Does the organization have a consistent record of supporting the American viewpoint over the years?

"14. Does the organization consider matters not directly related to its avowed purposes and objectives?"

In his decision on the deportation of Harry Bridges, the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, included the following excellent description of Communist-front organizations:

"Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry

on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution."

THE RULE ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I made a statement on the floor that I was convinced there would be a rule voted by the Committee on Rules rather promptly making in order the consideration of the so-called civil rights legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, questioned me as to just what the word "shortly" meant. I am very happy to advise the House, and especially to advise him, that this morning the Committee on Rules did vote a rule making in order the consideration of the civil rights bill pending before the committee. I am assured that the rule will be reported promptly, and without delay. The rule is an open rule. It is very generous as far as time is concerned so that in debating civil rights, the rights of no Member to be heard will be violated. It provides 15 hours of general debate. It does make in order, so that there is no question of germaneness, the consideration of the so-called referee bill, the McCulloch bill, which was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio on January 20, 1960.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 2485.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALOYSIUS CARDINAL STEPINAC, ARCHBISHOP OF ZAGREB, YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb, Yugoslavia, world renowned as a heroic opponent of atheistic communism, died while under house arrest in his native land. Cardinal Stepinac was one of the great heroes of our time and is a symbol of suffering that staunch champions of religious freedom have endured under Communist tyranny.

May I take this opportunity of quickly reviewing the pertinent facts of Communist persecution of this great religious leader. In 1946, he was sentenced to 16 years of hard labor for alleged treason in collaborating with the Nazis in World War II. These charges, as we know, were absolutely false since the cardinal was an outspoken opponent of both Nazi and Communist practices and had always been a staunch champion of minority groups. During the war years, he was credited with successfully arranging the flight to freedom of many Jewish refugees who were forced to flee from Nazi tyranny.

Since 1951, the cardinal had been under house arrest in his native village and was refused permission to exercise his official duties as archbishop and religious leader of Croatia. He was the spiritual leader of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia and was the obvious target for Red Dictator Tito's policy of persecution. The world realizes that by his steadfast opposition to communism in his country, he has forced Tito to display his true character even though there have been many attempts made to whitewash the present Yugoslav regime.

It might be well for us to remember that the present Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia was greatly aided in its suppression of the peoples of Yugoslavia by the wartime assistance it received from us due to the Communist influence that existed in our State Department at that time. These wartime leaders who betrayed legitimate governments in Yugoslavia and other countries now enslaved by the Communist will forever bear this historical stigma.

May I urge all of you to remember the cause of political, social, and religious freedom for which Cardinal Stepinac fought. As we remember him, we must maintain the inspiration that he has provided. Furthermore, we must maintain the fervent hope that some day the peoples of Eastern Europe will once again be free and communism forever eradicated as a world menace.

PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's message on agriculture delivered to the Congress last week opens the way to a permanent solution of the farm problem, one of the most vital domestic issues facing the Nation today.

The President's recommendations are flexible enough to permit adjustments among differing positions. Yet these recommendations would also bring about beneficial and much-needed changes in national policies regarding agriculture. The President's message should be recognized for what it is: The blueprint for a workable farm policy.

President Eisenhower has presented practical guidelines for stabilizing prices on basic commodities while reducing stocks of those in surplus. He has recommended a greatly expanded conservation reserve program which would alleviate the problem of surpluses today while preserving soil fertility for the needs of tomorrow.

The President has voiced his strong support for the food-for-peace program. This important effort is making it possible for us to use our abundance constructively in the worldwide battle against hunger. His message also places needed emphasis on research which will lead to increased use of farm products.

Finally, the President has recommended an expanded rural development program to assist families on small farms without sufficient resources to make an adequate living.

Of all the recommendations made by President Eisenhower, this one, it seems to me, holds out the greatest hope for the largest number of farm and rural people.

We sometimes forget that full-scale commercial farmers are actually a minority of all farmers in this country.

The majority of the Nation's farms, some 56 percent, are operated by farmers earning a large part of their income in nonfarm work, by older farmers with reduced operations, and by those on poor land or inadequate units.

Programs designed to improve efficiency and incomes on the larger commercial farms are of little benefit to families on small low-production farms. They depend for their well-being on availability of jobs, special educational programs, better training, and other activities supplementing their meager farm incomes.

The President's rural development program is focusing attention on this group of farm people. He has taken steps recently to speed and perfect this program.

An Executive order was issued to promote better coordination of effort among the six Federal departments and agencies putting resources into this program.

A few weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture appointed an assistant to help guide the program.

Now I am gratified to report the President's message calls on the Congress to increase appropriations so the work can go forward on a much broader basis.

I am sure the Congress will support this request. Benefits of the rural development program need to be broadened to all areas where many farm families are facing adjustment difficulties.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend our Presi-

dent's statesmanlike message on the farm situation, including his call for constructive proposals to help meet the surplus dilemma. I would especially like to lend my support to his inclusion of the food for peace program for, in my opinion, it represents one of our great hopes for peace and security.

One of the built-in strengths of the food for peace program is that it helps both the helper and those being helped. For us, the program provides outlets—essential outlets, I might add—for our abundant farm production. Exports under the program mean extra income for our farmers, add strength to the domestic market, reduce the cost of storing our crop surpluses, and strengthen our relationships throughout the free world.

For our foreign friends who lack dollar purchasing power, the food for peace program offers a means whereby their very great need for additional food and fiber is met at least in part through access to our surplus supplies. Countries receiving our agricultural commodities under the program, such as India, are able to feed their people better, to make greater progress in their all-important internal programs of economic development, and to hold to the ideals of freedom and democracy which characterize the free world. As to whether we are retaining the friendship of such countries we have but to compare the tremendous ovation received by President Eisenhower when he visited India with the much more reserved reception recently accorded Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

The Public Law 480 program is, of course, the cornerstone on which the food for peace program has been built. A tremendous movement of our surplus food and fiber to needy areas has been taking place under Public Law 480. Since 1954, the first year of the activity, about \$5.5 billion has been spent to move U.S. farm products under the authority. This is equivalent to about one-fourth of all our agricultural exports during the period.

American agricultural export operations give major emphasis to regular commercial sales for dollars for these, after all, represent the traditional way of doing business. Seventy percent of our agricultural exports at present are of this type. Through foreign market development work, in which the Department of Agriculture and private agricultural groups are actively participating, much is being done to further expand these dollar sales. But market promotion is most effective only in areas that have dollars, such as Western Europe. We hope that the less-developed countries too can become active dollar purchasers—but that is a long road ahead and it will take friendly hands such as extended through our food for peace program to help them along that road.

It is encouraging that we do not stand alone in offering helping hands to these needy countries. As part of the food for peace program, we are working actively with other wheat exporting nations—Canada, Australia, Argentina, and France—to get broadened participation

in the program. We have started with wheat because it is the one universal food that is in greatest supply. Our work with these nations is highly encouraging. Jointly we now have a mission in the Far East studying opportunities for people of that area to eat more wheat and to use more wheat in supporting their programs of economic development.

Also, our work with these wheat exporting nations has led to greatly improved understanding of U.S. objectives in making our abundance available to needy countries. This result alone justifies the whole undertaking. Where once there were complaints that our export programs were a vast dumping operation, today there are more and more comments that the program is serving an essential purpose and is not disrupting established world commerce.

I want to say again that I wholeheartedly support the food for peace program. It is a good program, a satisfying program. As was written many years ago, "It is one of the most beautiful compensations of this life that no man can sincerely try to help another without helping himself."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and somewhat a sense of accomplishment that I rise to acknowledge the rule to report equal rights legislation. May I at this point, Mr. Speaker, pay tribute and personal compliments to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], among others, for the aggressive leadership role they have played in the discharge petition which I give considerable credit to for causing this rule.

I am confident of the fact that the high number of petition signers have forced abandonment of possible previous bipartisan commitments, so that we can move forward in the field of equal rights so important to America, America's people and peoples of the free world. Personally, I feel this question was constitutionally and therefore legally resolved many, many years ago. However, because of anything but unanimity on this question, it is necessary we provide the answer again. I sincerely hope it will be a complete and final answer to this most controversial proposition.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to that of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] in saying that those of us who signed the discharge petition—a method provided for by the rules of this body—can well have a large measure of satisfaction. The discharge petition procedure has been a major factor in achieving the goal of getting civil rights legislation to the floor.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the job is not completed. We still face the responsible and serious task of approving a civil rights bill that is meaningful, that reflects what is already constitutionally guaranteed, but regretfully not practiced or followed—in other words, a civil rights bill that will assure political and human equality for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, civil rights is the moral issue of the day. Our duty is clear.

WE CAN HAVE BETTER SCHOOLS

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an important report on education recently released by the Committee for Economic Development. It was prepared by a distinguished group of businessmen and scholars headed by Mr. Ralph Lazarus, chairman of CED's subcommittee on education.

Essentially, four recommendations are made in the report.

First. Mandatory action by the State governments is needed in most States, including almost all of the most populous States, to bring about "immediate reorganization of small school districts into effective units of local governments."

Second. The State governments should assume a larger share of the financial burden of schools now borne by the local districts, and State funds should be distributed through foundation programs.

Third. Financial grants of about \$600 million annually should be made by the Federal Government "to support public schools in those States where income per public school child is substantially below the national average."

And, finally, better local, State, and Federal organization of citizens who appreciate the need for improved education is necessary for improvement of the schools in order to "generate the energy necessary for results."

Though we may disagree about some of these conclusions, everyone who has a real interest in the future of education will want to study the considered opinions contained in this report. I there-

fore, Mr. Speaker, include this digest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN HAVE BETTER SCHOOLS

(By Ralph Lazarus)

We need better schools. We can afford them.

Nobody can give them to us. We must—as Americans have always done—create, mold, and pay for better schools ourselves.

What we have achieved for our schools in the recent past should encourage us. What the future requires we can do if we wish. We can be confident but not satisfied.

The American ideal of a better life for each new generation through better education still moves us deeply. It need never die unless our will to fulfill it falters.

These fundamentals stand out in a report of the research and policy committee of the Committee for Economic Development. (This booklet is merely my summary of the report.)

For 3 years the committee studied problems of education created for all of us as citizens by the great postwar upsurge in births. Only the publicly operated elementary and secondary schools were studied. Being made up largely of businessmen, the committee felt most at home with the problem of finance—paying for better schools. Its report centers on that subject.

But what we pay for schools is affected by every aspect of education: its objectives, its methods, its staff, its facilities, its students. The report could not avoid comments on these subjects.

At the end of the study a majority of the committee agreed on four specific recommendations to help us get better schools. They appear in the closing section of this summary.

Why should businessmen, associated in a committee for economic development, consider how to pay for better schools?

We start with the fact that education furnishes one of the great drives behind our economic growth. It stimulates both sides of the production-consumption equation. Living standards rise as knowledge widens our awareness. Ability to produce the goods and services that we want for a higher standard of living depends upon skills that would be unattainable without the elementary grounding that our schools give us.

Furthermore, we have been shocked into recognizing a connection between the quality of our education and our national security: the need for scientists and engineers, the inadequate knowledge of many men drafted into military service, the high draft rejections for illiteracy.

But we need better schools because of something deeper than the important considerations mentioned thus far. A democracy lives or dies by the ability of its people to choose wisely. We need better schools to teach us how to understand the alternatives before us and how to choose wisely among the real alternatives.

We in America have developed a powerful and responsive economy. It produces efficiently and in large quantities what we as a people say, privately through the market or publicly through government, we want.

We also have developed a strong and responsive political system. It produces the government policies that a majority among us wants.

These great systems will not, by themselves, create a good society and good lives for most of us. They will produce what is good, desirable, and valuable only if we can decide what is good, desirable, and valuable. Schools must help us with the knowledge and the judgment that we need for these great decisions.

What more urgent justification could a committee of businessmen have for studying how to pay for better schools?

SCHOOLS HAVE IMPROVED

What we have achieved for our schools in the recent past we can be proud of—without being satisfied.

Gloomy predictions that the rising tide of enrollments would overwhelm our public schools began circulating a decade ago. Perhaps these predictions helped arouse us and thus to defeat themselves. They have not come true.

We do not yet have the schools we should have or could afford. But neither have we allowed our schools to sink under the weight of big postwar enrollments. On the contrary, we probably have improved our schools somewhat. The record is encouraging.

First, 11 million more boys and girls were in school in 1959 than in 1947—an increase of 46 percent in a dozen years.

Public school enrollments increased by an average of 581,000 a year during the 5 school years, 1947 through 1952. The average annual increase jumped to 1,150,000 during the next 8 years. The rise began, of course, in the elementary grades; recently high school enrollments have begun to accelerate while the rate of increase in elementary schools has lessened.

A higher proportion of children of school age (5 to 16-17) are in school now than were in 1950. This is true of all age groups, but schools have especially accepted more young children and held more older children. In 1950 about 5 of every 10 5-year-olds were in school; in 1958 6 of every 10 were in school. Seven of every 10 boys and girls 16 and 17 years old stayed in school in 1950; 8 of every 10 stayed in 1958.

Not only more children, but a higher proportion of children, are going to school today than before enrollments began to climb.

Second, the typical boy or girl probably goes to a better school than at any previous time.

The proportion of students in classrooms less than 15 years old has increased sharply.

Not all needs have been met. The U.S. Office of Education estimated that 140,000 more classrooms were needed in the fall of 1958, 65,000 to relieve overcrowding or to move from rented space and 75,000 to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

But 500,000 new classrooms had been built between 1949-50 and 1957-58. Construction has climbed to the rate of 70,000 a year. New schools are providing more space per pupil than before World War II.

Third, teachers have been found to teach the many new classes.

The teaching staff of public schools has grown by 50 percent while enrollments were increasing 41 percent (1948-49 to 1958-59). Allowance must be made for the greater teaching needs in high schools and for population shifts toward areas with higher standards. Even so, the number of students per teacher apparently has not increased and may have decreased somewhat.

Incidentally, the proportion of the teachers who are men—26.4 percent—is the highest in a half century.

Fourth, teachers have received more training.

By 1958, 36 States required that a beginning elementary schoolteacher hold a bachelor's degree; a decade earlier only 15 States had such a requirement. Standards have been raised in other respects.

In 1958-59, 93 percent of the teachers were fully certified, compared with 88 percent a decade earlier, showing that resort to teachers holding emergency certificates had declined.

Fifth, the relative income position of teachers has improved.

The committee report does not assess the equity of teachers' salaries. It traces the movement of teachers' salaries in relation to the annual average earnings of full-time employees in all industries combined.

Teachers' salaries lagged badly during World War II. By 1945 they had fallen to 88 percent of the all-industry average. Three years later, however, they had recovered sharply to 102 percent. Since then they have improved irregularly, reaching 114 percent by 1958-59. At that level, the relative position of teachers' earnings was the best it had been (except during the depression's depths) at any time since World War I, at least.

Low teacher salaries have not disappeared. In 1958-59, 18 percent of the teachers still were being paid less than \$3,500 a year. But as recently as 1952-53, 62 percent of the salaries had been below \$3,500.

Finally, the money has been raised to build classrooms, hire teachers, increase salaries, and cover other necessary expenses. Public school expenditures have tripled in 11 years, rising from \$4.3 billion in 1947-48 to an estimated \$14.4 billion in 1958-59. Even a generous allowance for inflation would leave a big and continuous growth in outlays for schools.

Schools now get a larger share of the Nation's resources than at any time during the last three decades. In 1958-59, school expenditures accounted for 3.10 percent of the gross national product, compared with pre-World War II percentages of about 2.4 percent and with a wartime low of 1.21 percent.

Part of the school money, of course, has been borrowed. The school tax burden, therefore, has risen less sharply. It was 2.6 percent of gross national product in 1958-59 compared with 2.1 percent in 1929-30 and 2.4 percent in 1939-40.

Thus far, the burden of paying for our schools, measured in terms of our total economy, has not increased far beyond the range of our past experience as a Nation.

This is the record of what we have done for our schools.

A crisis has been averted—and more. Some advances have been made. Yet better schools are so basic to our existence as a democracy that we must ask ourselves whether we have done enough.

What has been achieved thus far has been done primarily by men and women working in their home communities—their school districts and their States. Locality by locality, we have worked out our contributions to a need that is at once personal and national. The record shows that a better life for our sons and daughters through better education is still an ideal that moves us deeply. Therefore, we can be confident but not satisfied.

COSTS WILL KEEP RISING

What the future requires we can do if we wish.

Enrollments will go on increasing. Therefore, school costs should increase too, even with no improvements in our schools. A growing national economy will help us do that much. And, if we should choose in the next decade to increase our schools' share of our gross national product at the same rate as we increased it in the past decade, we could afford to improve our schools immensely. How far should we go? The answer to that question depends on the objectives we set.

The rise in enrollments probably will slacken after 1964-65.

Between 1958-59 and 1964-65 the number of boys and girls in school will increase by 21 percent. In the subsequent 5 years the rate of increase will be only about one-half as great. By 1969-70 the increase over 1958-59 probably will have gone up only to 29 percent. The rate of increase slackens be-

cause, beginning in 1965, graduating classes will be bigger as the children born in 1946 and thereafter leave school. (These estimates assume continuation of recent birth rates; a change in birth rates would begin to affect enrollments 5 to 6 years later.)

School costs would rise faster than enrollments even without improving our schools.

There are three reasons why, without increasing resources per pupil, costs would rise faster than enrollments.

1. School age population will grow relatively faster in those regions that now spend larger than average amounts per pupil.

2. A larger proportion of all school age pupils will be in secondary schools where costs are higher.

3. Teachers' salaries probably will have to rise to keep pace with earnings in other jobs.

Therefore, while enrollments rise 21 percent from 1958-59 to 1964-65, school expenditures would have to rise 31 percent just to maintain the present resources per pupil, assuming stable prices. By 1969-70, when enrollments are up 29 percent, costs would be up 47 percent.

If we keep the schools' share of our resources constant and if our economy, measured by gross national product, grows 3 percent a year, that growth will furnish 92 percent of these higher costs by 1964-65 and 95 percent of them by 1969-70. Therefore, to hold our present standards in the face of the future's larger enrollments will require only a moderate additional effort. The schools' share of a high employment gross national product would have to be 3.27 percent in 1964-65 and 3.12 percent in 1969-70, compared with about 3 percent in 1958-59. These increases are smaller than those we have achieved in the past decade.

But they provide only for continuing the amount of money per pupil that we now give our schools. Our goal should be better schools.

We can have better schools.

More than money is required for better education. Actually, our schools can improve somewhat with no increase in cost per pupil.

Schools could use better the resources that they already have if we as citizens would clarify what we expect of our local school. In some communities, representative groups of citizens have tried to resolve school priorities. More communities should do so. How much do we expect schools to do about physical and social development, character building, or vocational training? Should schools provide facilities for community activities, athletic events, and entertainments?

School officials and teachers could use the resources they already have more efficiently. Schools often are too reluctant to experiment or even to change. Methods are needed for systematic, objective appraisal of experience to determine what has worked and what has not, and why. Even when experience has produced a consensus that a new technique is good, years often go by before the technique is generally adopted. Schools need to give more attention to what business calls research and development. Some good work has begun. More needs to be done. The responsibility falls especially on private foundations, professional associations, the U.S. Office of Education and State departments of education. Local school systems might appoint a special official to encourage experiments and adoption of tested improvements. Better ways of determining useful changes and speeding their adoption may be the most urgent need in our schools.

But this committee believes that more money per pupil is also needed to improve our schools. It would seem to be attainable.

In the 6 school years, 1951-52 to 1957-58, the share of our gross national product going to schools increased by about 5½ percent each year. If we were to continue this rate of increase, money for schools would go up 70 percent by 1964-65. Only a 31 percent increase by 1964-65 is required to match enrollments. Obviously, therefore, even a substantial reduction in our recent rate of diverting additional resources to schools would provide money for improving our schools.

Put that way, the task sounds easier than it will be. We cannot pay for better schools just by continuing our present effort. To match enrollments and improve our schools we will have to increase the share of our national income going to schools. To accept a further increase on top of the effort already made may be difficult. But the magnitude of what we still must do is less than what we have recently done.

We can gage the minimum task ahead of us from the cost of holding unchanged the resources now devoted to the education of each pupil with rising enrollments. We should do more than this minimum—and we can afford to—if we want better schools.

How much more?

The citizens of each school district must answer that question for themselves just as they handled their local problem of rising enrollments after 1946. A national aggregate or average goal of school expenditures would be arbitrary and of uncertain meaning. We need, instead, a vigorous push forward, locality by locality, correcting known local deficiencies. In the process we will evolve new standards by which to guide ourselves into the future.

National projections of enrollments, costs, and gross national product do give us, however, one basic conviction: We can afford better schools. The American ideal of a better life for our sons and daughters through better education need not die unless our will to fulfill it falters.

WHAT TO DO

Four kinds of action would help us materially to get better schools. The committee recommends these actions:

1. Citizens working for better schools should improve their own effectiveness.

Nobody can give us better schools. In America we must always create, mold, and pay for them ourselves. Therefore, everything that has been done—or will be done—for better schools depends on effective action by men and women working in their own communities.

The best examples of local action show us what can be done and how. Organized citizen interest in a community's schools is the foundation. It will attract good school officials. A combination of effective citizens' organization and strong school officials gets results.

Citizens' committees have been more effective when organized on a representative, permanent basis with professional assistance. They should cultivate good relations with other local groups. A State citizens' committee, drawn from local committees, makes them effective at a government level that often determines the success or failure of their efforts.

The committees should stimulate public participation in school elections, referendums on tax rates or bond issues, budget hearings, and school program reviews.

2. States should redistrict their schools into systems of effective size.

The inefficiently small school district has been with us too long. For years we have known that a complete school program can hardly be conducted by a unified school system with less than 2,000 students. Advantages continue to accrue until a school system reaches perhaps 25,000 students.

Yet early in 1957, 30,000 school districts had less than 50 students. Schools in such districts are doomed to inferiority. Fewer than 3,000 school districts had as many as 1,200 students. Only 2,000 had as many as 3,000 students.

Small enrollments do not reflect sparse populations. Rather they result from school districts covering tiny areas. In 21 States the average school system covers an area equal to a 7-mile square (49 square miles) or less. They are horse-and-buggy school districts.

Small school districts cannot offer an adequate course of study. They use teachers wastefully. Often they offset their inefficiency by low salaries and by disproportionate amounts of State aid.

The 45,000 school districts in the country should be consolidated into less than 10,000. The number and their boundaries should be determined State by State. Counties often, but not always, offer a good area within which to consolidate.

The States created the multiplicity of school districts. They must force the consolidations. Voluntary reorganization, requiring approval by voters in the affected districts, has moved at a snail's pace, even when State authorities have applied pressure. Some States have achieved school systems of appropriate size by mandatory legislation. Obviously, similar action by the remaining States is past due.

3. States' financial aid to schools should increase and be through a foundation program.

In most States the State government should take over from local districts a larger share of the financial burden of schools. For all practical purposes local districts have one source of revenue—the property tax. Although a school district may have adequate economic resources to support improved schools, it will often be unable to tap those resources through the property tax. Property is less equally distributed among school districts than other tax sources such as income or sales.

State aid should be distributed to local districts through a foundation program that insures each district within the State the financial ability to support its schools.

A foundation program specifies the type and quality of school services that should, as a minimum, be available to students throughout the State. Usually it is based on the practices already prevailing in most districts. The cost of providing these services is determined. Then State funds are distributed in such a way that every school district can afford, with State funds and its own, this basic or foundation program.

States should provide each school district with funds equal to the difference between the cost of the State foundation program and the amount that would be raised in the district by a property tax levied in all districts at a moderately low, uniform rate, based on full or at least equalized valuation of property. The assumed tax rate should be low enough to leave the local districts with some fiscal capacity to go beyond the foundation program.

Unless the State's school districts have achieved reasonable size and financial strength, such a foundation program will not work well. Both school districts of an efficient size and an appropriate State foundation program are essential. Together they are capable in most States of eliminating the local pockets of substandard education, paying for expanding enrollments, and providing money to permit most school districts to improve.

4. The Federal Government should aid education in the poorer States.

In a number of States, mostly but not exclusively in the South, school expenditures

per child in public school are much lower than in the remainder of the country. With notable local exceptions, teachers in these States are poorly paid and often are less qualified than elsewhere. Better teachers are hard to retain. Classes are large. More pupils drop out of school before completing their education.

Per capita incomes in these States are low, and the proportion of the population in public school is large. Inferior education prevails even though a higher percentage of the community's income goes into schools than in other sections of the country.

Under the pressure of financial necessity, most of these States have already reorganized their school districts. They are supplementing local funds with large State programs.

Additional State and local support is possible. But it is not realistic to expect that the poorer States will be able to bring their schools up to nationally acceptable standards out of their own resources.

These facts do not justify Federal aid to all Schools throughout the country, in the opinion of a majority of the research and policy committee. The national interest in adequate education will best be served, a majority believes, by continued reliance upon State and local governments. They are capable of meeting the schools' needs. For the most part, they are, in fact, responding to the requirement for sharply rising expenditures.

The national interest in good schools everywhere and the national interest in a decentralized school system are not irreconcilable. The combination of these two interests calls for the assumption of an important but limited responsibility by the Federal Government. This is a residual responsibility. It is to provide support to the extent necessary in situations where the decentralized system cannot provide good schools. And the support should be reserved for cases where the deficiency is clear.

The clear and present need is for Federal financial assistance to the States that have extremely low personal incomes relative to the number of schoolchildren.

THE STATES AFFECTED

Present school expenditures in a number of States are so low as to demand improvement. Exactly how low is "too low" is a question not easily answered. But 80 percent of the current national average expenditure per pupil is a reasonable standard, below which school expenditures should be considered unacceptably low.

Eleven States fell below this 80-percent floor in 1957-58—most of them far below it. The States are Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, West Virginia, Virginia, Maine. The 11 States had 22 percent of the Nation's public school enrollment. Low standards affecting more than one-fifth of the Nation's schoolchildren cannot be dismissed as unimportant.

The size of the increase in present expenditures that would be required to reach the 80-percent level leads to the conclusion that, in most cases, the sums required are not likely to be forthcoming from sources within these States.

The Federal Government cannot simply provide each State with the amount, if any, required to raise existing school expenditures to 80 percent of the national average. To do so would penalize States now making the greatest financial effort to support schools and reward States making the least effort. It would eliminate the incentive to increase local support of schools.

To avoid this defect, a Federal aid formula should compare the relationship between personal incomes, school-age population, and school outlays within a State to the same relationship across the Nation. Under

such a formula, the Federal Government would pay a State, for each student in daily attendance, a sum computed as follows:

(a) The aggregate personal income of the State's residents would be divided by the number of students in average daily attendance to arrive at personal income within the State per pupil.

(b) This figure would be subtracted from the same figure computed for the country as a whole but then reduced to 80 percent.

(c) The amount by which the State's personal income per pupil fell below 80 percent of the national average, would be multiplied by the national ratio of school expenditures to personal incomes.

For example, personal income per student in average daily attendance in the Nation as a whole was \$11,446. Eighty percent of this was \$9,157. In Mississippi, personal income per student in average daily attendance was only \$4,893. Subtracting \$4,893 from \$9,157 leaves \$4,264. In the Nation as a whole, current school expenditures equaled 2.83 percent of personal income. For each student in average daily attendance Mississippi would get 2.83 percent of \$4,264, or \$121. With 444,200 students, Mississippi would thus receive a total grant of \$54 million.

The cost of such a program, if it had been in effect in the 1957-58 school year, would have been \$544 million. This payment would have been divided among the 19 States in which income per pupil was less than 80 percent of the national average, the 11 States previously listed, except Maine, plus New Mexico, Oklahoma, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Louisiana, Hawaii, and Vermont. In the future, the annual cost might be about \$600 million.

States would have to meet two conditions to be eligible for grants. After an appropriate adjustment period, they would have to provide current school revenues from State and local sources equal to at least the same proportion of their personal income as does the Nation as a whole. They could not reduce these school revenues below their level at the time the program is introduced. These provisions would insure a reasonable financial effort to support schools from sources within the State, and guarantee against the substitution of Federal for local funds.

This Federal aid would enable reasonably adequate education, as measured against standards prevailing in the rest of the country, to be provided in those States that have relatively small economic ability to support schools.

Although there were individual reservations and dissents, a majority of this committee believes that this proposal merits support from the entire country on these grounds. The expenditure required will contribute more to the welfare of the country than many existing Federal expenditures, some of which could well be cut. But if the program implies higher taxes, they will be justified by the anticipated benefits. The committee is now reviewing the problem of Federal taxation and expects in a subsequent statement to present suggestions for financing essential Federal expenditure, including those recommended here for education.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in further response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader, it will be our purpose if the veto message comes up on Monday or Tuesday to ask, after the message is read, that further proceedings with regard to the bill and message be put over until Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

LIBRARY SERVICES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the importance of extending the Library Services Act of 1956 cannot be overemphasized. It must be accepted as axiomatic that books constitute the most essential tools for knowledge coupled with the irrefutable fact that they make a positive contribution to relaxation and pleasure, vicarious or otherwise. Libraries have been called the repository of man's knowledge and, true, it is only through their use whereby we can communicate with the great minds of the past; a "golden treasury," so to speak, which spans the ages of recorded time. One has only to look at the attitude of the totalitarian nations to forcefully see the importance of books. By means of rigid control, people are forced to read whatever the state dictates and those books which seek after truth in an objective manner are banned as dangerous. On the other hand, in America and the free world, the principle of free access to libraries where we may choose, without fear, any book desired, is an inherent part of our basic freedoms. Therefore, it is an act of grave omission when we compare the attitude of a totalitarian versus a free state to books, that even in our own Nation people might not be able to read, not, mind you, because of police control nor governmental attitude, but because, unfortunately, funds are not available for libraries. True, our metropolitan areas can boast of some of the most replete libraries in the world; however, is it not true that all people in a free society should have this type of facility? The bookmobile program, therefore, fulfills this need in those areas where a permanent structure would not be practical.

Thus, I believe, that the intrinsic worth of libraries and books is beyond question and, hence, it is unnecessary for me to belabor the point any further before my distinguished colleagues. More specifically, I shall point out the great benefits accrued to the State of Massachusetts and to the First Congressional District which I serve, by the existence of the Library Services Act of 1956.

In the State, the improved and extended service now reaches 279 towns and the people to whom this service is available number 1,055,191. Approximately 30 towns in western Massachusetts are getting supplementary books via bookmobile which goes to pub-

lic libraries, deposit stations, and schools. The bookmobile operates from the Pittsfield Regional Center. In cooperation with the office of audiovisual aids of the Commonwealth department of education, an audiovisual aids center has been established in Greenfield. This service is available to all four counties in western Massachusetts.

In the State, 178 of the 263 rural communities received increased appropriations; increased hours of opening; 103 increased salaries. Circulation in the rural areas rose 13 percent. Regional group meetings on standards have been held and institutes and workshops conducted on storytelling, weeding the book collection, book repair, basic reference tools, exhibit planning, and regional cooperative services.

The total expenditure for the fiscal years of 1957, 1958, and 1959, in Massachusetts, was \$454,485 of which the Federal Government, under this act, contributed \$188,171. The expenditure in relation to the great benefits derived from the program is very small indeed. The great good cannot be measured by any statistical count. Suffice it to say, that many more people have become better trained and thinking citizens, more competent in science, technology, business, industry, and civic affairs through the operation of this service.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today is for the purpose of extending this act. I am sure that the evidence in its favor is overwhelming. The incalculable benefits under its provisions will be an asset to the United States which cannot be computed in terms of dollars; it will be an asset of strength through knowledge. I urge, therefore, that this bill to amend the Library Services Act be passed.

OCEANOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, since February 17, 1959, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. During these several months, under the leadership of the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], who is our chairman, we have been briefed by the several agencies of the Federal Government which have jurisdiction over the many phases of governmental interest and activities in the broad area of oceanography.

Merely naming these several agencies will serve to point up the extensive scope of the subject and will also emphasize the rather sticky problem involved in getting the coordination necessary for action for the expansion and the acceleration of the oceanographic program so urgently needed in our national interests.

These agencies are Navy, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Maritime Administration, Na-

tional Science Foundation, Office of Education, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Bureau of Mines, as well as the Weather Bureau, U.S. Coast Guard, and the Beach Erosion Board of the Army Engineers. In addition, there are several other offices which are directly or indirectly involved in action, or lack of action, in this broad area. Of course, there is also involved the overlapping jurisdiction of committees of the House in their responsibilities for the many other activities of these several agencies of the Government. I stress this point only to point up the inevitable built-in delays, inherent in our Government, in meeting this urgent challenge which confronts America right now; namely, the challenge, not only of Soviet competition, but the challenge of time as well to increase our basic knowledge of the great resources of the oceans, the resources available in almost unlimited abundance at our very doorstep.

The reports of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences spelled out in detail the critical needs and recommended a 10-year program which was to have been implemented with the necessary funds, starting in fiscal year 1960. Of the \$65 millions recommended for annual commitment over the next 10-year period, it is my understanding that some \$13 millions were actually appropriated for this current fiscal year of 1960. This, obviously, means that America in terms of what should be done has lost substantially another year of time, an asset which can not be bought for replacement. It is my hope that we will not be found still spinning our wheels in fiscal year 1961. Soviet Russia, in her drive for scientific gains in oceanography, is not losing time but, on the contrary, is accelerating her rapid pace with even more drive.

President Eisenhower, recently, in decorating Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy, and Jacques Piccard, for their 7-mile bathyscaph dive into the Mariana Trench in the Pacific said:

The United States is in the forefront of oceanographic research.

This past week, Dr. George Kistiakowsky, the chief science adviser to the President, is quoted as saying that—

The United States is in a science-technology contest with Russia which today involves our national prestige and tomorrow, perhaps, our very survival.

In the light of these statements from the summit of our leadership in America, it is appropriate to take a good look at the existing facts of life without any discoloration by rosy-hued lenses.

I am told that in a lecture on "World Perspectives" some time ago, at the Political Academy—military—in Russia, the lecturer stated that—

The Soviet Union is the greatest maritime country in the world and must fulfill its historic mission on the oceans * * * who dominates the oceans, doesn't know distances.

Today, in their drive, the Soviets have moved, and are moving, into every ocean of the world. A comparison of Russian locations before World War II, and as of

now, is most startling. From the Arctic to the Antarctic, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Russia is now located and is still moving for wider and more intensive locations. The Soviet merchant marine has the broad mission of studying world seas, so as to make them serve the needs of human society, under their regimentation, of course.

Kaliningrad has been designated as the base for the Soviet oceanic activities in the Atlantic. A sea hydrophysical section of the Soviet Science Academy has been opened there. The largest research vessel in the world, *Mikhail Lomonosov*, which the gentleman from New York (Mr. DORN), our staff consultant, Capt. Paul S. Bauer, U.S.N.R.—retired, and I visited last September in New York Harbor, is operating from this base in its research of the Northwest Atlantic, the Gulf Stream, the Gulf of Mexico, and, incidentally, the waters off Cuba. There may be no special military significance to these research plans, but it is to our best interests to recollect the signaling of Soviet submarines in these waters during this winter. Of course these signalings could have been from the *Herring* submarine, about which Khrushchev boasted while in Iowa last summer. The oceanic research of the *Lomonosov* which, by the way, carries a larger complement of scientists than crew members, coordinated with the research mission of the submarine *Severyanka*, obviously compiles data of great strategic value, uncomfortably close to our shores. It is, also, my understanding that 10 big refrigerator and processing trawlers for Latvian use in the North Atlantic are being put into operation, as well as Ukrainian fishing vessels off the west African coast. In the Pacific, there is the same pattern of fisheries operations. These operations cover the South China Sea, the Gulf of Tonkin, and waters off the coasts of Alaska and Canada. New, bigger, and specially designed ships are being delivered continuously to follow up all research findings. These 3,000-4,500-ton vessels are self-sufficient for 3 months operations at sea, with refrigeration, canning, and processing capacities for production.

The well-known Soviet research ship, *Vityaz*, is now busily and continuously engaged in all-inclusive operations in the Indian Ocean, undoubtedly, to be followed with the same pattern of intensive fisheries operations as now practiced in the Atlantic and Pacific.

At least one and probably several bathyscaphs will soon be in operation by the Soviets to supplement their already intensive fisheries activities. This means, of course, operations in depth. Soviet and satellite whaler fleets are also engaging in intensive activities, in every oceanic area, consistent with this type of fisheries endeavor.

By their own admissions, the Soviets are not even recovering their investment bait in their fisheries catches. The substantial increase of invested capital—new vessels, electronic equipment, and so forth, is admitted to be the major cause for these deficits in their fisheries operations. For example, in the Yukat Fishing Trust, while investments in-

creased 18 times, as compared with pre-war times, catches increased only by 11.3 percent. Yet the Soviets move ever forward with increased fleets and fishing activities. We are then justified in assuming, that there is a more general state interest involved. This seems to imply, especially in the Atlantic, a defense importance to our national interest which is strikingly basic.

In portions of the diary of V. G. Azhazha, leader of the expedition of 1958-59 of the submarine, *Severyanka*, in the North Atlantic, from whose diary fragments were published by *Izvestiya* on February 15, 17, 18, and 19, 1959, it becomes quite apparent that this submarine was operating under strict orders to avoid being observed by foreign ships, crash diving whenever any foreign ships were observed approaching.

SOVIET OCEANIC EXPANSION

The number of special research ships of the Soviet which are reconnoitering are specially equipped with sonar, radar, and so forth. In 1956 the number was 19. This was considered very unsatisfactory, the average proportion desired being 1 research ship per 10 fishing trawlers. During 1957, 1958, and 1959 the number of these research ships has been increased.

The Soviet interest in fishing in other zones of the Atlantic, apart from the northeast Atlantic, became apparent several years ago. Until 1954, they were mainly occupied by their expansion in the northeast Atlantic, but in 1954 they sent their research ships in the northwestern Atlantic to explore fishing possibilities off Newfoundland, and they found new fishing grounds, apparently "unexploited by other countries," on the Newfoundland banks, where they started to fish sea perch in 1956. In 1957 they again found big concentrations of fish on the northeastern slopes of the big bank, then pushed their exploration north into Davis Strait, and, since 1956, began to fish also in Davis Strait on banks off Greenland and Labrador. In 1959 the Baltic Research Institute for Fisheries and Oceanography announced that its research ships discovered new fishing grounds in Davis Strait.

There are two research institutes for fishing and oceanography active in the North Atlantic. They are the Pinro, or Polar Institute for Fisheries and Oceanography, with seat at Murmansk, and the Baltiuro, or the Baltic Institute for Fisheries and Oceanography, with seat in Leningrad.

In 1959, however, the Soviet interests being already directed to the South and Central Atlantic, a new institute was set up in Kaliningrad, namely, the Atlantic Institute for Fishing and Oceanography, which has been provided with a series of special ships, installations, and personnel, and a big Atlantic oceanarium is now under construction in Kaliningrad, which is to become the "capital of the Atlantic Ocean."

In 1957 and 1958 Soviet research ships explored the waters around Cabo Verde Islands and the Continental Shelf of western Africa in the central Atlantic, looking for fishing grounds for sardines,

sardinellas, and tunafish. In this research they were followed by Polish research ships which collaborated with them.

Having completed this task, *Kazan*—flagship of flotilla studying distribution of valuable fish in the central Atlantic—will sail south from the Guinea Gulf as far as the Cape of Good Hope, exploring on their way along the west African coastal shelf the zones of concentration of another quality of fish—the sardinops, also a very valuable fish.

The Kaliningrad Atlantic institute has its own scientific research fleet, with a flagship *Mikhail Lomonosov*, previously mentioned, and enjoys the cooperation not only of all Soviet fishing fleets operating in the Atlantic waters, but also, of the Polish and East German fishing fleets.

Soviet fishing authorities are determined to establish themselves firmly in the west African fishing grounds, as they did in the North Atlantic.

EXPANSION OF SOVIET FISHING IN DISTANT WATERS

At the same time, when Mr. Khrushchev insists on the liquidation of all U.S. bases in foreign lands and wants the United States of America to withdraw across all oceans to the territorial waters of the United States of America, Soviet Union leads a definite policy of military, political, and economic expansion over world oceans.

It seems that the appearance of Soviet fishing fleets in this region, that is South Africa, would not be welcome, especially as Soviet authorities use a brazen method of claiming not only the freedom of the seas, but also discovery of new fishing grounds by them, entitling them to fish there in exclusion of others. They go to some region where fishing has been going on for centuries, fish some fish out, and then declare solemnly that they discovered new, unknown, fishing grounds and then fix themselves there. They did so along the Newfoundland Banks, claiming of having discovered their new fishing grounds for sea perch and cod. More recently, they did the same trick in Davis Strait—between Labrador and Greenland—where they calmly declared in June 1959 that their fishing research ship *Muksun* discovered rich fishing grounds off the west Greenland coast, between Cape Farewell and Disko Island. They studied the sea bottom of these new fishing grounds.

From Kaliningrad, a Lithuanian flotilla of 10 big trawlers fished there—Newfoundland Banks—and others too. One of them, the *Novorossiisk*, has been involved in an incident, having fouled transatlantic cables, five cables having been cut simultaneously.

All these flotillas are supported by oil tankers, refrigerator ships, and keep in contact with Soviet oceanographic ships cruising in the neighborhood as well as with the Soviet Antarctic shore stations: Mirny, Lazarev, and Bellinghausen.

The above figures illustrate, very well, the expansionist character of Soviet fishing industry, which has already considerably spread out from home waters to distant waters of the Atlantic, Antarctic,

and Pacific, and is to be even more intensified in the same sense.

This means that if, at present, some 15,000 Soviet sailors are at sea fishing in the North Atlantic alone, by 1965 their number will grow to some 25,000 with about 1,000 fishing trawlers. As they stay the whole year around on their fishing grounds as far as Newfoundland Banks, Davis Strait, Cabo Verde, and equatorial Atlantic—this whole community provided with radars, sonars, and so forth—presents a kind of permanent occupation of these free waters, over which no control of any kind can be extended, the seas and oceans being free for everyone.

From the legal point of view, international law gives them all freedom to do as they wish and like.

As previously noted, they have fishing submarines for the underwater research, and one of them, the *Severyanka*, is particularly active in the North Atlantic. Young Soviet officers, especially navigators, are being appointed to these fishing flotillas for practice, especially in strategically important waters, which they can study at their leisure. In fact, these Soviet fishing fleets provide them with a close observation net from Newfoundland and Labrador to Dakar and Gulf of Guinea, then, all around the Antarctic with its round-the-continent sea communication lines, and then, in the North Pacific from the Aleutians to Japan, and later on, as far as Solomon Islands, where Soviet fishing research ships have already made their appearance during the last few years. This expansion of the Soviet fishing over the seas is one of the features of their competition with the Western World. It has more strategic importance than might appear at first glance.

SOVIET INTEREST IN THE WORLD OCEAN

The expansion of fishing activities is typical for all seas and oceans. Soviet fishing, which was minor in scope before the war in the North Atlantic, and in the Antarctic, now takes the form of all-year-round fishing, aided by auxiliary and mother ships of all kinds, whole floating towns in the North Atlantic. In the Antarctic, as the captain of the *Slava* flotilla, Captain Solyanik said recently, Soviet whalers have created already a "kind of home waters."

In the Pacific Soviet fishing activities develop more slowly, but already this year five Soviet fishing trawlers have been arrested by Philippine authorities in their territorial waters.

Some 400 Soviet trawlers and other vessels are spread all the year round in the Norwegian Sea, North Sea, and northern, central, and south Atlantic, organized in groups of 10, led by their research ships.

This expansion of fishing activities has been preceded by a series of research activities led by research vessels of Soviet Oceanographic Institute and of the Institute of Fisheries.

These scientific activities are also being very extensively developed by Soviet top scientific institutions whose aims have been described by Prof. V. G. Bogorov from the Oceanographic Institute of the Soviet Science Academy in

the monthly *Priroda*—January 1959—said that the study of the world ocean, apart from its purely scientific interest, is very important also for practical reasons, such as meteorological forecasts, fishing activities, navigation, transoceanic flights, and so forth. Therefore, the Soviet Union has been conducting widespread research in the world ocean for several years. In 1958 oceanographic research was conducted in the Pacific, Indian, and Atlantic Oceans, in the Antarctic waters, and in many seas around U.S.S.R.

The research in the Pacific was conducted in its western and central regions by the research ship *Vityas*. It is my understanding that the *Vityas* had alarmed some American authorities by making observations near some strategically important islands in the Pacific. In the southern Pacific the research ship *OB'* worked. The span of Soviet research in the Pacific was from the Kuriles to the Antarctic and the results are of great importance. Underwater currents, geographical zonality, topography of the sea bottom, physical, chemical, biological, and geological particulars of the oceanic natural features. Among others it has been found that in the depths, even of few hundred meters, the waters can move with a speed 10 times greater than it has been accepted until now. The topography of the sea bottom, especially the great depths, are of interest for the disposal of radioactive waste material. It has been found that the ventilation of such depths as the Tonga and Kermadec trenches goes so rapidly that in 5 to 10 years the radioactive waste would come to the surface.

In the Antarctic waters *OB'* crossed and studied the southern parts of all three oceans, Indian, Atlantic, and Pacific, which join together only in these southern latitudes. Therefore the study of Antarctic waters is a necessary part of the studies of the world ocean and of its dynamics.

In the Atlantic Ocean during 1958 worked two science academy vessels, *Mikhail Lomonosov* and *Syedov*. They collected much material concerning geology, hydrology, and biology of the Atlantic Ocean.

Further on Professor Bogorov describes various scientific works of the Soviet oceanologists during the 1958 period and says that at the same time were studied new methods and new equipment for oceanographic research for the merchant fleet and navy and for the fisheries.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I digress from this detailed statement of Soviet efforts long enough to urge that our agencies which have jurisdiction should plan for similar oceanographic activity by the ships of the U.S. merchant marine. Instrumentation of these ships would substantially help us to fill the gaps in gathering data which now exist because of our current lack of research vessels as we pursue our relatively meager programs. The technique of the Soviets in using their merchant ships indicates the urgency of their efforts. We can and should do no less.

During 1959 Soviet oceanologists studied in detail the whole northern part of the Pacific Ocean from Asian shores to the American shores. A series of complex research activities are foreseen in the Indian Ocean. In the Atlantic the *OB'* and *Mikhail Lomonosov* made a meridional sectioning of the whole ocean along the 20th or 30th meridians west from Greenwich.

Wide theoretical studies were made to learn the laws governing the distribution and the dynamics of physical, chemical, biological, and geological phenomena and processes in the world ocean, which are the main task of Soviet oceanology.

For the above presented research work on the world ocean various institutes of the Soviet Academy of Science dispose of over 30 specially equipped vessels. They are small, such as the 103-tonner, 300-horsepower, 11-knots *MS Mauka*—built in Black Sea shipyards in 1956—the bigger *Akademik Kowalevskiy* has five laboratories, while *Nauka* has only three, and can stay 40 days at sea and has deep anchoring equipment for 2,500 meters depth. *Vityaz* is known, as well as the new *Mikhail Lomonosov* and *Okean*. The latter two have special platforms for helicopters and radio location. Moreover, the diesel-electric ships *OB'* and *Lena* also belong to the academy.

The fleet of the Soviet Academy of Science is under the administration of a special department called Section of Sea Expeditionary Activities under V. A. Polyushkin.

For the geophysical year they organized 25 expeditions of which 6 were deep-sea expeditions.

As all the fishing flotillas have their own research ships provided with radar, sonar, some with helicopters and various other equipment—these ships belonging to the Academy of Science play a senior role and collect all information gathered by the research vessels of the fishing flotillas.

In each sea there is a flagship of the scientific research. In the Barents Sea apparently works *Nauka*. The *Akademik Kowalevskiy* works in the Black Sea; *Vityaz* is in charge of the Pacific; and in the Atlantic the *Mikhail Lomonosov* has the leading role.

The fishing and research ships of the Polish, East German, Rumanian, and Bulgarian fishing fleets are in close collaboration with the corresponding Soviet authorities, and for instance Polish fishing research has been conducted in the South Atlantic, together with the Soviet expedition there, and Polish whalers are expected to go to the Antarctic soon to cooperate with Soviet whaling flotillas. It is possible that also the East German whalers would be there.

All of the above information, Mr. Speaker, has been gathered from Soviet publications. There is nothing from any other sources.

All of the preceding could make a chapter on Soviet maritime expansion, which has already been predicted by Mackinder—Sir Halford Mackinder, the originator of geopolitics—at the beginning of this century.

The order of events is very simple. Soviet scientists study the seas and oceans, then they send their fishing and whaling fleets there; where they found the best conditions, they ask for extended rights. Naturally, soon afterward they are ready to defend their freedoms and sovereignty over such waters by protecting them with their navy and air force. Having shown great economic activity, they will claim better conditions for its development, they will settle down whenever this would be of interest, without the slightest regard for costs.

In other words the scientific activities are bringing about economic interests, which in turn raise political and strategic problems.

The whole plan from the beginning is expansionist in character and pursues definite political, strategic, and economic aims. On the basis of such a plan, which is at the bottom of their sea expansionism, they start scientific, economic and other activities. These things simply must be done, following the plan, independently of their economic value as scientific, fishing or other activities are concerned. They explain why, despite the permanent losses, the deficitary fishing is being developed, funds invested in it, and so forth. Because the plan said so many proteins from the sea must be produced, the fishing fleets must occupy their definite positions on the world ocean, where they execute such-and-such missions, often divorced from fishing, but connected with naval activities instead.

In the final result, the scientific and economic aims can often be considered as of secondary importance; political and strategic aims occupying first place.

Perhaps this presentation, Mr. Speaker, has been in too much detail. It has been my purpose, however, to stress the terrific drive which the Soviet Government is conducting together with its satellite states in order that some contrast may be portrayed with the relatively meager oceanographic efforts of America.

For example, one only needs to check the obsolescence in many of our fishing fleets and research fleets, as well, to understand the full impact of this Soviet drive. According to their published plan, the Russians intend to have 1,000 deep-sea-going trawlers by 1965, equipped with the most modernized electronic equipment. These trawlers are to be serviced while at sea with their catches being processed by factory ships which accompany them. This kind of an operation, then, becomes a sort of a permanent stake-out on the waters of the high seas where they are operating. For every 10 trawlers they plan an efficiently equipped and scientifically manned research ship which could mean that, by their target date of 1965, they could have 100 of the most modern oceanographic research ships in the world.

What are we doing in this regard as we recall again the recent words of President Eisenhower and the evaluation of Dr. Kistiakowsky, his chief science-technology adviser?

Here are the facts according to the best information which I have been able to get as of today.

The Committee of Scientists report of last year on page 12 indicates that in 1959 we had 45 vessels in all categories of research, research and development, and survey projects under military direction, while of these 45 there were 7 in resources and fisheries research under, I assume, civilian direction. Of these 45, as the total availability, 30 should be replaced as expeditiously as possible. Over the 10-year construction period, recommended by the scientists, we should build 40 new research vessels. Fifteen of the present 45 would still be operational in 1970 according to the original 10-year program of the committee. We would then have 85 research ships of efficient capability to do the job of retaining our position in the forefront to which the President has referred.

But we are not doing this. In fiscal year 1960 we appropriated for one Navy research ship. In fiscal year 1961 budget, now under consideration, the Coast and Geodetic Survey budget called for three class III ships using the unexpended balance from a class I ship now under construction. We have one research ship included in the fiscal year 1961 budget for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and another provided for with a grant from the National Science Foundation. Fiscal year 1961 provides for only one new research ship for the Navy. Accordingly, we have for the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years only 6 of the 15 new ships which the Committee of Scientists recommended as a minimum schedule, as found on page 13 of their report.

What of the additional needs for the oceanographic program, which is needed as a minimum to keep us in the forefront to which the President alluded?

These include such items as cost of ship operations; shore facilities for basic research; oceanwide surveys; engineering needs for ocean exploration, that is, more manned submersible vehicles such as the *Trieste*, only modernized, with more capacity and versatility; programs directed to more knowledge of and protection against radioactive contamination of our ocean resources; and educational funds for the development of oceanographic scientists from the undergraduate to the doctoral levels. These are only some of the urgent requirements of the oceanographic challenge which confronts us from a defense as well as an economic standpoint. The President's budget message for fiscal year 1961 had this to say about oceanographic planning which does not reflect the urgency needed to meet the Soviet challenge and certainly will not keep us in the forefront of the race to which Dr. Kistiakowsky referred:

Federal support of oceanography and related marine sciences is being substantially augmented by several agencies under long-range program development by the Federal Council on Science and Technology to strengthen the Nation's effort in this field. This program stems from the study undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of several agencies. The expansion of oceanographic research will be

undertaken by the Navy, the Departments of Commerce and Interior, and the National Science Foundation. Funds are provided for the construction of new vessels and the replacement of obsolete vessels and for increased support for research by private institutions.

As my witness, that these words do not measure up to the realistic challenge which so obviously confronts us now and which will increase in direct relation to our continued fumbling around with inadequate budgetary recommendations, I submit that an increase of \$18 million in the 1961 fiscal year budget over the \$37.7 million fiscal year 1960 appropriations for all oceanographic activities, including \$7.8 millions for new ship construction, is not a realistic facing of the facts of life. We cannot and will not remain in the forefront with this penny-pinching evaluation of our minimum needs, in this critical crisis posed once again by Soviet relentless determination to rule the world. This is not a game of marbles in which we are engaged. We are either going to shape up to the challenge for survival as Dr. Kistiakowsky has phrased it or we are doomed to be shaken down to the status of a second-rate power in the eyes of the world.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I refer back to my comment at the start of this discussion. I stated that the practical approach to the problem of overlapping jurisdictions not only of agencies of Government but also of the overlapping of the various House committees' jurisdiction in the area of oceanography must be resolved if we are to move ahead, effectively and efficiently.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the following quotes from the recent testimony of Dr. Roger Revelle before our committee in response to a question of the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is most appropriate:

The new Federal Council of Science and Technology has made an experiment in trying to go a good deal further in this (coordination) than has ever been done before and they have made the experiment in the field of oceanography simply because there was a readymade case here where several departments of the Government had different interests and different activities and the problem was to fit these into one unified coordinated nonduplicating and effective package. I was talking to Mr. Kistiakowsky recently, the President's scientific advisor, and his comment was that in the oceanography effort this was what they have been able to do. It is an achievement by them. It is a small field compared with the development of atomic energy or space research but it is an important field and one in which there have been vested interests of different Government agencies for a long time. They think they have effected, and I am sure they are right, a very satisfactory degree of coordination. I myself am not worried at all about the problem of duplication both because of this deliberate attempt at coordination within the Federal Council on Science and Technology, and more particularly however, because of the fact that if every surveying ship available in the United States were multiplied by three or four, they could all be profitably occupied for many years to come in the surveying of oceans.

In response to a question about the coordination plan that the Federal

Council has with respect to oceanography:

Is that a published document, do you know? It has not been presented to this committee.

Dr. Revelle replied:

No, sir; it has not been presented to this committee nor has it been published. It is something which has been done during the last 2 weeks.

The next question from the staff was:

Is it the intention of the executive branch do you know to advise the Congress of this plan?

Dr. Revelle replied:

I am sure it is.

In order that this approach to the problem of legislative coordination may be resolved in the interests of reaching the essential objective which I have been discussing, together with other members of the Oceanographic Committee, I urge the Members of this body to support H.R. 10412, which has been introduced by our distinguished chairman. Today I have introduced a similar bill.

Adequate implementation of oceanographic research must be provided for, now, or America will perish.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished, able chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I congratulate the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] for the speech he is making pointing out to the House of Representatives the importance of oceanography. Unfortunately, knowledge of this subject is as dark as the depths of the ocean. Oceanography has none of the glamour connected with man going out into space. But, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Maine has told you, the importance of this field of science is just as great as space exploration. From a national defense standpoint, we must know the ocean. We must know its nature and its physical characteristics and its geodesy, if we are going to successfully operate submarines beneath the surface of the oceans. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the atomic submarine is really a submarine ship. Heretofore, the ships that we have had merely descended beneath the surface of the waters. They had to come up for air. The atomic submarine can stay down beneath the surface of the ocean. The importance of oceanography cannot be overstressed at this time. I thank the gentleman from Maine for the contribution he is making to this important matter.

Mr. OLIVER. I thank our able colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], not only for what he has just said but also in appreciation of the very able leadership that he has shown during the past several months in this complicated field covering so many facets of the science of the oceans. I think without the leadership we have had by the gentleman, we would not have even made the little progress, relatively speaking, that we have made during these past several months. You

have made a great contribution, Mr. MILLER, to this whole problem, and I wish to express to you my appreciation for what you have done.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman who is also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] in the very kind and complimentary remarks which he made earlier with regard to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER]. We have had very able leadership in our subcommittee, and I believe we are well on the way to recommending legislation to the House in a constructive and objective way, which will do a great deal toward making it possible to fill the gap which exists in knowledge of that part of the world below the depth of the sea and likewise of the sea itself.

The gentleman has referred to legislation, particularly to a bill (H.R. 40412) which would establish a public policy with respect to oceanography. I am very interested myself in helping to pass that legislation. I think it is something we need very much. The gentleman from Maine referred to the report of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Science, and various pamphlets that it has issued with regard to various aspects of science. I have had a little in the way of fear expressed by scientists in my district that possibly the report and recommendation might be eliminating some of the necessary work in basic research, in our interest in pushing this accelerated 10-year plan, but I understand that is not the case. Is that the understanding of the gentleman? He would not suggest in any way holding back on our basic research in marine sciences, to accelerate the oceanography studies in the next 10 years?

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly join with the gentleman in the sentiments he has expressed with regard to the absolutely essential need for continuing basic research in marine science in this nation. I am not too happy with the way in which the expansion of our basic research has been funded up to date. That is one reason why I felt it necessary to express myself on this subject.

I agree with the gentleman that we should continue not only with basic research but that we should extend it without causing the developments you have spoken of; namely, that it might be expanded too fast. Certainly we cannot afford to go too slowly either.

Mr. PELLY. Coming from a part of the country which is almost across the continent from the State of Maine, I can say without equivocation that there is no division in the committee in our interest in this science, nor is there any partisan division. I believe the interest of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] in this subject is shared by other members of the committee, but I want to commend him, because there is nobody in this House who has demonstrated greater interest in the necessary progress we must make in the studies of oceanography.

Mr. OLIVER. I thank you very much. In turn, I express my own feeling of appreciation for what you have done in bringing about such progress as we have had up to the present time, and I know that your dedication to this subject is appreciated by the people of your own State and by the people of the Pacific coast as a whole.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the splendid address being made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Maine for his presentation today and for bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives something which is extremely important to every American and to the future of this country.

I would like to pay appropriate tribute also to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that has established a fine working program which I think will be of benefit to this country and which will, if carried out, be very important and significant in the scientific advancement of the Nation in the field of oceanography.

Mr. OLIVER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his kind remarks.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to add my commendation to the gentleman from Maine for bringing this subject to the attention of the House, and also to our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] for the long work he has done in emphasizing the potentialities of oceanography.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION—REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has become customary, from time to time, for me to submit to my colleagues in the House an informal report on the activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Currently, the Committee on the Judiciary exercises congressional oversight of ICEM's activities by virtue of House Resolution 27 of the 86th Congress. The last four semi-annual sessions of ICEM's council, at which I served as the alternate U.S. delegate, have had variously the benefit of the attendance and advice of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Chelf; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Frazier; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Rogers; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McCulloch; the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Moore; the gentleman from California, Mr. Smith; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Henderson; and our former colleague, Judge DeWitt S. Hyde, of Maryland. My colleagues have spared

no effort to guide the committee and they have earned the deep gratitude of all concerned. Formal reports on ICEM, numbered 1570 and 203, respectively, were submitted to the House in the 84th and 85th Congresses. I have last reported on that subject on July 2, 1958, when appropriation for the U.S. contribution to ICEM's funds was before the House.

ICEM ENTERS ITS NINTH YEAR

Provisionally established by an international conference held in Brussels, Belgium, in November 1951, and first conceived as a successor organization to the then expiring International Refugee Organization, ICEM commenced its operations in February 1952. It seems particularly fitting to present some observations on its past and future at this time as the month of February 1960 marks the conclusion of 8 years of the committee's activities.

Today ICEM comprises 29 members. All of them are nations of the free world who are in agreement that the committee has well established not only its viability, but its continuous usefulness. This recognition does not imply at all that ICEM members desire to see the organization's methods of operations jell—or become petrified—in their present form. Quite the contrary is true.

THE PAST IN REVIEW

However, before going on to discuss the future of ICEM, a short recapitulation of the circumstances leading to the creation of that organization may be, at this time, helpful to those of my colleagues who may not have followed closely the events occurring in the field of international assistance to displaced people and migrants since the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—UNRRA—later succeeded by IRO—International Refugee Organization—stepped into the overwhelmingly complex situation created by the uprooting of over 11 million human beings by Hitler's war machine and the Communist conquests.

The monumental task of assisting this mass of humanity to be repatriated, or integrated in the economies of the countries of asylum, or to be resettled in countries which offered them opportunities to start a new life, had been but partially completed by the end of 1951. It was realized then, that with the expiration of IRO scheduled to occur at the end of that year, the problem of resettlement of refugees and displaced persons required additional effort in order to resolve successfully their rehabilitation and integration. Moreover, another problem was challenging the free Western World—that of "surplus population" an ugly definition, meaning that there were too many people in Western Europe for whom work and opportunities for a decent livelihood could not be found in their own countries.

At the same time, many overseas countries—Canada, Australia, and several of the Latin American Republics—had indicated their interest in acquiring new settlers in order to increase their agricultural and industrial productivity while the United States, although not in need

of more immigrants for economic reasons, had kept its door reasonably open to the victims of calamities and persecutions as well as to the reunion of separated families.

In the late summer of 1951, I gathered in my office a few officials representing various agencies of the U.S. Government and submitted to them a tentative plan calling for the creation of an organization designed not only to take over the functions of IRO with respect to surface and air transportation of refugees and displaced persons, but also to build an efficient machine capable of stimulating and carrying out migratory movements from Europe to overseas countries.

My idea was to create an intergovernmental organization, outside of the United Nations, for the obvious purpose of eliminating Communist interference and the presence of Communists on the staff, and to offer to the countries of emigration and immigration an efficient shipping service as well as a clearinghouse and an honest broker in developing new resettlement opportunities, new methods of financing of migratory movements and assistance in selection of immigrants and their vocational preparation for migration.

In a series of sessions, which continued in my office for about 2 months, my plan began to take shape and before the year 1951 was over, we succeeded in obtaining the cooperation of the Government of Belgium, which invited 27 governments to participate in an international conference to convene in Brussels.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS

After 3 weeks of intensive work, a provisional organization—later made permanent—was created. The free world has been equipped with an instrumentality which by the end of 1959 has moved to new overseas homes a total of 959,281 European migrants, nearly 45 percent of whom were refugees. It is expected that the movements will reach the 1 million mark of assisted migrants early in May of 1960, when ICEM's council is scheduled to meet in regular semiannual session in Naples, Italy.

Forty percent of all emigration from Europe proceeds now through ICEM facilities. The largest number of emigrants moved by ICEM came out of Italy, 268,584, with Western Germany, 208,516; Austria, 147,665; Netherlands, 73,965; Greece, 63,294; and Spain, 33,590, following in that order. The remaining 164,000 persons emigrated from other European countries and from Hong Kong—14,160 European refugees from Communist China.

The principal receiving countries were Australia, 272,644; United States, 174,780; Canada, 149,114; Argentina, 102,291; Brazil, 80,676; Israel, 52,571; Venezuela, 43,155; with Chile, Colombia, Rhodesia, and Nyasaland, New Zealand, South Africa, Uruguay and others sharing in the resettlement of the balance.

The migration of close to 1 million people who—let me stress that point—in the absence of ICEM's assistance would not have been moved from Europe to the countries of resettlement, has been achieved at the expense of \$238,476,825,

of which \$79,545,069, a 33 percent share, has been contributed by the United States of America.

THE SIGNIFICANCE

As I said a short while ago, in the opinion of those of us who maintain close and continuous supervision of ICEM's activities, the organization has proved its usefulness. Its growing membership and the absence of withdrawals from membership tends to sustain our opinion and appears also to indicate that our views are shared by the executive and legislative branches of the governments which maintain their continuous and active participation in the Committee.

As I see it, ICEM achieves four purposes: First, by helping to relieve economic, social, and political pressures in European countries, it contributes to their stability, thus strengthening the free Western World in its momentous struggle with the Communist colonialism; second, it contributes to the economic growth of underdeveloped countries by supplying them with desirable settlers and workers; third, it generates a highly valuable, tangible capital of experience in a cooperative, practical, and realistic international effort, while—on the side of the imponderables—it creates in millions of human hearts the feeling of happiness and purpose for living, where unemployment, war, and totalitarian oppression had planted the seeds of despair and hopelessness; and fourth, last but not least, it relieves pressures on the U.S. immigration quotas by permitting European emigrants to find resettlement opportunities in countries other than the United States.

THE SHORTCOMINGS

Having established its place in the international working rather than talking community, ICEM is, at the present time, engaged in the much needed reassessment of its activities with a view toward modifying its ways and means, but not its basic concept, and bringing its operation in accord with the current aspects of the free world's economic picture.

To say that such changes in ICEM's approach to reality are much needed, is an understatement. Addressing ICEM's eighth council session in May 1958, in behalf of the U.S. delegation, I made it abundantly clear that if the administration of ICEM proceeds in pursuing the well-beaten and well-worn path of automatic shipping of migrants for whom resettlement opportunities were opened by someone else, ICEM's days may be numbered. A short time later, in July 1958, I repeated that warning on the floor of the House, stating quite pointedly, I believe, that inertia may lead ICEM to extinction. I am certainly glad to be able to tell the House that my views are widely shared around the council's table as well as in the capitals of the member nations. Two heads of state, the illustrious presidents of Argentina and Brazil, Dr. Arturo Frondizi and Dr. Juscelino Kubitschek, in conversation with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and myself, last November

and December, while restating their gratitude to the United States for our contribution to ICEM's activities and reiterating their appreciation for what ICEM has done so far, stressed the need for improving the methods of selection and preparation of the proper type of immigrants instead of indulging in loading up of human cargo most of which remains in the crowded vicinity of ports of entry and never moves to where settlers and workers are needed. As an illustration let me tell you that the Argentine Minister of Interior, Dr. A. R. Vitolo, told me that 83 percent of immigrants who entered Argentina in the last 10 years settled in Buenos Aires and its suburbs. Representatives of emigrant-sending countries, experts like Mr. B. W. Haveman, the Dutch Commissioner for Emigration and men of great vision and untiring efforts in the field of migration like Mr. Carmine de Martino, the Italian Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, have repeatedly voiced similar, if not identical views.

THE ROAD AHEAD

All of this prodding, it appears, begins to show effect. It could be that the time has now arrived for the United States to take action in order to push ICEM off the dead center, and our Department of State seems to have a task cut out for it in asserting U.S. leadership.

The mere size of U.S. financial contribution, let alone the prestige which our country enjoys, appears to make it possible for the Department of State to exercise a decisive influence in causing a gradual but accelerated reorientation of ICEM's activities.

The manner in which our annually appropriated funds for ICEM's purposes are used remains the responsibility of the Department of State. It seems advisable at this time to recast the executive rules in that respect with a view toward earmarking our contributions so as to stimulate and promote specific undertakings in the field of international migration, planned and executed in a way consistent with the current more realistic thinking clearly evident among the participating governments. This approach, rather than the old routine of financing on a per capita basis of migratory movements, will certainly be conducive to bringing about the much needed changes.

There appears, for instance, not much need in spending a lion's share of U.S. contributions for the financing of all movements assisted by ICEM regardless of whether the economic and financial situation of the countries directly interested in such movements justifies assistance. Nor is there a need for grants where loans to migrants for their transport are infinitely more advisable. The migrants, by and large, are good debtors, as evidenced by the fact that ICEM has during a 3-year period received substantial repayments on loans for transport for refugees moved to the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. In the course of the year 1959, practically all such loans were repaid. In that connection, I am very happy to see that Australia has now agreed for the first

time to experiment with loans rather than grants to migrants for their transport. Arrangements are now in progress to initiate the loan program with respect to 1,500 carefully selected Italian migrants who are to depart for Australia. It is foreseen that repayment on the loans would be collected by Australian banks for ICEM's account. This is an experiment worth watching, and probably one which will point out the way for a basically altered method of internationally assisted migratory movements.

Further, I see no need to maintain grossly overstuffed ICEM missions in countries like Italy, Brazil, Argentina, and others, where such missions either duplicate or substitute for services such as employment brokerage, which already are or could be easily and more properly supplied by local governments.

In summing up, I wish to express my sincere belief that our own, as well as other governments' money, could be spent much more productively if it were used so as to develop ICEM's resources for the purpose of improving the quality and augmenting the quantity of emigrants from Europe by offering services, planning, contacts with international financial institutions, and exploring the ways and means of supplying the underdeveloped countries with the desired type of a new agricultural settler or an industrial worker.

With the diminishing number of resettlable or, as they call them in Geneva "emigrable" refugees, the percentage of refugee movements as compared with the movements of migrants in the category of agricultural and industrial workers, is rapidly diminishing. Compared with the 45-percent refugee share in the total ICEM movements in the years 1952 to 1959, the percentage is expected to drop to 33.5 percent in 1960, with continued diminishing of refugee movements in evidence for the future. Obviously, ICEM's activities must necessarily become geared to the manpower needs of countries who need immigrants instead of relying on movements generated by humanitarian factors in the immigration policy of the overseas countries. At least two South American countries, Argentina and Brazil, have now openly stated their desire to duplicate the magnificent efforts of Australia and Canada, who since the end of the last war have succeeded in bolstering and developing their economies through the planned integration of immigrants.

Argentina is ready to open the wide spaces of its interior for a planned colonization effort which could permit the resettlement of 300,000 European immigrants. Brazil is faced with the urgent necessity of increasing its agricultural production while building a new capital and developing industries. Both countries represent potentialities which I hope will not be overlooked or neglected by ICEM and the international banking institutions.

There is a job cut out for ICEM. There is the most important task of working out lending methods for the establishment of new settlements and assisting the interested governments in

obtaining sound financing. It is precisely in these areas of planning and supplying expert services where ICEM could emerge as a stimulant and broker, a role we envisaged for it when its foundations were fashioned in Brussels in 1951 and its constitution written in Venice in 1953.

Those of us who have the continuous opportunity to watch ICEM at work, recommend that the Department of State use the powerful instrumentality of our financial contribution to ICEM so as to steer the committee in that direction, a truly rewarding task.

H.R. 8601

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House that the Rules Committee granted a rule on H.R. 8601. The discharge petition filed during the last session of this Congress by the distinguished gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, and cosponsored by members of the Democratic study group, to which I belong, had reached almost the required number of 219 signatures. This is proof of the worth of the discharge petition and shows that those dedicated to worthwhile legislation can overcome substantial obstacles by use of this parliamentary device.

GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador of the Republic of the Philippines, former President of the Assembly of the United Nations, former Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Commonwealth occupying a chair in this House, soldier, and war hero, has been repeatedly honored by Members of our Congress. There is nothing I can say which will add to the store of his richly deserved praise.

At the same time I cannot refrain from rising to voice my surprise, shock, and indignation upon reading an Associated Press dispatch from Manila to the effect that a certain veterans' organization there has requested the recall of General Romulo for alleged failure to obtain GI benefits for Philippine veterans through legislation in the United States. To extend this vilification to the extreme of absurdity the veterans have charged that during the hearings on the proposed legislation General Romulo was out of town and otherwise negligent of the welfare of Philippine soldiers.

We all know that there has been no foreign representative in the United

States who has been more industrious, loyal, zealous, and indefatigable in presenting the interests of his countrymen than the Ambassador from the Philippines. I have personal knowledge of the man and his efforts on the basis of my long service in this Congress, dating back to the days when he was Resident Commissioner and served here with us.

With respect specifically to Philippine veterans' benefits, economic assistance, and war claims, Ambassador Romulo has not only become thoroughly versed in all aspects of these difficult questions but has presented the position of his country to our Government and to Congress in a dignified, capable, and convincing manner. Whatever disappointments his Government and groups of his fellow citizens have experienced certainly cannot be ascribed to any lack of understanding, attention, or persistence on the part of their able Ambassador.

We have Biblical authority for the proposition that man may be a prophet except in his own home. Ambassador Romulo can be sure that although there appears to be a failure to appreciate his high mission among certain small and biased groups of his countrymen, we in the United States never falter in our recognition of his high place and accomplishments in the annals of history.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from California for giving us this message. One of the finest speeches on the use of food for peace was made in Iowa at a State Farm Bureau Convention some time ago by General Romulo and he made one of the finest speeches that was given on the subject and did much to change the thinking of the people of Iowa.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I think General Romulo has done a great service to the world in trying to bring the two cultures together. It is unfortunate that a limited group in his own country does not appreciate what you and I know of his good work.

FAMILY FARM ACT OF 1960

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that approximately 20 other farm State and city Congressmen have introduced the Family Farm Act of 1960.

This bill is designed to raise farm incomes, while reducing surpluses and slashing Government costs. It would provide for controlled production at fair prices to producer and consumer.

The main features of this bill are:

First. It reduces the costs to the Government—cost of maximum 5 percent—by reducing the surplus in storage and by paying farmers in kind with grain taken from existing surpluses. The present storage costs of \$1,500,000 a day will be reduced drastically each year.

Second. This is a voluntary program, requiring a referendum, needing approval of two-thirds of the producers of each commodity to change from the current program. The farmers themselves adjust supply to demand by means of

nationwide marketing orders or other commodity-stabilization procedures.

Third. A soil bank feature is included. In order for a farmer to take advantage of the soil conservation part of this new bill, he must voluntarily have taken 10 percent of his tillable land out of production. In addition to the 10 percent, he may put in 30 percent additional for which he is paid in kind out of existing surpluses.

This bill combines all feed grains as a group and would enable the producers of feed grains to sit down and evolve a total feed grain program which will be workable.

Fourth. Midwestern dairy producers benefited. This bill enables the producers of milk, milk fat and cream, and producers of milk for manufacturing and fluid consumption, to work out a total national program on milk and butterfat which would make sense nationally, as well as locally.

Fifth. School lunch and needy direct distribution programs now in operation will receive increased distribution of high-protein foods—not only milk, but poultry and meat products. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to spend \$500 million each year to purchase these items off the market and make them available to the needy.

The greater use of these foods would create a greater demand for feed grains which would also help to reduce present surpluses.

Sixth. Humphrey-Wolf food-for-peace program is provided for in the bill. I have long been an advocate of and have been working for a food-for-peace program, and under this bill provision is made for our commitments abroad under Public Law 480 and the proposed food-for-peace program to help feed the hungry peoples of the world.

Seventh. Eliminates depressing effects on Main Street. Under this proposal, the placing of entire farms in the reserve will be eliminated. No farmer would be allowed to put more than 40 percent of his land into the soil-building base; moreover, payments or benefits under the act would be limited to not more than \$5,000 to any one farm operator in one year.

I realize that this bill is not perfect. We hope that during the course of hearings on it, some improvements can be made. However, this bill gives the Agriculture Committee and everyone interested in our farm problems something to work on.

We are very optimistic that a bill will emerge from this Congress and be signed by the President which will preserve the family farm and, consequently, put the American farmer on the upward swing again.

The President said last week that he would sign a constructive bill. We have worked many months on this bill, and we believe that we have a constructive proposal, and that it will be even better by the time it reaches the President for signature.

I would like to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], if he would care to discuss this matter.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues in the House that there is a general recognition that we must have farm legislation at this session. The President says we must. He says that it is up to the Congress to present a bill. The Congress felt last year that we needed farm legislation and presented the President with a bill. He vetoed it, and offered no better reason for the veto other than that the bill would have provided a higher degree of support for farm producers than he thought advisable, although it was admitted by everyone—and I know of no exception—that the bill would have reduced the production of wheat to where it would have been in balance with the normal demand.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would not mind an interruption, there was one slight difference in the bill that the gentleman introduced and the bill I introduced. I called for a maximum of \$5,000 per farm, and I believe the gentleman's bill called for a maximum of \$10,000. I thought maybe the gentleman would like to discuss that point.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. I will be glad to discuss it. But, I think we should first understand that we must have a bill. We must have a farm bill. Whether there is a \$5,000 or \$10,000 limitation is a matter of detail in the legislation. The important thing is: Are we going to continue a program that is admittedly costing us \$1,000 a minute? Now, I just came from a meeting in which the Secretary of Agriculture just this morning confirmed that storage costs were \$1,000 a minute under the present program. That is approximately \$1 billion a year for storage alone. And, I would call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that at the present rate we are paying for storage it is costing us more in 20 months than the entire farm program, all of the expenses of the farm program, cost for 20 years prior to 1953. We are spending more on storage alone in 20 months than we spent during the whole history of the farm program prior to 1953.

While I am talking about histories, I might also call attention—because I think that some of our colleagues will certainly be interested—to the economies that are now being exercised. The present Secretary of Agriculture—and I do not want to say it is his personal fault—but under his direction, under the present administration's 7 years in office, there has been more money spent by the Department of Agriculture than was spent by all of the Secretaries of Agriculture, including Mr. Brannan on back to the day that the Department was created under Abraham Lincoln. There has been more money spent by this Department of Agriculture in 7 years than was spent in 70, yes, in 90 years under all of the preceding Secretaries of Agriculture. And, I ask you to look at Mr. Benson's own reports.

You probably will not believe what I am telling you because it sounds fantastic, but I ask any of you who doubt to read the reports of the present Secretary of Agriculture and see if it does not verify what I am telling you; \$32 billion spent in the last 7 years, which is more than has been spent in all the rest of history on agriculture. And what has it achieved? Well, it has succeeded in dropping the income of farmers, in dropping the price of farm products from approximately full parity down to on the order of an average of around 75 percent of parity at the present time. Such a stupendous drop in the income of our people, such a stupendous burden on the taxpayers of this Nation does not seem to me to be justified unless someone can point to some benefit that has not yet been called to our attention.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be prepared to state what percentage of this \$32 billion actually found its way into the farmers' pockets?

Mr. POAGE. I could not give a firm figure, but obviously rather little. There was a reduction in the total farm income, so it could not have been a very large percentage. Remember that while we have an extremely expensive farm program—and I am as ready to admit that as any Member of this House—we have a fantastically expensive farm program, one which I can understand my colleagues from the great cities feel is utterly unjustified and as one who represents a farm area I feel that that expense is unjustified, too. But where has that money gone?

One thousand dollars a minute is going into storage. Farmers do not get that storage money. That goes to somebody else. Then on every bale of cotton that is moving from American shores today there is a \$40-a-bale subsidy. On every bushel of wheat that is moving from American shores today there is approximately 60-cents-a-bushel subsidy; a subsidy not paid to American producers or for the benefit of American consumers, but a subsidy that goes to foreign consumers and foreign purchasers. The President said that he was opposed to paying any subsidy directly to American producers, but he finds no fault with paying vast subsidies to foreign purchasers.

I do not have figures as to the exact percentage, but I think it is clear that a very large percentage goes into storage, a very large percentage goes to subsidizing foreign purchasers, and a very large part of the money that is spent and which is called a part of the expense of the farm program goes to carry on programs which are in nature primarily social or relief programs. But they are charged to the Department of Agriculture.

We just authorized \$90 million a year for a school milk program; a desirable program and one which I certainly support. It does help agriculture. It provides a relatively very small market for agriculture, but it does a great deal more for the children of America, as does our school lunch program and as does our program to provide food for the needy both at home and abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE.] He is gradually getting out of the group of long-haired internationalists and now he is talking about something concerning America. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas is fast reaching that age when he is going to have as little hair as the gentleman from West Virginia, whether long or short.

But back to the bill, I think it is quite clear that if we are going to be fair with the American people—farmers, consumers, taxpayers, all of the American people—we are going to have to change this fantastic program under which we are operating. I think there are some other people recognizing it will have to be changed and hoping that its parentage will not be traced to them.

I read a few weeks ago, as perhaps some of you did, a speech made by Dr. Don Paarlberg. I think he is in Michigan now, but he was an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, as many of you will recall. Dr. Paarlberg was seeing the handwriting on the wall, because he announced that this program which we now have is something that the present administration inherited.

Let us see about that. The day the present administration took over the farm program was supporting, at least the basic commodities, at 90 percent of parity. It was what we call rigid, fixed support. The present administration immediately announced its opposition to what it described as rigid high supports, and said, "We must have flexibility," meaning we must have lower supports. They had quite some problem in getting that flexibility, but finally they succeeded in getting it. They said that they needed flexibility, between 75 and 90 percent of parity. They got it, and immediately dropped the supports. Farm income dropped. Then they came back and said, "We must have more flexibility to cure the deteriorating situation." They finally got more, over the violent protest of many of us, but they got more flexibility.

Just this morning the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Committee on Agriculture and said that he had been given almost everything he had asked. So I think it is fair to say that this program of flexibility which was sponsored by this administration, which was enacted at the request of this administration, is not something that was inherited, because when this administration took over we had rigid 90-percent supports and we were not losing any money on basic commodities.

I want to repeat that because there are too many who simply do not believe it, and again I refer you to the reports of the present Secretary of Agriculture. The day he took over there was not a loss, there was a net profit of \$13 million on the six basic commodities as a result

of the program that had been in operation many years.

Mr. WOLF. The enemies of this new program we are putting out, or who take exception to it, are saying the cost is going to be terribly high on this new program. Apparently they fail to take into consideration the 5-percent feature of it. I wish the gentleman would discuss that feature.

Mr. POAGE. I would be happy to, but I would like to approach it from the standpoint of why we must have this program, or rather why we must have a program. I would not say we must have this program. I would not say we have to bring in something that came down on tablets of stone from Mount Sinai. We have not done anything of that kind. We have simply done the best a group of human beings could work out in the time we had. If the same group works on it another 6 weeks we will make changes in it, I have not the slightest doubt, and as you Members of the House work on it you will make changes in it and improve it, I have not the slightest doubt. There is nothing absolutely fixed or perfect about this. But there is an approach, and I think it is a sound one. It is an approach that allows a large degree of self-determination. I think we might well call this the farmers bill of rights because under it the farmers may for themselves decide upon a sound program.

The first section of this bill simply provides that farmers may, if they see fit, establish marketing orders on a national basis for nationwide commodities. It simply extends the scope of the existing marketing order program. Does anybody find any fault with that? Oh, yes, I have had some criticism come to me. I have had people raise criticism because they said they were doing well under the existing marketing orders and they did not want them enlarged—they did not want anybody else to be taken in because they were doing well. "Lord, bless me and my wife and my son, John, and his wife—us four and no more." They did not want anybody else brought in. They said they were doing well, so why extend this thing. I think we owe an obligation to all of the people of America. If marketing orders are good for some groups, let us make them available to other groups. I do not know that all other groups want to accept them. Certainly, I think I have some farmers who do not want them, but this bill does not require any group of producers to adopt a new program unless it wants to do so.

Mr. WOLF. Perhaps it might be helpful to explain what a marketing order is, in a little detail.

Mr. POAGE. Marketing orders, of course, are agreements entered into by the farmers and which have been promulgated as orders by the Department of Agriculture, which authorized controls on production, on marketing, on packing, on processing, on ways of delivery, and so on, and all of that multitude of activities that go into producing and selling a crop. Primarily, they relate to the sale of the crop and are normally directed to channeling the crop into the market in the most profitable

manner. Ofttimes they involve the elimination of culls and unfit and subgrade fruit, and such commodities, which would break the price and would destroy the market. Certainly when the housewife finds that she is getting a bad commodity, she does not want it at any price.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not from the peanut-growing country. I know the gentleman from Texas is a ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and understands peanut legislation. But, as I understood the testimony of the Secretary, Mr. Benson, this morning, he proposes to extend marketing orders to peanuts.

Mr. POAGE. He did.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Then this could be done under this bill.

Mr. POAGE. It could. Under this bill marketing orders could be extended to peanuts or extended to rice or to honey bees. They could be extended to any other farm produce. They would not be forced upon any group of producers. No group of producers would be required to follow this method unless they wanted to, but we do give a wider opportunity and we do make more tools available than have been available to our farmers in the past.

The second section of title I of the bill says that if you do not want to use marketing orders, as may be the case particularly with regard to the larger crops such as wheat and cotton and feed grains, which will probably want to use some type of control, possibly something comparable to our present programs for those commodities or something on that order, we say—all right, let the farm committees meet with the Secretary of Agriculture and work up a program. Then this program must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of all the producers of that commodity.

We, too, put out some guidelines and we say that you can use all of the tools we know of for balancing supply and demand, but you must balance supply and demand. You must have a program which the Secretary will certify as calculated to bring about a balance between supply and demand. Oh, you know there have been lots of people who have said—why, that foolish bunch of people in Washington, the Congress, has tried to repeal the law of supply and demand. The Congress has never tried to repeal the law of supply and demand. The Congress has recognized from the very beginning that we must try to make the law of supply and demand work for the good of and not to the detriment of farmers.

So we tried to bring about a balance of supply and demand. I might point out that has been done in the case of many other commodities. Some of you do not come from oil-producing States. I happen to represent a State that produces more crude petroleum than any other State in this Nation. We are suffering evil days at the present, but for 20 years the petroleum business has been a pretty good business. Why has it been

such a good business? For one reason only, and there is but one, because I was in the Texas Legislature when the oil fields of East Texas ran wide open down the creeks and you were lucky if you could sell oil at 10 cents a barrel.

The well owners came to us and they said: "We cannot live on this sort of margin. We cannot drill our wells. We have got to have protection. If everybody would produce only what the market wants, we would be all right, but somebody always produces in excess of what the markets want. We have to have some assistance on the part of the government."

Starting with the Legislature of Texas and later with the legislatures of all but one of the large oil-producing States, we passed legislation providing for proration. Proration is simply a division of the right to produce, so that those who produce get their share of the market and no more. This Congress has put the stamp of approval on proration. It made it a criminal offense against the United States to ship or sell or move oil in interstate commerce that is produced in violation of the proration laws of any State in the United States. Oh, yes. You have a Federal law on it. Do not let anybody tell you that it is a matter dependent only on the laws of the States, because this Congress has put its approval on that sort of thing. I find no fault with it. I think it is good for the country. But why if this is good for the oilmen should it be wicked for the farmer?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Was not that the principle that we tried to incorporate in the wheat legislation which the Congress passed last year, in which we called on the farmers to reduce their wheat production by 25 percent, in return for which we agreed to protect them in the marketplace on the price level?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly the principle we had in the wheat bill last year. I think if the gentleman will read the message by the President of the United States delivered here last week he will find that the President sets out exactly that as one of the principles that he feels is essential and desirable. He says in setting out his guidelines that the price-support levels must be realistically related to whatever policy the Congress chooses in respect to production, it being recognized the higher the support the more regimented must be the farmer.

Now it seems to me the President has clearly said if you are going to support the price you must restrict production and bring it in balance. Unfortunately that was only one of the guidelines that he set up. Then he gave several more which completely contradicted the first one and makes the first one utterly unworkable by itself. Unfortunately while we recognize the soundness of that principle the President's later pronouncements make it clear that he will not let us apply it. We submitted a program that everybody agreed would have

stopped the surplus production of wheat, but because it provided also that the farmer should be allowed to receive nine-tenths of a fair price for his share of the market, the President vetoed it, because he said the farmers were not entitled to nine-tenths of a fair price.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As a matter of fact, while we reduced production below what consumption is, and therefore provided a market, the support price was only raised to 40 cents to offset the factor.

As a matter of fact we are paying out close to a dollar a bushel on every bushel that goes into a Government bin before we get rid of it. So they think it is all right that the farmer gets 40 cents so long as the dollar goes to somebody else.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman makes a wonderfully good point. I do not know exactly that it works out to 40 cents a bushel. The Secretary this morning appearing before the Committee on Agriculture said that we were subsidizing every bushel of wheat, but when you realize that we are paying out more than \$400 every minute on wheat storage I think the dollar figure is conservative.

Mr. WOLF. Did the Secretary discuss this morning why grain was moving into Government storage instead of into private storage?

Mr. POAGE. No, that was not discussed.

Mr. WOLF. Cost figures have been arrived at of 17 cents a bushel in private storage as against 3 or 4 in Government storage.

Mr. POAGE. When it comes to the question of what the storage is costing I recall that representatives of the Department of Agriculture in discussing the matter with the committee last year, appeared to know remarkably little. The head of the Grain Division testified in answer to questions that I propounded that he had not the slightest idea what it cost to build storage for a bushel of wheat.

I think the members of the committee will remember that in response to my question as to what it cost to build, to provide a bushel of storage, he said he had not the slightest idea, that we would have to consult the grain trade to determine that, yet he is paying a billion dollars a year for storage and does not have any idea, according to his own testimony, what that storage costs and for information would send us to the grain trade.

In view of that testimony I think we will get very little help from the Department in determining what is a reasonable charge for storage. In this matter of storage the fact remains that if we are going to be entitled to the confidence of the American people, we must do something about this awful accumulation of surpluses.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Under the bill which the gentleman has introduced would the surplus be reduced?

Mr. POAGE. I think I can explain to the gentleman how it must be reduced. The bill about which we are talking provides that in adopting any program that program must be worked out so that the Secretary and the representatives of the producers, their committeemen—

Mr. GEORGE. Under any of those programs could more be added to the surplus in storage?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will let me go one step further I think he will be able to follow me.

We provide as one of the guidelines that under no circumstances can the program for any commodity provide for the acquisition of any of the commodity by the Government. That means you cannot have a Government-purchase program; you cannot have a recourse loan program, so the Government cannot get any of this commodity.

It leaves you in this position—the Florida orangegrowers, the California orangegrowers use marketing agreements today, but they do not put anything in Government storage. This says that the only tool, the only tool that we deny you the right to use is the tool of putting the commodity in the warehouse as the Government's property and on which the Government has to pay storage.

Mr. WOLF. The reverse is actually in effect that we are moving grains out of storage in our feeding program; we are actually reducing the grain in storage.

Mr. GEORGE. If this bill is enacted you certainly would get rid of the surplus.

Mr. POAGE. That would depend upon the rate at which we remove the surplus from existing storage.

There are two provisions in this bill which will assure a drawdown of existing surpluses. The first is that in determining balance between supply and demand the Secretary is required to make a finding that the program adopted will result in the production of no more than the amount of the commodity that is needed to meet current demands and exports, and a normal carryover, less a deduction of 10 percent. There is no place to get that deduction of 10 percent except out of existing surpluses. That does not guarantee that you will eliminate your surpluses in less than 10 years. That is too slow.

The bill provides further in another section for a retirement of land from cultivation and a payment in kind from the surplus stocks to the farmers. I am skipping through the bill somewhat, but you will understand it if I point out that rather than continuing the present fantastically expensive soil bank.

Mr. WOLF. That is the soil bank?

Mr. POAGE. That is the soil bank; and, without speaking for anybody but myself, I feel it was used in 1956 to influence votes and I think it will be used again in 1960 to influence votes if it is in existence this fall. Instead of continuing that kind of program we provide that the payments the farmer can get will be of CCC storage. The farmer must put first 10 percent of his cultivated land into retirement, comparable to the soil bank,

with no payment whatever. That is his contribution. That is the cover charge that he pays to do business here. Of course, it will be his less productive 10 percent; everybody knows that. Everyone knows that the 6 or 7 percent we have in the soil bank today is basically—not every acre but basically—the less productive acres. So we just say that stuff is not worth much; you put it in and you get nothing for it; then, if you want to put in an additional 30 percent, which will mean up to 40 percent of your tilled acres, you will get, if you are growing feed grains, cotton, or one of these commodities that are in surplus and you are participating in the program and complying—for each acre that you put in, two-thirds of your normal production on that acre. In other words, if you have normally been producing 30 bushels, you will get 20 bushels out of the Government storage, the Commodity Credit stocks. I anticipate that that will account for a very rapid reduction of existing stocks. I was reared on a farm; I am still interested in farming, and I never did know where I could net two-thirds of my normal gross yield, where I could get that much net in my granary. That looks like an awfully good deal to me, and I would rather take it than to gamble on growing excessive crops. I think most farmers would feel the same way.

Mr. GEORGE. In connection with the remarks you just made, does the gentleman know of any method available to the administration that has not been used for political purposes?

Mr. POAGE. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE. Any method available to the present administration that has not been used for political purposes?

Mr. POAGE. Well, I stand on my statement. I think the soil bank was used for political purposes in 1956, and I think if money is available in 1960 we will see a repetition of the same unfortunate thing.

Mr. GEORGE. It might be correctly named a voting bank.

Mr. POAGE. I think so.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas on his general moderation. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question. He knows, of course, that I represent a district which produces a lot of cotton and I am interested in what the cotton allotment might be if the gentleman's bill is enacted into law.

Mr. POAGE. I think the cotton allotment—and you understand this can be nothing more than a rather rough guess—2 weeks from now I might want to tell the gentleman from Arizona I was wrong. But I think the cotton allotment would be and should be made in bales rather than in acres. Personally I would hope it would be made in bales, although under the terms of this bill the cotton producers could use a program based on acres or they could use a program based on pounds. I would hope they would use the latter, but

they might not. If based on acres I would assume it would be somewhere in the order of 14 million acres, which is a very rough guess.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That would be somewhat more than the present allotment?

Mr. POAGE. No, that would be less than the present allotment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is the bill just so broad that the growers themselves can decide whether they desire to have their allotment measured by the unit of production or the unit of land?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, it is. It is so broad that they can determine whether they will use acres or units of production.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And this applies to every commodity?

Mr. POAGE. Every commodity.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Not only to the 6 basics?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And it is a marketing order approach to the whole thing?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. At least it could be. It is not mandatory.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does the grower go about adopting this plan? Does somebody submit a plan for an election?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. And, I know that I can get very thoroughly confused in the details of the program, but basically it is this: If the Secretary estimates that there will be a surplus in any crop that materially affects the interstate commerce of the Nation—obviously I doubt that caraway seeds would qualify—but if it is vital to the commerce of the Nation, is about the words that are used, and if the Secretary estimates that there will be a surplus in any year, it becomes his duty to call for the selection of farmer committees, which start down at the precincts and are built up until you get a national advisory committee going all the way from the precincts up through the States up to the national advisory position, and they advise the Secretary. Of course, we recognize they will not go down into his office in the north building, but they will meet with some of the technical people of the Department and they will work out with the Secretary a program to be submitted. The Secretary is required to certify, when the program is finally submitted, that the program must provide for a balancing of production and demand with this 10 percent taken out which I have mentioned, which would be used to reduce your surpluses. That is the way you originate your program. The Secretary first has to make a finding that there is going to be a surplus. When he does that, he has to institute the farmer advisory committees, and then the farmer advisory committees advise with him, and the Secretary and the farmers work out the program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Now, do I understand correctly that the Secretary then must accept the plan if it meets that one test, the test being that it will reduce the surplus?

Mr. POAGE. That is not quite the only test. There are certain other tests; especially there is this important test

that I think should be called to the attention, particularly to the attention of the gentleman from Arizona, because he is going to be vitally affected as to short staple cotton—I do not think that it will affect his long staple cotton but there is the limitation as to the amount that can be expended on any one program.

Presently we are spending, the Secretary said this morning, \$550 million a year on the wheat program. This bill limits the expenditure on any commodity to 5 percent of the estimated value of the crop. The Secretary, again, makes the estimate as to what the value of the crop will be. Five percent is a tremendous reduction under the expenditures that we are making today. You might say on wheat it means possibly not more than 20 percent of the amount of money that we are now spending. On cotton, again, a very rough guess, maybe 25 to 30 percent of what we are now spending. On corn and feed grains it will be a somewhat larger percentage than that, maybe 40 or 50 percent of what we are spending. Those are very rough guesses, and please do not anybody hold me to the exact figure. I am just giving them as nearly as I can. But, it will require a considerable reduction in the amount of money that we are spending on the very commodities the gentleman is interested in and the very commodities the gentleman from Texas is interested in. But, if we have a program that honestly balances supply and demand and although I have questioned the business judgment of the Secretary, I do not question his honesty—I think that the Secretary, and I think that any other Secretary that I have ever known, will give us an honest estimate as to that amount, and that we can expect to achieve this balance. I think that with an actual balance between supply and demand that this 5 percent is going to take care of any program and will enable us to bring these farmers up to a fair price for their products which, incidentally, under the terms of this bill, is parity.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman for his presentation and for yielding to me as he has. One other question: The gentleman made the remark that there had been no losses in the commodity credit program, the price support program prior to, I think it was 1952.

Mr. POAGE. January 1, 1953, there was a profit of \$13 million.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I recall, there was a rather considerable budget item for the storage of surplus commodities in the budget for the year 1952. I recall it so well because I kind of ran against it in my first campaign for Congress, which seems to indicate that there must have been quite a few products in surplus at that time. Would the gentleman say that possibly one reason why there had not been any losses is because the Commodity Credit Corporation had not sold any of the commodities and therefore they were carrying them at their book value; therefore, there had been no losses, there could be no losses until the commodities were actually sold.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think that is a valid observation for this reason, that at that time there were in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation only about \$2 billion worth of stocks. Presently the figure is \$9.5 billion, roughly. Obviously, there had not been anything like the accumulation of stocks at that time that there is now. I do want to be fair with the gentleman; I do not want to give a false impression.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is always fair; I appreciate it.

Mr. POAGE. And I want to be fair to myself and to the public, because I do not want it to go out that I have made an unfair statement here. I think the gentleman may have had in mind, perhaps thinking that I said that there was no loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation prior to January 1, 1953. Maybe my immediate statement led him to believe that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. That is not what I intended to say, and I do not think that is what I said awhile ago. There was no loss on the handling of the 6 basic commodities prior to January 1, 1953. There was a loss to Commodity Credit Corporation prior to that time of approximately \$1 billion. That was largely accounted for by the loss on potatoes, and a substantial loss on milk prior to that time. But there has been a net profit on the 6 basic commodities. Those were the commodities I was talking about. I wanted to make it clear that I would not say there had been no loss. There had been a loss, but it was not on the basic commodities which were at that time all rigidly supported at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to say at this point that the price of corn at this time—I happen to have been in the grain business in Iowa at this time—was around \$2 a bushel. This year, in the crop season, the farmers had difficulty getting over 60 cents a bushel for it out of the field. I remember that because I took quite a beating in the fall immediately after, because I had a lot of money tied up in corn.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas who has led this discussion here today as well as our distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

I represent one of the largest wheat-producing districts in the country. Wheat is the No. 1 problem of my district. Not only the wheat farmers, but small businessmen in the towns and villages of my district have a direct stake in any farm legislation passed by the Congress.

Thus far, I have not introduced this general farm bill. I have been working closely with a group composed of many farm and commodity organizations on specific wheat legislation. It is my hope that when this legislation is ready it can be used as a wheat section of this general farm legislation.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that one of our most pressing problems on the agricultural front relates to wheat. Wheat is constantly cited as a horrible example of the result of Government interference in agriculture.

The public is being told that the cost of the program is so great that all agricultural programs should be repealed and freedom restored to the farmer.

I am sure that Members of this House will not be hoodwinked by such propaganda. I am sure that all of us realize that a sudden and complete return to the so-called free market with no controls and all the surpluses now on hand would result in bankruptcy for thousands of farmers.

We also realize, I am sure, that we need to improve the present program, reduce its costs to the taxpayer, but, at the same time, protect the income of farmers.

That is what this wheat legislation now in preparation is aimed at accomplishing.

To the Members of this House who have devoted so much time and effort to writing this general farm legislation now under discussion, they deserve the thanks of all of us. They realize that we have a most serious problem. They are anxious to get on with the difficult task of passing legislation that will be in the public interest—that will be fair to the taxpayers and fair to the farmers.

I assure these distinguished Members who have recently introduced this general farm bill that I support their efforts.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas and Iowa for this opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. WOLF. We are happy to have the gentleman's support on this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman will yield to me to try to round up what we are talking about here and then let others ask questions.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. May I inquire of the gentleman if his question relates to the question just discussed, or could we wait until the gentleman from Texas rounds out the point.

Mr. MICHEL. I was not here the entire time when the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Texas were making their remarks, but the gentleman from Texas criticized the conservation reserve in some respects.

Mr. POAGE. I criticized the soil bank, although the acreage reserve was a good deal worse than the soil conservation.

Mr. MICHEL. Now we have no acreage reserve as such, it is the conservation reserve.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is aware that we have up to 28 million acres in the conservation reserve. How many more acres does the gentleman think we would retire under his program?

Mr. POAGE. I think we would probably get under this program between 70 and 80 million acres. I say it on this basis; if all the farmers enter into it,

and all of them will not, but if all of them went into it, 10 percent would be 38 million acres for the free contribution. Then the amount that the farmers will put in will, of course, greatly vary, particularly after the first year. I think the first year they will all enter it. After the first year, if they are getting a substantial price for their commodities, there will not be as much.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman said that today it is quite evident that the farmer does not put his best acreage into the reserve but his leanest.

Mr. POAGE. I think that is right.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman said that in his bill he would not tighten up that provision at all. Does it not seem a little bit silly, if we recognize that this is being done and it is not right? If we are taking a step, why should we not take a full step, do the right thing, and say they have to be tillable acres?

Mr. POAGE. We do say tillable acres. We say that very definitely. Even under the present law, when anybody puts in anything other than tillable acres somebody violates the law. There has been merely laxity of administration when anything other than tillable acres has gone in under the present law. Certainly this bill clearly provides that they must be acres in cultivation that go into the reserve. But, in answer to the gentleman's implication that there is something morally wrong in putting in your least productive acres, I would defend even those who have put acres in under the present law. If they have complied with the law, I do not see anything wrong with their action if the Government allows that to be done. I do not happen to have an acre in the soil bank myself, but I cannot condemn the man who takes the best deal the Government offers.

Mr. MICHEL. But we are writing a law, and that is why I am bringing up this question as to the possibility of making the law too loose.

Mr. POAGE. And I am trying to show the gentleman why I think we should write this law differently. I want to say I see nothing wrong on the part of the farmer under the present law. If we offer to take in a barren hillside just because it has been plowed and planted in the past and pay for it, I do not see any fault with the morality of an individual who puts it in the soil bank because the Government offers him that opportunity. But the Government should not offer him that opportunity—I agree to that. Now the difference between the present program and what we propose is the Government is paying under the present program for putting that land in. Under this program, the Government is not going to be paying one thin dime for putting in that 10 percent. We are just requiring the farmer to take his least productive acres out of production in order to get the benefits of the new program. We are just going to wipe out the lowest producing land and get it out of the way and not pay anything for it.

Mr. MICHEL. Are you convinced that a great number of farmers are going to go for this?

Mr. POAGE. We do it on the basis that we have seen that 90 percent of the cotton farmers and often more voted just last December for these controls. I have forgotten what the tobacco vote was. I think it was even greater than that of the cottongrowers. When we have these votes and it has been repeatedly shown that the farmers vote overwhelmingly in favor of these programs, certainly I think they are going to go for it, because it is going to be the only way in which they are going to be able to get an adequate price. Remember, we provide that they cannot get the benefits of any of these programs unless they are putting in that 10 percent. I would certainly pay that price in order to get the assurance of price supports. I think most farmers will. To me, price is extremely important—much more important than it seems to be to Mr. Benson or to the Farm Bureau. I believe most farmers are vitally concerned about their prices.

Mr. WOLF. If the farmers are going to get two-thirds or three-fourths of his production out of storage bins, this will be much more efficient than trying to farm the entire 40 percent because of the costs involved.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know anybody who would debate that very much.

Mr. MICHEL. I fully appreciate that—that he would stand to benefit if he is going to get two-thirds of his production.

Mr. WOLF. Certainly.

Mr. POAGE. And if he stands to benefit, I think he is going to take advantage of it and if he does, we are going to have a great deal more land out under the terms of this than we have under the existing soil bank—a great deal more. I am inclined to believe that in order to make the soil bank plan effective and in order to make any land retirement program effective, you have got to take out at least up to the critical point—I cannot tell you where the critical point is. On a thermometer I can tell you where it is. It is 32°. You can freeze water at 32° F., but I do not know where that point is with respect to this problem. But I know that if I am going to produce ice and I reduce the temperature of some water that is now at 90° temperature and I reduce it down to 35°, I still do not have any ice. But if I reduce it another 5°, I will have passed the critical point. I will have ice. I think the same general idea applies in connection with this. If you take out just a little land, then you do not have any appreciable effect on the markets. You will reach, however, a point where it is going to be quite effective. I cannot tell you just where that point is. Mr. Benson cannot tell you, and neither can anybody else tell you. We can all guess at it. My guess is 75 million or 80 million acres. His guess is lower. I do not know where it is either and neither does anybody else. But, we do know that this program is going to get more acres out of production than the present program. We are sure of that, and we are going to get it at much less expense to the U.S. Government. We are sure of that. In

fact, we are not spending money getting it, but we are going to spend surplus commodities in getting it. It seems to me, those factors would recommend the program if nothing else.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman has talked about how much the cotton farmer and the tobacco farmer is in favor of regimented and controlled acreage. Would he apply the same yardstick to the farmers in my grain belt of Illinois, for instances, and the corn producers, and the soybean producers?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to that point, may I say it is my understanding that the State Farm Bureau passed a resolution recognizing the need of regimentation to solve this problem. I do not know the exact wording of that resolution, but they have recognized this need. Two of the leading farm organizations in the State of Illinois recognized that need.

Mr. MICHEL. I think that is partially true. We recognize that if we are going to have a program, everybody has to participate or we will not have a program. This idea of having a referendum and having it go one way and then in the end not participating in the program, I do not think is very sound.

One further question. The gentleman said he would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the total value of the crop, and then he talks about a 5-percent figure. Regardless of who the Secretary of Agriculture may be, would the gentleman take the Secretary's word that his figure is sound, and arrive at any judgment that the gentleman was to arrive at?

Mr. POAGE. I believe before the gentleman came in that I said I had never known a Secretary of Agriculture who I thought was dishonest and who would give us anything but the actual figure as best could be arrived at from statistics before him. I know of no better way to get it. I do not know anybody who is in a better position to make that estimate than the Secretary of Agriculture. That is why we named him. Certainly we will accept the present Secretary or any other Secretary.

Mr. MICHEL. But would he be open to criticism?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. He will be open to criticism just exactly as the present Secretary has been criticized when he estimates the number of acres to be allotted to a given crop. I have never known a Secretary who did not get criticized on that point. If a man is unwilling to accept criticism, he should not become Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WOLF. I promised to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

There seems to be widespread opinion that the existence of the 15-acre exemption in the present wheat program has contributed greatly to the present surplus. I was interested in having the comment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on this point, and what his proposed legislation would do about it.

Mr. POAGE. This proposed legislation is not specifically a wheat bill, although it makes provision that the

wheatgrowers, like the grower of any other commodity, can establish a program and work through their committees and the Secretary of Agriculture. They could put a 15-acre exemption or a 100-acre exemption or 200 acres. They do not have to put any if the wheatgrowers decided they did not want it. They do not have to put any exemption on it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have great respect for the judgment of the gentleman in this field, and I would be interested in his own views as to what could be done about the 15-acre exemption.

Mr. POAGE. I am like some of these gentlemen. I do not live in a wheat-producing area. At least it is not a major crop in my area, but I think the Secretary of Agriculture laid it on the line on the acreage question this morning, that if you are going to have controls you cannot offer 15 different doors around every room and keep everybody in.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Now, I am going to try to summarize what this bill does. The bill does not impose any program on anybody. It does not inaugurate any new programs. Incidentally, there is a specific provision in the bill that if farmers do not want new programs they can keep what we have. But I am not sure that the public will continue to pay for the present storage program whether we pass this bill or not, and if the farmers do not make changes in the next year or two, I imagine most of us would want to insist that they make changes. But this bill gives them an opportunity to promulgate programs, using any tools known, except the acquisition of commodities in the hands of the Government.

That is substantially the first title of the bill.

The second title of the bill simply provides larger authorization and more clear-cut authorization for the use of Government funds to provide food for needy people. Its title is "Protein Foods," I believe, because there is a formula there that relates protein foods to carbohydrates and, therefore, we are hoping that it would enable the Government to use a larger percentage of protein foods in the various relief and social activities of the Government than we are presently using.

Mr. WOLF. And the recipient goes into the marketplace to buy these commodities.

Mr. POAGE. Possibly, although that is not essential under the terms of this bill. The bill does specifically provide for the use of food stamp programs if they are adopted; it does not require their use. It does authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to go into the market and buy the commodities he proposes to use rather than necessarily to draw them out of the stocks of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As we see it, that achieves these desirable things: It eliminates a considerable expense in handling. There is unnecessary expense in handling at present, because if we are going to distribute wheat flour in West Virginia it

means that we have got to send it from Kansas City or down in Galveston or some other place where we have wheat in storage and ship the identical wheat to West Virginia. The Commodity Credit Corporation goes to the mill and asks them to ship the wheat. It becomes a cumbersome and expensive program. This bill simply provides that if you go to the market and buy the flour as close as possible to where it is going to be consumed, in the long run it is better business for the Government to do that, and it has exactly the same effect of reducing surpluses, because no more flour is involved either way. We think it is a good sound provision both from the standpoint of agriculture and the standpoint of those who are primarily interested from the welfare or social angle.

I would like to sum this whole thing up for you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would be good enough to explain so a city fellow like myself can comprehend, a person who does not quite understand the effect of this bill, what the gentleman is proposing. Would this limit cash payments to those who subscribe to the program?

Mr. POAGE. No; and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the present law does not provide for the making of any cash payments to farmers. This bill would allow direct cash payments to farmers instead of loans allowed under present practice.

There are no direct producers' subsidies at present in the basic commodities. We do make direct payments to the producers of wool and sugar. They are exempt here. Tobacco is also exempt because it is considered to have a good program now, a satisfactory program. The Secretary seems to think it is and the people seem to think it is.

Then we exempt here wool, sugar beets and sugarcane. Wool, sugar beets, and sugarcane all receive direct producers' subsidies at the present time, and they are the only three commodities in the United States that receive them at the present time.

Mr. WOLF. What percentage of parity?

Mr. POAGE. Wool receives 106 percent of parity. Sugar beets and sugarcane receive 98 percent of parity—direct payments. I am not criticizing that. While we do not think the consumer is being mulcted by this program, we think the producer is getting a little better break. Unfortunately but a relatively small area is dependent upon wool, sugar beets, and sugarcane.

I want to make it clear that to me the gentleman's question indicated that we were giving direct subsidies to cotton, wheat, and feed grain producers. We are not. We are presently buying those commodities or making recourse loans and the commodity later is turned over to the Government. We are presently acquiring title to those commodities, placing them in warehouses and paying stor-

age on the commodities, then shipping them abroad and paying a direct subsidy to foreign purchasers, but none to American producers.

The effect of that is that it maintains the price on what you buy; it lowers the price on what the man in Spain, or Japan, or Germany buys; and the U.S. Government subsidizes him, but it does not subsidize the American consumer or producer.

This bill would allow us to make, within the limitations I have mentioned here, would allow us to use the direct-payment method if that was the thing that was desired by the growers. The direct-payment method would mean, as it has meant in the case of wool, that you as a city consumer would be able to buy your commodity at least at the world price, not at a price that is artificially higher but at a world price and that the difference, if there be a difference, and we assume there would be, will be made up in a direct subsidy not to exceed the 5 percent I talked about which is, in fact, only about 20 percent of what we are spending right now.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Iowa in this summation they are now presenting would be good enough to answer the question as to what this means to the consumer, the housewife in my district? Up to this time we have been discussing what this would mean to the farmer. But what does this legislation you are proposing mean to the housewife in my district? I would appreciate an explanation of that.

Mr. WOLF. I think part of the point was lost in the last question and the subsequent discussion. The farmer will receive payment in kind, which means he will get corn, wheat, and so forth out of storage for his part of the program so far as the commodity is available on a local basis. If this is not available, then he will receive cash. The product will seek its price in the marketplace on the so-called supply-and-demand theory. As the gentleman from Texas said, the difference between the price of the commodity in the marketplace and what would be a fair price to the farmer for producing that commodity under our existing circumstances will be made up in direct payment from the Government.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from Iowa has very well answered the question. We can round that out by saying to whatever extent the cost of farm products influences the retail price of groceries, and I do not think they are influenced nearly as much as most city people are under the impression they are, that this bill would bring that retail price down.

Mr. WOLF. The price of wheat at the present time is about \$2.50 and a loaf of bread something like 20 cents.

Mr. POAGE. The price of wheat was \$2.80 a bushel when the price of bread was 13 cents for a pound loaf. The price of bread today is approximately 20 cents a loaf and the price of wheat about \$1.70. The price of wheat has gone down materially, the price of bread has gone up even more than the price of wheat has come down. While I cannot say that proves a law, certainly in that case we

ought to greatly increase the price of wheat to lower the price of bread.

I simply mean to say there is not the close relationship between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets which once existed, because the farmer does not get as large a share of the consumer dollar as he did 10 or 15 years ago. I think it was about 15 years ago, in the late forties, since the war, the figures were that the farmers were getting 53 cents out of every dollar that the consumers spent in the grocery store. Today the farmers are only getting about 37 cents out of each dollar that the consumer has been spending. Consequently you can see that the relationship is not as close as it once was. Of course, it varies with different commodities. Obviously the relationship between the price of cotton and the shirt is very remote whereas with bread it is a little closer and with meat it is still closer. It will vary with the commodity, but, taken as a whole, the producer is getting a little more than one-third of what the consumer is paying for the product. But to whatever extent that relationship exists, the present program tends to raise the cost of living. To whatever extent that relationship exists the direct-payment program would tend to lower the cost of living. I am not going to tell you it is going to bring about a 15- or 20-percent reduction in the cost of living. I think it will maybe result in a 2-, 3-, or 4-percent reduction. Certainly it will not be spectacular. But to whatever extent the relationship exists, the proposal tends to bring it down rather than up.

Mr. WOLF. I would suggest to the gentlemen from the cities that they should be concerned with the program for the needy that is involved in this program. A half billion dollars are in this program for that purpose.

Mr. POAGE. In title II?

Mr. WOLF. Yes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think there is another cost of living advantage in this program that the gentleman might wish to point out to our colleague from Illinois and other Members of the House who are concerned about the cost of living, and that is, it would very substantially reduce taxes and the cost of running the Department of Agriculture that we are now operating on a current budget in that Department of about \$7 billion. Seven years ago it cost \$1 billion to run the Department, when we had 4 million more people living on the land than we have today. If we can legislate a program here in the Congress that will substantially reduce the cost to the taxpayers, giving us a good farm program, this is going to be a saving to the people of Illinois, Texas, and all over the country.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman makes a very excellent point. I thought I had discussed the savings and the cost, but the gentleman clarified the fact that any of those savings are reflected in a reduction of taxes, and consequently tend to make savings for the consumers as well as everybody else.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am very grateful for the additional information by the gentleman from South Dakota. May I ask this further question? Have the proponents of this legislation made any estimate as to what the appropriation for the agricultural program might be and what percentage they might be lowered if this legislation is passed?

Mr. POAGE. I can only give you possibly two commodities—one of which, frankly, my people would like to see it otherwise—cotton and wheat. Those great commodities each bring in about \$2.5 billion a year. They vary, you understand. The Secretary testified this morning before the Committee on Agriculture that we were spending this year \$550 million on the wheat program. Under the terms of this bill we could not spend more than on the order of \$110 million to \$120 million at the outside because of the limitations that we have in this bill. That is a saving of over \$400 million on one commodity alone. Now, obviously I think the largest saving of all would be on wheat, but there certainly would be a very considerable saving on what we are spending for cotton, what we are spending for feed grains; there is not a large amount of rice and peanuts, but there would be a comparable saving involved compared with the size of the crops. So, it would certainly run into many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. WOLF. May I inquire if there are any other questions? Our time is running short, and I want to be sure everybody who has a question has an opportunity to ask it.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me and I appreciate the statement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is making today, and I regret I was called off the floor and did not have the opportunity to hear his entire remarks from the beginning. I am sure the gentleman would like to see the farmers free and to have the laws of supply and demand untampered with in the agricultural field. This, I am sure, is the wish of all of us. I, as a farmer, feel that way and know farmers generally feel likewise. However, I am sure the gentleman has pointed out the disaster that would befall the farmer by the very fact that practically every other segment of the economy is being supported by the Government in some form or other. We know that the laws of supply and demand were free to operate during the time of the great depression, and we know how the whole economy of the Nation suffered at that time. Now, I have often been told, and I am sure you have also, that if farmers cannot make it go on the farm under the laws of supply and demand, they ought to get off the farms and move to the cities and get jobs there. I wonder if the gentleman would want to comment on what would happen if this were to be the policy adopted by our Government.

Mr. POAGE. I think it would result something like this: The report of the committee from the land-grant colleges to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry just 2 weeks ago indicated that if we abandoned all of our agricultural programs and supports, within 5 years there would be a loss of 46 percent in the present net income of agriculture, which would bring us down to about \$7 billion. Of course, that would force a large number of families off the farm. Forced off the farm, there is not anywhere for them to go except to the cities. Forced into the cities, there is no way for them to make a living except to compete with existing labor in the cities, or to go on relief, where the Government would pay the grocery bill. I think it is a good deal cheaper, from the standpoint of the Government, to have a good, sound farm program that allows that farmer and his family to stay on the farm than it is to have him go to town and then have the Government pay his grocery bill.

We are faced with a choice of which we are going to do, because we are not going to say to 3 or 4 million farm families, "We are going to let you starve along the road."

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman would agree that merely driving the farmer off the farm and into the cities does not in itself cure the matter of overproduction of food, if there is such a thing in this country.

Mr. POAGE. I am delighted that the gentleman raised that point, because I think it goes to the heart of the misunderstanding. It goes to the heart of our deep-seated differences. Certainly there are people who honestly, sincerely believe that if we will but lower farm income, lower prices to the point where you will drive the farmers off—and ultimately you would—the first reaction, of course, would be just the reverse. Because, when you announce that you are going to have lower prices, farmers always try to make up in increased volume what they see they are going to lose in price. That is the only way they have of protecting their living standards. They are going to try to grow more. We grow the biggest cotton crop this Nation ever knew when we had 52-percent parity supports for cotton. The reason was that the farmers knew that they had to grow 20 bales where they had grown 10 bales if they were going to maintain their living standards. Sooner or later that kind of disastrously low price will, of course, drive many of those farmers into town.

But the farmer does not take the land with him when he goes to town. He takes the wife and children, and maybe the dog, but he does not take the land. Remember that, those who believe in the administration-Benson program. Remember that you cannot take that land to town. It is still going to be in production, but it is going to fall into stronger hands. What happens is that the less-efficient farmer is driven off first. He may be less efficient because

he is sick; he may be less efficient because he did not have a good education; he may be less efficient because he did not have the needed financing; he may be less efficient because he ran into a drought. There are many things that would make him one of the less efficient. But, whatever it was, his production was not achieved as cheaply as somebody else's. The man who is able to produce the most for the least money is going to stay there longer than anybody else. He is going to be the man who is going to be farming that land after your so-called inefficient farmer has moved to town, and, instead of getting a reduction, you are certainly going to get a net increase in production when you turn that land over to strong hands.

Mr. LEVERING. I think the gentleman made the point very clear and touched upon a fact which we have to recognize in this area; of course, we all want to get the Government out of agriculture. I hope that desired day will come at an early date.

Mr. POAGE. We all agree with that. Mr. LEVERING. Is not the crux of this whole problem and the very basis of it found in the fact that the farmer lacks economic bargaining power as compared to those with whom he deals, both those to whom he sells and those from whom he buys?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman has stated it very soundly and succinctly. Of course, this bill attempts to give him some bargaining power. It attempts to do for him what we have done for the oil industry, what we have done for a great many segments of our economy.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a word with regard to this matter of the Government getting into business. The Government has never been in the corn business as much as it has been under the Benson corn program. We have gotten the Government further and further into business more than we had before because we are producing more and more corn which is eligible for nonrecourse loans. As a matter of fact, we have more instead of less government under this kind of approach; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I think that is exactly correct. As one who does not live in the commercial corn area, I can see it only at a distance, but maybe more clearly. It was perfectly plain to everybody in the United States that if we intended to have any control we could not reward a man for breaking the program. When the Secretary deliberately stated he would support the price of the noncompliance corn and support the price of the man who flouted acreage allotments and let him do nearly as well as the man who complied, it was perfectly obvious the Secretary did not carry out the guidelines the President has now laid down, because the President said, "If you are going to have these supports you are going to have to have some controls." But the Secretary said, "I am going to give this to you regardless of whether you comply or not. Those who

are out to destroy the program are entitled to go ahead as well as those who try to support the program."

Mr. MICHEL. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if his bill here is not in effect quite a radical departure from the present law?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it is a distinct departure from the present law. I think the present program is unsound. I think the present program is broken down. I think we need to build a new program. Here we are trying to build it on a firm foundation.

Mr. MICHEL. Is the gentleman in a sense not criticizing pretty much his own program?

Mr. POAGE. No; this is not our program.

Mr. MICHEL. You wrote the program.

Mr. POAGE. This program is the program that was asked for by this administration. On the 1st of January, 1953 we had what Mr. Benson delighted to call high rigid supports. We were supporting the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. He came in and said, "We need flexibility. Oh, give us flexibility." He finally beat us over the head until he got flexibility down to 75 percent. Farm prices went down and he got more and more flexibility. Every time he got more flexibility the price to the farmers went down and the amount in storage went up. This is his program, it is not ours.

Mr. WOLF. I should like to agree with the gentleman from Texas and say most wholeheartedly this is true. I do not think we have time to discuss in detail the differences.

Mr. LEVERING. In line with the statement of the gentleman from Texas, it is no small concern to me that for years Secretary of Agriculture Benson and his staff continually stated that the welfare of the American farmer was steadily improving and that he never had it so good prior to the Benson regime.

Despite the gradual deterioration of the farmer's position in our economy and despite the fact that the Secretary and other spokesmen for the administration are being forced by the ugly facts of the farmer's plight to admit that all is not well with our farmers throughout the land, they are now blaming all of the ills in agriculture upon the Democratic Congress, indicating that the administrations hands have been tied. This is most interesting, particularly in view of the record which reveals such statements as that made by Mr. Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, on February 27, 1957, at the National Association of Wheat Growers annual convention. At that time Mr. McLain stated:

And finally it is a real pleasure to be able to report that things are looking better. There are definite signs that adverse threats have been reversed and that the agriculture economy is on the upgrade after a long period of decline. We now have the tools—the programs and legislative authority—to seek continued advancement in sound and constructive ways. The principle of flexible price supports has been established.

Then consider what Secretary Benson said on September 11, 1956, at the Chi-

cago Grain & Feed Dealers National Association annual meeting:

We had to develop a sound and sensible price support program—while holding off the onslaught of those who believed the solution of our farm problems is to be found in the Federal Treasury. We won the battle for flexible supports in 1954 and we successfully defended them in 1956.

But, Mr. Speaker, it will avail us nothing to merely castigate Mr. Benson's policies. To criticize a program without offering a constructive alternative is taking a negative approach. I want to say that H.R. 10362 which I along with several of our colleagues recently dropped in the hopper and which is almost if not identical with the bill which the gentleman from Texas is discussing today does furnish a positive, realistic, and refreshingly different approach to the situation which plagues our farmers and the country.

Mr. Speaker, all agree American agriculture is in serious trouble. This endangers the whole of America. Despite the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has spent more in 6½ years than all his predecessors combined since 1852, we now have the worst farm situation in history. The official record shows that since 1953 farm purchasing power is down 33 percent. During the same period farm surpluses have gone up 400 percent and the Agriculture Department budget has gone up 700 percent. Believe it or not, during this farm economy decline, interest charges have risen 2,000 percent, and perhaps the most shocking fact of all is that consumer food prices instead of going down with farm income have actually gone up.

A healthy farm economy is basic to our Nation's economic well-being generally. Every major depression in our country has started on the farm. The importance of a prosperous agriculture to our overall economy is readily seen when we consider what happens to farm income. For the past 2 years it has been around \$35 billion. Farmers spend on an average of \$11 to \$12 billion of this amount to buy supplies before starting their operation. This includes gasoline, insecticides and machinery. The farmer is one of the greatest consumers of steel.

On top of this, the farmer spends another \$11 or \$12 billion on labor before his production gets under way, which means that he is left with a net of approximately \$12 billion.

Not only does the farming industry spend two-thirds of its entire income, but let us consider what happens to those things which it sets in motion. For instance, what happens to the raw food production, wool, and other fiber produced by farmers? According to the Department of Commerce, the items represented in the \$35 billion figure generate some \$100 billion worth of goods at the consumer level. This is roughly one-fourth of our entire national income.

From the foregoing, it is clear that what hurts the farmer hurts all of us. Now to the perplexing question. Why does the paradoxical situation exist in which the farmers are going broke producing the food and fiber which are costing the housewife more and more? Cer-

tainly it is not the farmer, for his man-hour productivity has shot up into outer space in recent years—far ahead of non-farm workers. The fact is, the more efficient he becomes, the more he hurts economically. It occurs to me that we have for many years taken the wrong attitude toward agriculture. Instead of concentrating our energies and taxpayers' money on attempts to cut back production which have been a colossal failure, we should be developing a better system of distribution of our abundance. Who can say our problem is one of over-production when we know that all the products of the farm can be sold at a price? Why should we regard abundance as a curse and not a blessing when more than one-half of the world goes to bed hungry every night, when some 6 million families in our own country do not have a balanced diet?

The truth is, agriculture and the consumer public have both suffered. As we agreed earlier the farmers simply do not possess the economic bargaining power of those with whom they must deal.

Farmers, though disappearing from the American scene by the millions are still a formidable crowd compared to the few processors or handlers who buy their products. The important difference is that those who buy farm products possess greater bargaining power—and this power is growing day by day. According to chainstore spokesmen, within 10 years 75 percent of the food business will be in the hands of five or six huge chains. Farmers have always been at the mercy of the marketplace since they are the only major producer of goods who do not put a price tag on the things they sell. So, we find organized buyers buying what they want at their own prices from unorganized farmers. But strangely enough, consumers have not been the beneficiaries of this system. Then, too, those to whom farmers sell are not only the ones who are possessed of great economic bargaining power. In addition, those who sell to farmers—the implement people, the chemical, fuel and power producers, are also well organized and this is why there has been no decline in their prices even though farmers' income fell 25 percent in the first half of the last decade.

I firmly believe that the answer to the farm problem lies within the farmers themselves through voluntary organization of their own, but economists in and out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture point out the desperation that would befall the farming business if Government were to completely abandon the farmers and cast them adrift alone in the economic stream prior to the time farmers develop a program for their own protection. This is true because in a very real sense as I pointed out earlier, we are living in a subsidized society with practically every segment of our economy being supported by the Government in one form or another. The railroads, the airlines, oil companies, and hundreds of others have been and still are subsidized by Uncle Sam. Tariffs, a form of subsidy, date back to our early history and it is interesting to note that from 1932 to 1952 subsidies paid to farms in this country amounted to \$1.2 billion

as compared to \$40.8 billion in subsidies to manufacturers in the way of tariffs. Early in 1958 a House subcommittee reported that actual losses on price supports to farmers were \$5 billion from the time the program started through November 1957, but that mail subsidies in a recent 10-year period amounted to almost \$6 billion. As long as this situation obtains can we in fairness to our farmers and our country force the farmers to buy in a protected market and to sell in an unprotected market? In other words, can the farm problem be solved simply by insisting that farmers try to make a free market work in the farming business when there isn't such a thing as a free market outside of farming?

When we consider that processing, packaging, and delivering food to consumers are the only prosperous segments of the food industry, it is time to recognize that the farmer who produces it had better participate in these operations if he wants to survive without Government assistance, and I am convinced beyond all doubt that Government help is the last thing the American farmer desires. I have an abiding belief that farmers can enjoy security with other segments of our society without Government supports and controls if they can but lay hold of marketing machinery. This can be done and when it happens, the Government can get out of agriculture and at the same time the consumer will get the greatest break of several years, for the reason that Federal controls keyed to scarcity can be replaced by realistic programs of pricing, marketing, and distribution.

Is there any reason why farming should be regarded as different from any other industry which has at least four major component parts—namely raw materials, production, finances, and marketing? Is there any reason why farmers could not own processing plants in the same way that steel companies own coal and ore mines?

I am sure that many of my colleagues believe farm-owned cooperatives can be the farmers' salvation. Is this not one way by which they can participate in the prosperous segments of the food business at no cost to the Government? Because great amounts of capital will be required in the development of these cooperatives, the Government through the farm credit system could lend assistance to farmers in the formation of cooperative enterprises. It is not suggested that cooperatives control an entire industry, but if they participated to the extent of 10 percent of the food industry for instance, they would provide a yardstick for the entire market. Rural electrification cooperatives have proved this point.

We know of course that all this would take time, Mr. Speaker. In the interim period while farmers are firming up a system of self-help, I recommend that we greatly accelerate our research program to find new uses for farm products. Further, we should switch our thinking which creates the impression of feeling sorry for our ability to produce to that of being thankful we have this great asset; then go to work to perfect a more

efficient marketing system for our agriculture output at home and abroad.

This should not be an impossible undertaking inasmuch as our production is little more than what is now consumed—without even considering the exploding population which is fast crowding in upon us.

When all is said and done, our farm productivity is our greatest asset in the battle for world peace and we ought to make the most of it. The Russians boast of the fact that they are ahead of us in the missile field, but try as they have for a quarter of a century, they have not come even close to competing with American farmers in the production of food and fiber. What a tremendous advantage our enemies would gain in the battle for men's minds around the world if they could outproduce us in this vital area. The outcome of the current struggle for survival between the Communist bloc and those countries which embrace freedom, may well depend on which side can feed a hungry world in the critical days to come.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that the bill which we are discussing here today, though we do not claim it is perfect in all respects, in my judgment, warrants the serious consideration of every Member of the House. I trust that the Secretary of Agriculture will study it in a spirit of cooperation as he today in our committee pledged he would do. I think it offers sensible answers to the problems with which we are confronted today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I should like to mention two or three points. One is in regard to the point made by the gentleman from Illinois. I should like to mention this, too, that there was a shortage of meat in this country. What has happened for 100 years? You would have first a surplus, then a shortage. One of the great things that would happen under this bill is that it would do to other commodities what marketing orders have done to citrus fruits. This would level out supply so you would always have an abundance, have a supply at a stable price. You would stabilize prices, so that the person on salary would be able to anticipate in the future that his food costs would be more reasonable than at present.

Another thing is, we can talk about the total costs, and all that, but we can be sure of this: The total maximum cost under this bill would be less than we are spending for storage alone today. It is just like all these other things on which we are spending, the total maximum cost would be less than under the present program.

Mr. WOLF. And it would be less each year as the program continued.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There has been some misunderstanding, I think, concerning the temporary aspect of this program. That is only one of the tools that can be used. The principal thing is permitting the farmers to have the help they need to form a big co-op for each commodity, so that they can regulate their production and marketing. Therefore, they would be getting in the market their fair price. The things like

the export price, and so forth, are incidental, and not to be compared to the principal benefit.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GEORGE. If the gentleman will yield, would these agreements be based on bushels or acres?

Mr. WOLF. It can be either way. This is the option that the farmer has for himself. Two-thirds of those voting in the affirmative would change the program, as I understand it.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. I think the gentleman agrees that the farmers need better public relations. Many of our people are unaware of the fact that there are many other programs of the Government assisting business and every other segment of the economy. I wonder if the gentleman would like to point out other areas assisted by the Government in one form or another.

Mr. WOLF. I do not have those facts and figures at hand at this moment. But, the gentleman's statement is good and I believe we should try to draw up some material together and place it in the RECORD on this question. I shall ask unanimous consent to place such material in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks following the statement made by the vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] made the point that, and particularly with reference to citrus fruits, for instance, that this is going to bring about a Utopia and that there would be more orderly marketing and that there would not be any ups and downs. The gentleman certainly must be taking it for granted that weather conditions are going to be constant and that the law of supply will not be operating at all. What would happen, for instance, if the price of wheat got down to \$2.60?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] has kindly consented to give us a little bit more time and I want to thank the gentleman very much for his courtesy.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. Just to conclude my statement. If the price of wheat, for instance, should get to \$2.50 or \$2.60, what is going to preclude Canada from shipping some wheat into the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is a specific provision here that the quotas must be adequate to meet the needs of supply and demand. In other words, you cannot regulate the supply now after the surplus is gone to where you are going to get that kind of price. You just cannot do it. But, under this bill, we provide right here that you will be protected against that kind of situation. This helps to stabilize the situation in comparison to what we have had in the past.

Mr. MICHEL. Then the gentleman does not think there will be any need for any kind of restriction on importing of Canadian wheat, for instance?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No more than we have at the present time. Certainly, I do not think you would say that citrus fruits are worse off under their marketing orders than they were before or that the housewife has a less stable supply of citrus fruits than she used to have before we had marketing orders. Certainly, she has a much more stable supply today and this would work even better.

Mr. MICHEL. If the housewife has a stable supply today, then why do we need to change it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. We are not changing it for citrus fruit at all. What we are doing is extending some of these things that have worked so well in the case of citrus fruits and other commodities and extending them to some other commodities.

Mr. MICHEL. Does the gentleman think the same rules would apply for sorghum grains as for citrus fruits?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Well, yes. You regulate your supply of feed grains that eventually goes into perishables such as pork and beef. If you have this supply available, you will not have a recurrence of what happened in 1948, and I am sure you know what that was when we had a shortage of corn which resulted in a shortage of pork in the following year to the point where the housewife was standing in line looking for pork that year and if there is anything the housewife does not like worse than high prices, it is not having anything to buy.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's replies.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Who is going to make the decisions on the quotas and who is going to make the decisions that the farmers are going to raise how much and where, and so on?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Secretary of Agriculture does this through the marketing service statistics that are available every year. Those are the guidelines set up. So he must follow those statistics.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That means that the control of our agricultural economy would rest in the Secretary of Agriculture here in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. WOLF. That is not true. In the first place, the farmers would have the opportunity to vote on the program and they will make the decision voluntarily and decide whether they want to vote for it or not.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. But it will be administered from Washington, D.C.?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No. If the gentleman assumes that, he would have to assume that the Secretary is going to make some kind of assumption that is not correct. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, we have never had a Secretary of Agriculture, even including the present one, who I would consider has made wrong assumptions and put out wrong figures. I do not agree with his policies but I would not say that the agricultural marketing service has ever made false statistics.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to suggest, if I may, the gentleman from West Virginia has time to speak on a very vital subject and I want to hear him myself. If we can ask the gentleman from Iowa to obtain some time himself, we can discuss this program more fully.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have introduced bills on this subject, as well as all others who may care to do so, may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the new farm bill that we have proposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the defense of the American family farmer, who today finds himself in the throes of an economic battle that has seen no parallel on this continent since the early 1930's.

I believe that I am speaking for every honest, hard working American farmer when I ask this great body of legislators to give fair and serious consideration to the plight and the problems of this man and his family.

In my best judgment I can conceive of no greater task to which we could dedicate a little of our time and a great deal of thinking in an effort to be of some real help to the producers of our food and fiber.

It is right and in the tradition of our democratic way of life and self-government that, as citizens of this great country, our farmers after futile attempts to solve their problem as individuals or collectively in cooperatives, associations, and so on, turn to the only organization, their Government, for help.

Because the American farmer is the last frontier of rugged individualism, because he and his family represents a backbone of independent business in this country, the Federal Government should have a vital interest in, not helping agriculture obtain an economic advantage over other segments of our economy, but rather lending the organization, the thinking, and the plan to raise the income of our farm people to a level on a par with or equal to that of the people in other areas of economic endeavor.

In the past 7 years we have witnessed a steady decline in this economic equality as indicated and charted by the parity index. In 1952 the parity index stood at 100 percent, while today the parity index is 77 percent.

Parity means "equality or buying power prices and income for farmers on a par with other groups in the economy." They have used this one work to convey

a complicated and involved formalization of a simple thought—equality.

The vagueness of this concept has made it and its farmer origin susceptible to attack from those who either through ignorance, lack of understanding or prejudice, seek to hold a misconceived position of economic advantage.

Parity equality for our farmers has been ridiculed, scoffed at, and maligned in recent years.

People have not taken the time to see the significance the relationship between the prices the farmer must pay for all items of production and living expenses, and the price he receives for his farm products, as expressed in the parity ratio published monthly in the Economic Indicators. The Indicator charts and index figures show a continually widening gap between the higher prices the farmers must pay and the lower prices they receive.

The reason for this is simple. I have heard it said and repeated it myself many times, "Farmers sell everything at wholesale, buy everything at retail, and pay the freight both ways." As businessmen, farmers have tried desperately to break away from the yoke of this cost-price squeeze, but the tradition of independence and rugged individualism has worked against all efforts to solve the basic economic problems of farming.

In my studied opinion, these basic problems stem from two factors, one, price and the other production.

According to the latest available figures, there are today in the neighborhood of 4.6 million farms. For the most part, all of the farm units sell their products independently and in competition with their neighbors. This practice has forced a competitive market in farm products, which have no equal today in any other market of essential products. Coupled with the fact that, unlike manufacturing production, farm production normally goes to market once a year. At harvest time we have the unusual situation that a year's crop, next year's food supply, is glutted onto the market by millions of independent producer-sellers during a relative short period of time. All these sellers deal directly with a very small number of buyers, who can invariably set their buying prices to suit themselves. In other words, the farmers have no bargaining power.

This then, sets in motion the second factor in the basic farm problem, as I see it, and that is production control. For the farmer, beaten in the marketplace on price, decides, as a reasonable businessman would, that to live with a lower price from his products he must become more efficient, but his costs, and increase his volume of production. This he has done, aided and abetted by the policies of lower prices and wide open production, espoused by the Department of Agriculture, as a result our American farmers have been thrust deeper into the depths of a disastrous economic whirlpool, which is spiraling its way to a total farm depression.

The theory of low prices on big volume may work for some retail stores, but when over 4 million farmers all try it at once, it just cannot and has not worked.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I believe in talking about a farm program, we must talk about controlling production either directly or indirectly. In my conversations with individual farmers, as well as farm groups, I have detected a notable strengthening of the realization by farmers that production control of one kind or another is the key to the solution of their problems.

If our farmers could produce just enough food supply to meet all this country's domestic and export needs in return for a fair price, they would gladly do it, but as I have pointed out, they cannot do it alone. They need a fair program to follow, they need resources to extend their day in the market, they need the leadership and help which can only and must come forth from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is to the advantage of every living American that we devise and pass a farm program designed to meet the two basic and gigantic factors which I have outlined, to meet these problems head on, boldly, and with imagination. I cannot subscribe to the policy of giving an economic advantage to the majority at the expense of the minority. I am sure that you could not subscribe to this reasoning either, yet this theory appears to pop up again and again from high sources in talk about food costs.

It has been said that higher prices paid to the farmers would only mean higher consumer prices for food in the grocery store and at meat counters. People have been led to believe that low farm prices mean low food prices. City folks, especially, cling to this thinking and have come to despise farm programs and farm subsidies, and why should they not? Their weekly paycheck is divided up for fixed contractual obligations, time payments for almost every modern appliance and the family budget is balanced with the remainder of the cash at the checkout counter of the food store. The remaining variable of any consequence to be found in American families budget is food and as a consequence of this we have become a hamburger-eating Nation. Add to this the repeated reports on the front pages of our newspapers of the 10th of a point increase in the consumers price index, due to the rise in food costs caused by an unseasonable freeze of oranges or a bug in the lettuce or seasonal increase in the price of meat and it is easy to understand the concern of the city people. Yet, it has been abundantly proven on the floor of the House, in the record of this body, in reports from Government agencies and private groups that an hour of man's labor today in the shops and the factories of this country can and does buy more nutritional life-giving food today than ever before.

Food expenditures, as a percentage of income, have gone down drastically since 1947. In that year 26.9 percent of disposable income went for food, while in 1959 the proportion of income used for food had fallen to 20.8 percent. While purchasing power for nonfarm workers is expected to reach a new high in 1960, the Department of Agriculture predicts that farm incomes will drop over a billion dollars before this year is over.

This will be a new low for farm income. Are we not condoning improved food-living standards at the expense of farmers alone?

I believe that by inaugurating a farm program to reverse this trend toward lower farm incomes, retail food prices would not need to and indeed should not rise in any corresponding fashion. The price a farmer receives for the raw materials of our finished food is a very small percentage of the retail cost of food and only one of many factors involved in processing, packaging, preserving, and shipping food to the retail outlets.

The farmers' share of the food dollar has continued to drop. At the close of 1959, it amounted to only 37 cents as compared with 47 cents of each food dollar in 1952 and over 50 cents in 1947.

It is abundantly apparent that the retail cost of food is determined by factors other than the mere price of the raw materials. I wish my colleagues from the big cities would tell their constituents these things.

For example, that the price of pork chops is not determined by the 12½ cents per pound farmers are paid for their hogs or the added 3 cents a pound in labor to butcher and process those hogs. No, the price of pork chops in the store is fixed by the price people will pay for beef. The retail price of food has very little relationship to the price a farmer is paid for his products. It is closer to the truth to say retail prices on food relate to the old business theory of "charge what the traffic will bear."

Another thing which needs to be cleared up in the minds of some people concerns so-called farm subsidies. Again, common fallacies associated with the stereotyped prosperous farmer waxing fat on Government doles, have been exposed for the fairy tales that they are. Dreamed up years ago and perpetuated by the slickback magazines and big city editors.

Members of this body have made intensive studies of the cost of the farm programs. The actual facts and figures have been very scholarly analyzed and compiled for the record. An outstanding factual breakdown of farm program costs was presented to this body last April by the gentleman from Minnesota [FRED MARSHALL]. His analysis of the 1959 budget expenditures for the stabilization of farm prices and income, presented a very revealing study of who actually benefits from the farm programs. Out of the total budget of \$7,341 million for agriculture, \$5,386 million was set out for the stabilization of farm prices and income. It was discovered that the farmer should be fairly and properly charged for only \$1,831 million, which represents only 34 percent in the budget for stabilization of farm prices and income. The balance of these funds were used for purposes directly benefitting others than farmers. The school lunch program, food distribution to the aged and needy, meat inspection, bartered materials in the supplemental defense stockpile, international wheat agreement, and financing of military housing in Europe with surplus farm products, are examples of expenditures charged to the farmers, but more realistically

chargeable to defense, foreign relations, public welfare, and so on. Other large expenditures under this general heading, which were received by others than farmers, covered export costs, purchase of storage facilities, net interest expense, administrative expenses, county office expenses, bank charges, storage, and handling and transportation charges for the year.

After studying this breakdown of expenditures it is more clearly understood that with actual Federal expenditures of \$5,126 million during the fiscal year of 1959 net farm income dropped to \$10.3 billion for the calendar year of 1959. This was \$5.8 billion under the net farm income for 1951, when the total Federal expenditures for agriculture was a mere \$834 million.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of nonsense cannot long be endured by the people of this country. For the past several months, a number of us, vitally concerned with the farm situation have devoted a great deal of time to compile the best of the current thinking for a fair, workable, farm program, which would have maximum effectiveness at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayers. Through this effort, a bill was drafted and jointly introduced in this House last week. I urge my colleagues to obtain a copy of H.R. 10359 and study it. The main provisions of this bill are:

First. Balancing supply and demand at fair prices: This vital part of the bill has two sections, dealing with marketing orders and price stabilization programs as alternative choices for farmers.

(a) Nationwide marketing orders would be authorized, expanding the present regional orders, many more commodities would be made eligible for this program—started in 1937—and more functions would be authorized under the orders—such as contracting on prices and terms of sale.

Commodity groups not choosing to get their bargaining power through this device would use the other major type of program:

(b) National commodity stabilization programs would be established by and for producer groups to maintain a fair price, defined at 100 percent of parity.

Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determined that the supply of any commodity—except tobacco, wool, or sugar—would exceed the estimated effective demand at a fair price in the next crop year, he would have to call for the election of a farm commodity program development committee. This would be composed of one producer—no processors or others—elected from each of the nine geographical regions. Every producer of \$500 worth or more of the commodity annually would get one secret vote.

This committee must then propose to the Secretary a stabilization program for its commodity, all within limits of the act, of course. After this, the Secretary would make an independent finding of the feasibility and legality of the proposal. If he approved, he would call a referendum among producers, with a two-thirds majority required.

If the proposal were defeated, the old program would remain in effect. If approved by producers, and if the proposal

called for an expenditure of more than \$20 million a year from the U.S. Treasury, it would be referred to Congress, which is given 90 days to reject it. If rejected by Congress, the old program would remain.

Thus, farmers could try to better their program, but would not lose the one they have by trying to do so.

In determining the annual national supply factor, the Secretary would add together domestic needs, foreign requirements and a safe reserve; then he would subtract 10 percent of the Government inventory of the commodity involved and an estimate of the amount of the commodity which might be paid "in kind" under provisions described later.

The Secretary is required to establish the necessary production or market supply adjustment procedures to assure a balance of supply and demand at a fair price. Other provisions of this part of the bill include:

Adjustment goals would have to be divided among States, counties, and individual producers.

All kinds of support methods would be used except for commodity loans or diversion purchases. Direct payments are specifically included as a method of support, but storage would be bypassed.

There would be a "family farm" limitation on the amount of support available to any one producer.

Interrelated commodities such as feed grains would have to be handled together.

CCC could sell its inventory into the market at not less than parity, rather than 5 percent above the current support level, as now.

Farmer-elected committees are strongly favored by the sponsors, although their use is left to separate legislation.

Second. Distribution of high protein foods is provided in two parts, as follows:

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could spend \$500 million to buy high protein foods such as dairy, poultry, and meat products for distribution to the needy, charitable institutions and school lunches.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture could spend an equivalent ratio in the form of feed grains.

Third. Soil-building base: The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 would be amended to expand the ACP program to encourage up to 40 percent of each farmer's tillable acreage into soil building, rather than soil-depleting crops. Tillable acres are defined as land devoted in the past 5 years to wheat, cotton, peanuts, corn, oats, barley, rye, soybeans, sorghum grain, flax, dry edible beans, potatoes, and rice.

This would be done in such a way as to allow the soil bank to stay dead. It expired last December 31, although contracts extend into this year.

This feature is not compulsory, but any farmer who wants to participate in one of the national commodity stabilization programs, described earlier, would have to take the following conservation steps:

(a) Contribute 10 percent of his tillable acreage, without receiving payment

or rental but being allowed regular ACP cost sharing on it.

(b) Designate up to 30 percent of his tillable land for Government rental, such acreage not to be grazed or cropped except when falling in a disaster area. Owners of this acreage must maintain it in timber or other good conservation cover, and the Secretary is required to issue and enforce regulations to assure fire, weed, and insect control on the idle acres.

Payment for this rental would be "in kind" at the rate of two-thirds the average normal yield per acre over the past 3 years. However, the bill provides that "if no such commodity is available locally in the inventory of CCC, payment shall be made in cash or negotiable certificate, at the option of the producer."

The proportion of land retireable is designed to preclude whole farms being idled.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about our Nation's missile and space programs, and the role of presidential leadership in national security.

Never before in the history of our great Nation have we faced a graver crisis.

It is fitting that at this moment following the birthday of the Savior of the Union, and immediately prior to the birthday of the Father of our Country, we pause to take stock of the nature of this crisis which our people confront. I have full confidence that the United States of America, as in past crises in our history, will rise to meet the challenge which threatens the very existence of humanity.

We are going through a strange period, a period marked by latent desire on the part of the American people to do everything within their power to meet the Soviet threat. In a sense the people are ahead of the leadership in their desire to move ahead with the job at hand. The people are waiting for the signal to move forward, they are yearning for the great voice of leadership which can come only from the President of the United States.

In recent weeks, some people have repeated the great question in the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

The American Presidency is the most powerful office in the free world. The President is the No. 1 educator of the Nation. He alone can point the goals toward peace and freedom. He alone can dispel the fog of confusion which arises from a babel of many conflicting voices.

He alone can lift the people up to the point where they can exert the maximum effort in achieving a common objective.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower is my President. He is President of all the American people. He alone has the potential as a mighty force to lead our great Nation. President Eisenhower has demonstrated that he can awaken in the hearts and minds of millions of people in foreign lands an emotional feeling toward the American dream and what it represents. In his travels President Eisenhower by his very presence in many other lands has rekindled the beacon of hope for untold millions.

The President announced yesterday that he would address the Nation next Sunday at 6:15 p.m. on the question of national security and his forthcoming trip to South America. I believe that his forthcoming trip will reveal the same warm reaction of people everywhere toward the President as the symbol of the American ideal. Yet, I trust that when he speaks Sunday on the issue of national security, President Eisenhower will reverse the attitude of complacency he has displayed and will sound in bold and fearless tones the clarion call of leadership. The American people, I repeat, yearn for that leadership. The people will respond if the President will only lead.

Thus, I hope that the President will close the book on the past and take the fresh approach of leadership in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, and all of our towering Chief Executives who grasped the full potentialities of that great office.

I would like to cite a few examples of the dreary past, not to criticize the President, but to express the sincere hope that he might turn his back on weak-kneed expressions, on timid and timorous attitudes, and unrealistic conclusions which fail to recognize that the American people will respond if they are only given the leadership.

After the Russian sputnik was fired, the President stated on October 9, 1957:

So far as the satellite itself is concerned, that does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota.

On June 18, 1958, the President stated:

With respect to the thrust * * * I do know that our plans, programs of development, are the kind that will put up any kind of missile or any kind of satellite that we believe will be necessary.

The President has never fully recognized, or expressed even to this day the serious lag in our development of large booster engines. Even the sensational Russian successes have not shaken the President's attitude of complacency on this point.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of February 16, including quotations from President Eisenhower since the launching of the Russian sputnik in 1957:

CATCHING UP

Tass, the Soviet news agency, announced the first intercontinental missile on August 26, 1957. The first Soviet sputnik took flight on October 4, 1957. On September

13, 1959, a Soviet rocket reached the moon. On January 20, 1960, the Soviet Union reported the successful test in the Pacific of a missile that went nearly 7,800 miles and struck within 1½ miles of its target.

Following are some of the comments of President Eisenhower during this progression:

"Let's take the earth satellite, as opposed to the missile, because they are related only indirectly in the physical sense, and in our case not at all. Never has it been considered as a race."—October 9, 1957.

"So far as the satellite itself is concerned, that does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota."—October 9, 1957.

"It is my conviction, supported by trusted scientific and military advisers, that, although the Soviets are quite likely ahead in some missile and special areas, and are obviously ahead of us in satellite development, as of today the overall military strength of the free world is distinctly greater than that of Communist countries."—November 7, 1957.

"At this moment the consensus of opinion is that we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic missile development."—January 9, 1958.

"With respect to the thrust * * * I do know that our plans, programs of development, are the kind that will put up any kind of missile or any kind of satellite that we believe will be necessary."—June 18, 1958.

"There has been no place that I can see where there has been any possibility of gaps occurring."—August 27, 1958.

"Today the so-called missile gap is being rapidly filled."—October 20, 1958.

"We are rapidly filling the gap that existed; and in some ways I think that our scientists have already achieved what we would call even more than equality, particularly in types and kinds, even if not in number."—October 21, 1958.

"The so-called missile gap of 6 years ago is speedily being filled."—October 22, 1958.

"Today America—and all the world—knows that in less than 4 years we are rapidly closing the missile gap that we inherited. And Sputniks have been matched by Explorers, Vanguards, and Pioneers."—October 31, 1958.

"It is absolutely fatuous and futile to try to balance, item by item, the progress of two great nations in their technology of defense. To disturb ourselves too much that we have not yet caught up with another great power and people with technical skill in a particular item, it seems to me to show a loss or a lack of a sense of balance."—January 14, 1959.

"We do not believe that there is a relative increase in their capacity."—February 4, 1959.

"Our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements."—January 7, 1960.

"I am always a little bit amazed about this business of catching up. What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate."—February 3, 1960.

"There are too many of these generals with all sorts of ideas. I cannot be particularly disturbed because everybody with a parochial viewpoint all over the place comes along and says that the bosses know nothing about it."—February 3, 1960.

"The biggest problem there is in the United States today is to make sure that her own people understand the basic issues that face us and form their own judgment."—February 11, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has repeatedly indicated that this coun-

try is not in a space race with Russia, despite categorical statements by many officials in key positions in his administration that we are indeed in a space race with Russia. Again, I do not bring this up to be critical of what is water over the dam, but merely to express the hope that starting on the eve of Washington's Birthday next Sunday the President will say yes, we are in a space race with Russia, we do face a grave crisis, and it will take every ounce of the heart and mind and muscle of the American people to meet that crisis.

At this point I have a special word for my friends on the Republican side. I am informed by a very reliable source close to Vice President Nixon himself that after the Vice President is nominated he will cut loose from the complacent approach of President Eisenhower, and will call on the American people for sacrifices to meet the crisis, and will call on the people to meet the great challenge of the space race with Russia. We have heard much talk of the missile gap and the muscle gap, and perhaps historians of the future will term the period between February and the Republican Convention as the Nixon gap—that period of weightlessness when the people complacently relax on their couches, with no guidance system, no control, and no propulsion.

But although we might hope that Vice President Nixon will assume this new role, as most certainly the Democratic presidential candidate will assume the role of leadership also, we must consider the serious and stark fact that this still leaves the Nation without the full potential of Presidential leadership during the critical months ahead.

For example, at his press conference on January 26, 1960, the President was asked by William McGaffin of the Chicago Daily News:

Mr. President, in view of the international prestige at stake, why are we not moving with a greater sense of urgency to catch up with Russia in the field of space exploration?

The President answered:

Just start at that again—how did you start it, how did you start that question?

Mr. MCGAFFIN. I said, in view of the international prestige at stake.

The PRESIDENT. Is it?

Mr. MCGAFFIN. Well, sir, do you not feel that it is?

The PRESIDENT. Not particularly; no.

Now let us examine this statement for a minute or two. In an address in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 13, 1960, the President's own science adviser in the White House, George B. Kistiakowsky, stated that America is engaged in a "scientific and technological contest with the Soviet Union which today involves our national prestige, and tomorrow, perhaps, our very survival."

On January 29, 1960, 3 days after the President made his comment about our international prestige not being at stake, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, appeared before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member. In his prepared statement to our committee, Dr. Glennan affirmed the fact that "our

competitor in this business is the Soviet Union." I asked Dr. Glennan this question:

I assume then, of course, that our international prestige is at stake in the space race?

Dr. Glennan answered:

Mr. HECHLER, I think our international prestige is at stake in every activity of this Nation.

On January 28, 1960, we had before our committee Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director, Space Flight Programs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I asked Dr. Silverstein:

You would agree that our international prestige is at stake, in relation to our progress in this whole area?

Dr. Silverstein's answer was:

I certainly would concur heartily in that statement.

In testimony before our committee on January 20, Under Secretary of State Livingston Merchant indicated:

There is no question but that by its achievements and exploits in the field of outer space, the Soviet Union has enhanced its prestige.

This morning, Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, former commander of the Army Ordnance Missile Command, made a provocative statement before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the entire text of which I include in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. J. B. MEDARIS, RETIRED, HOUSE SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1960

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is once again an honor to speak to you. Because my time before this committee is limited, I have selected two particular subjects to which my remarks will be addressed. The first is general, and has to do with my views with respect to our national missile and space effort. The second subject which I will consider is specific, and deals with my opinion as to the urgency of our requirement for an operational anti-ballistic-missile system. Incidentally, it is both unusual and fortunate that this divided effort finds unity within the responsibilities of this committee.

In assessing the U.S. missile and space program, I believe we must first consider the character of the gross United States-Soviet competition. Fundamentally, it is a clash between different philosophies as to the position of the individual in society. The field of conflict is so broad, so profound, that it encompasses every element of international power—military, economic, diplomatic, political, psychological, and spiritual. Clausewitz observed that in human conflict the moral is to the physical as three is to one. Our strength must therefore be at least three parts psychological.

Now, I do not want to belittle the material benefits that may accrue from aggressive space exploration. I do not want to pursue in detail the self-evident fact that material benefits inevitably derive from new knowledge. Nor do I want to press the point that the military implications of a new principle or environment are never understood until that principle or environment is itself fully understood.

Without considering these corollary reasons, I want to affirm my personal conviction that for psychological reasons alone the free world must attain and maintain no less than parity and preferably a margin of superiority in the field of space exploration and

exploitation. I consider the decision to achieve that parity—and eventually superiority—one of the most critical and fundamental decisions of our day. If the space race is not a valid one, then I would suggest that we are already spending too much money and effort on it. On the other hand, if the competition is as critical and as fundamental as I believe it to be, then we are faced with two possible solutions. Either we must spend more in dollars and effort; or, we must substantially increase the efficiency of our effort.

Let us consider the manner in which our national missile and space program is presently splintered. First and most important: It is divided between two executive departments, NASA and the Department of Defense. Functionally, it is splintered into four agencies, NASA and the three branches of our armed services.

Within the Department of Defense, a recent directive from the Secretary has revised the missions of the respective services. Both the developmental and operational aspects of space vehicles have been assigned as missions to the Air Force. A navigational satellite system has been assigned as a mission of the Navy. A communications satellite system has been assigned as a mission of the Army. On the surface, perhaps this decision pretends to settle old issues. Actually, it creates dissension. By direction, the Army and the Navy are to buy their space vehicles from the Air Force; however, there is no immediate knowledgeable authority responsible for the overall mission. The problem of wedding and payload and the vehicle must be settled by such anemic devices as committees, coordination offices, and other such inadequate administrative devices. There is no technically competent authority sitting astride both the vehicle program and the payload program to give a joint program the decisive drive that success demands. In theory, system coordination has been assigned to the Air Force; but this, if authoritatively exploited, denies to the responsible service full control over its assigned operating space mission. Since no one authority is totally and immediately responsible for the complete mission, what is everybody's business ends up being nobody's business.

Let us now turn to the creation and continuing expansion of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The presumption has apparently been accepted that the borderline between scientific space exploration and military space requirements can be cleanly and effectively defined. Gentlemen, I believe this presumption to be totally incorrect.

From a purely technical viewpoint, there is so little difference between civilian and military space programs that there is no justification for their division and resulting duplication. For example, in the area of powerplants, both programs are concerned with a reaction-type engine, liquid or solid, whose functioning requires rather sophisticated control. This is a fundamental characteristic of every vehicle, whether it be a short-range ballistic missile used by troops in the field, or a more ambitious vehicle used in an interplanetary probe. Their development and operation stem from identical technologies.

Not only are the power sources themselves fundamentally identical, but the control methods, either on board the vehicle or those located at ground stations, come from common parents. I can give you as many examples of commonality between the military and so-called civilian systems as there are components of their respective systems. For added example, in both programs, it is necessary to explore ways of getting dependable electronic propagation from a supersonic vehicle, getting antenna patterns, the effects of boundary layer, heat and velocity, and so forth. All of this knowledge is

essential to the development of any missile or space vehicle. Also, there is a common requirement for guidance systems that perform identical functions. The same thing is also true in terms of dependable long-range communications to and from missiles and space vehicles. Further proof of the principle is offered in the use of smaller ballistic missiles as upper stages of larger vehicles.

Even from the standpoint of pure science, these programs are interrelated. Scientific exploration is in no way inconsistent with military objectives. New military technology inevitably results from scientific findings. An examination of the many projects contained in the research and development programs of the Department of Defense would indicate clearly that the military is supporting and fostering fundamental research insofar as its limited resources will permit.

There is a final consideration on this subject that I believe to be particularly cogent. The military objectives and the civilian programs, with very limited exceptions, are, and must continue to be, derived from the same physical and manpower resources. Every single engineering and production facility that is involved in any kind of important space project is now or has been involved in one or more missile projects. This includes both commercial and governmental resources. Further, the exploration and exploitation of space will continue to demand the use of the same facilities and the same manpower that are now being used in the development of weapons systems.

Again, the list is endless and complicated, but the principle is brief and simple: we are trying to divide the indivisible.

I quite well understand that because of the pending transfer of the Von Braun team from the organization which I have commanded, this criticism may sound like sour grapes. Let me dispel that presumption by saying flatly, that under present circumstances, I concur in the transfer.

In the area of political competition for control of resources, the Army has done the only thing it could do. When one is forced into making a choice from a bundle of bad choices, he must take the least objectionable one. The transfer of the Von Braun group to NASA is the unfortunate culmination of a long series of such dilemmas. At the end, the Army faced a Solomon's choice: First, by the assignment of the space vehicle development, production, and launching mission to the Air Force, and secondly, the Army's total inability to secure from the Department of Defense sufficient money or responsibility to do the Saturn job properly, we found ourselves in the position of either agreeing with the transfer of the team, or watching it be destroyed by starvation and frustration. However, gentlemen, this particular issue of the transfer of the Von Braun team is only one small part of the issue I hope to put before you.

Now, of course, good men working hard together can make any form of organization work after a fashion. The purpose of sound organization should be to reduce the requirements for coordination and cooperation to a point where they are reasonably consistent with human nature and the capabilities of the average executive group. With sound organization, coordination and cooperation become the natural product within the organization. Thus only, may we avoid the sort of hothouse nurtured or blackjack inspired coordination that presently seems to be the order of the day. People after all are human. The only way that we get the best effort out of any individual, no matter what his size or stature, is to so place him that in furthering his own intelligent self-interest he is at once furthering the objectives of his organization, and hopefully, of his country. This is the sort of organization toward which we must work.

There is a further reason why the present trend is illogical and undesirable. The Von Braun group has been supported extensively by a nationwide Army organization which must continue for the performance of Army missions, regardless of whether the Von Braun group goes or stays. You cannot expect to create a new and separate system to support them in terms of finance, accounting, purchasing, inspection of purchased products, contracting for services, and the provision of general logistic resources and facilities, without spending additional money.

The Congress has continuously beaten the Department of Defense over the head in an attempt to unify those same activities, and thus reduce the duplication among the three military departments. By the existing organizational concepts and the operational responsibilities placed on NASA, NASA must necessarily proceed to create its own system for all of those things—a system which already exists in triplicate—Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Now, for all of these reasons, I believe, that if we are to compete successfully without bankrupting the country, there must be a fundamental organizational unification of the entire missile and space program. One asks immediately, how can this be done and where?

It is unrealistic, and an improper division of responsibility to take outside the Department of Defense the responsibility for weapons essential to the performance of the mission of that Department. However, and particularly in view of past performance in areas of purely civilian activities, such as the work of the Corps of Engineers in rivers, harbors, and flood control, the work of the Signal Corps in operating the Alaska communications system in the absence of a commercial capability to do so, the administration by the Army of the Panama Canal, and many others, there is nothing fundamentally inconsistent in assigning civilian scientific efforts in a particular field to the Department of Defense.

Thus, in view of the fundamental inconsistency involved in taking the responsibility for weapons development out of the Department of Defense, we are forced to the conclusion that the space effort, if it is to be unified, must be inside the Department of Defense?

Now, how can this be done? If we look with discerning eyes, Congress itself has pointed the way. In the most recent amendments to national defense organization, it is evident that Congress intended an extension of the principle of the joint unified command composed of elements of the several armed services. By its enactments, the Congress gave to those joint commands a substantially greater degree of independence from the individual services than such commands had ever before had. They strengthened the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and set up the commands to operate with direct channels to the Joint Chiefs and to the Secretary of Defense. So far, this concept has been applied almost exclusively to geographic operating areas. These are now almost entirely handled through joint commands. While this is as far as this concept has gone to date in its broadest applications, it has been applied to an important degree in atomic weapons through the charter of the Defense Atomic Support Agency, or DASA.

DASA offers us a tested pattern for the problem that faces us here. It would appear there is nothing to deny the possibility and the desirability of creating a joint command to assume the undivided responsibility for the major missile and space activities of the Nation. Each service, being fully represented within, and dependent upon the command, would necessarily feel the compulsion to support its representatives in the joint command. Through that medium and that

fact, the availability of the various supporting elements of the several services to smoothly and competently reinforce the joint effort would be assured. In order to assure adequate attention to the scientific side of space exploration, the scientific community should be represented at the command level. Thus, we align individual and national objectives.

In substance, gentlemen, I am recommending that this committee and the Congress take a broad new hard look at the organization of our resources to meet our needs in missile and space activities and give thorough consideration to the suggested course of action, or any other, which will achieve with assurance a solid, undivided, and effective approach to the solution of our most urgent need.

In concluding these remarks with some consideration of our need for a ballistic missile defense system, and particularly of the present position of the Zeus system, I want first to deal with that school of thought which argues against the need. In this connection, I should like to rephrase an old cliché: When offensive capabilities are equal, then the best offense is a good defense. We have a positive deterrent only when we can do something the aggressor cannot do.

There is no denying the requirement for an assured retaliatory capability. It serves as an effective deterrent against all-out massive, and sudden annihilation. If its purpose is achieved, it will never be used. Conversely, if it has to be used, it has failed in its purpose.

For a deterrent force to be fully effective, it must have certain characteristics. It must be powerful enough that the damage certain to be inflicted would be wholly unacceptable to the aggressor power. Second, it must be supported by the unquestioned public will to use it if necessary, and without delay. Third, the potential aggressor must know with certainty that the two foregoing conditions do exist.

Certainly, the deterrent force must not be made ineffective by the very act it is designed to prevent. Within the military there are many ways to achieve this relative invulnerability. Being military, the direct retaliatory capability is subject to military discretion. It can be hardened, dispersed, hidden, and made mobile. It can simply be multiplied to the extent that the aggressor cannot completely destroy it in a single blow. This is a technique which we understand and can apply.

However, it seems to me that there would be little sanity in destroying half of Russia and Asia, if before such destruction was meted out, the major populations of the 20 largest cities of the United States had suffered massive damage and wholesale slaughter. It would be nothing more than revenge. There would, in fact, be little left for us to fight for.

What are we going to do with those cities—with New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Detroit? They cannot be effectively hardened, dispersed, made mobile, depopulated, or forgotten.

Passive means of defense have their very real limitations. By the nature of economic circumstances, if for no other reason, it is unrealistic even to consider adequate hardening as a protection for the physical resources from which stem our industrial and economic strength. In the cold and pitiless light of pure logic, we must therefore find means for their defense against sudden and massive annihilation. This has been adequately recognized in the development and deployment of missile systems to protect these centers from air attack. To the more formidable threat now rising we have only one present answer.

The Nike-Zeus antimissile system, now in development, is our only conceivable positive defense for the next decade. While

better means may be discovered in the future as a result of active research, the nature of those possible means is not nearly sufficiently and clearly known at this time to warrant the commitment of resources to the development of any other systems.

Given the essential leadtime required for the genesis of any such complex defensive system, any really new approach cannot, in my judgment, be available for use before 1970. Meantime, the millions of inhabitants of our concentrated centers live with a sharp and cruel sword poised over their heads and held only by the gossamer thread of our opponents' rationality.

At the same time, it is a certain fact that every day we delay in initiating the series of complex actions required to commit the Zeus system to production will delay by an exactly equal period its availability for use.

Admittedly, there are development problems still to be solved, but far too much has been made of them as a negative point. They exist in all development programs. Otherwise, there would be no need for any such program, and we could go directly into the production of a new weapon. I assure you that those technical problems are proportionately no greater in the Nike-Zeus system than they have been, or are in other weapons systems of great cost and importance. The immediate, discernible problem of straightforward defense against straightforward ballistic missiles, IREM or ICBM, is, in my opinion, fully in hand. I am further convinced that additional defense against more sophisticated weapons can and will be solved at least as fast as any such more sophisticated weapons can be brought against us.

In other complex and urgent programs, great virtue has been ascribed to the technique of integrating development, initiation of production, training, and preparation for deployment. In fact, the term "concurrency" has been widely advertised as representing a virtue. Such telescoping of all phases substantially shortens the leadtime to availability, and, therefore, carries assurance against the obsolescence of the weapon itself before it can be brought to bear. I am at a loss to understand why it is not equally obvious that this same procedure is essential in connection with a weapon of such tremendous importance to our survival as is the Zeus.

In essence, gentlemen, the question is not whether we have yet completely demonstrated the full effectiveness of the Zeus system, but rather, whether we are to make any effort to defend the major centers of the United States against atomic annihilation by ballistic missile during the next 10 years. I feel very strongly that we cannot afford not to initiate immediate action looking to the prompt production and deployment of the Zeus system. The absence of a decision is in itself a decision. To fail to order the immediate preparation for production of this essential defense system is to add days, months, or years to the period when fear must hang like a cloud over our civilian population. To do otherwise than take this action immediately represents, in my opinion, the assumption of an awful and burdensome responsibility—a responsibility for the survival of the women and children, as well as the men, in the population of our great cities, upon whom in large measure both the prosperity and the will of the United States to survive as a nation depends. I for one am wholly unwilling to have that responsibility on my conscience.

Gentlemen, the entire field being considered by this committee is extraordinarily broad and complex. Giving full consideration to the influence of technology on the strength of this Nation, and on those elements which go to make up that strength, the decisions to be taken are, in my opinion, of vital importance to the future of

this Nation, and, indeed, to its very survival as a free Nation. I could not hope to cover even a fraction of the problems involved, let alone discuss all elements of their potential solution within the scope of this comparatively brief statement to you. I have tried to single out two areas as being, in my opinion, of the greatest significance at this particular time.

To summarize my carefully considered feelings with respect to those two areas, I should like to conclude with these brief statements:

First, I do not believe we can afford not to compete, with all the necessary ingenuity and resources, to demonstrate to the free world both the capability and the will of this Nation.

Second, I feel that because of its prominence in the public mind of all Nations, the field of space activities has become a most critical element of that competition, and that we, therefore, must have an aggressive and urgent national program to attain and maintain no less than equality, and preferably, demonstrated superiority in that field.

Third, I believe strongly, and feel that it is wholly demonstrable, that the fields of ballistic missile and space exploration and exploitation are in fact naturally indivisible elements of a single broad technology, and that a continuance of divided efforts in this broad area cannot but result in delay, duplication, and waste of both money and manpower.

Fourth, I believe that any pretense toward the deterrence of atomic general warfare must necessarily be ineffective unless it includes the effective protection of our population and our major resources, and thus assures the survival of our will to live as a Nation. I further feel that to delay the full acceptance of that responsibility, regardless of the uncertainties that may exist, involves a risk far too great to be accepted by an individual who can in any way influence the decision.

I therefore strongly recommend that this committee give full consideration to the means for the creation of a truly unified and singly responsible authority for the direction of the national missile and space effort, and that it further recommend immediate preparation for the production and deployment of the only visible means for the protection of our population against the awful threat of atomic ballistic missile destruction, whether medium range or long range, sea launched or land launched, that is represented today by the Zeus anti-missile-missile system.

Mr. Speaker, I have cited a few of these statements by high officials differing with the President, not to criticize the President, nor to expose these officials to possible charges of being parochial in their attitude, but rather to indicate that here is a vital question which the President could and can clear up when he makes his address on Sunday. If the President will not exert leadership, at least we hope that he will exert followership and recognize and articulate the overwhelming opinion of his key executive officials. The crucial point, however, is that Mr. Kistiakowsky's Philadelphia address, for example, was printed on page 19 of Sunday's paper, whereas the President's statements to the contrary are printed on page 1, and reverberate around the country, and the world.

I know that this whole question deeply concerns the President, and I give him full credit for his sincerity and patriotism in wrestling with the problem. This was certainly the motive back of his trip

to Cape Canaveral on February 10, 1960. He wanted to highlight the nature of the problem and his understanding of it. I am only sorry that the trip did not accomplish the purpose, and for this interpretation I rely on the report printed by the highly respected science writer for the Washington Evening Star, William Hines. Mr. Hines states, in an article printed February 11, 1960:

PRESIDENT'S QUICK TRIP SPARKS SECURITY SLIP

(By William Hines)

When President Eisenhower left Cape Canaveral, Fla., yesterday after 3 hours and 15 minutes on that desolate sand-and-palmetto heath, he observed that it had been a very worthwhile trip.

Many of the reporters who made the hurried 1,600-mile round trip wondered from what point of view the President spoke. They thought that as far as increasing his grasp of either science or missileery was concerned, Mr. Eisenhower could have learned as much by staying at home and being briefed, or by looking at any of a spate of recent picture books on the Florida missile site.

About the only thing of any national consequence that occurred was a breach of military security. The effect of this was to spread among perhaps twoscore reporters information about the Polaris missile that had been known earlier to a relative few on a confidential basis.

BOBBLE ALMOST INEVITABLE

The security leak was nothing more or less than a bobble of the sort almost inevitable in a hastily arranged trip like that Mr. Eisenhower took yesterday. How effectively the fumble was covered up remains to be seen; how serious its import is a matter of opinion.

But the leak was important as a symptom characteristic of what happens when news is created, or "managed," for reasons that apparently have little to do with the national welfare.

President Eisenhower's trip to Canaveral was whipped up on the spur of the moment. Some of the White House aides who normally are "cut in" on trips far in advance say they did not know about this one until 24 hours before the President left for Florida.

This was just about the same time officials at the Cape were notified of the forthcoming trip, and 1 hour before reporters were called in by White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty and given the news.

From all that could be learned in the course of that hectic trip, the Canaveral inspection tour apparently "jus' growed" like Topsy.

"Plan a 4-hour tour for the President," seems to have been about the extent of the instructions sent down by Cape Canaveral. The trip was later cut to 3½ hours by eliminating a luncheon, and finally to 3¼ hours by spinning the convoy's wheels a little faster.

A prime purpose of the tour seemed to be to secure photographs of Mr. Eisenhower in front of some missiles.

In the original tour plan photographers were given ample opportunity to take pictures, but writers were not granted an equal chance to observe. This plan broke down, however.

DEVIL-MAY-CARE AIR

The whole thing had a gala, devil-may-care air about it. Had the President wished to inspect a war-ready missile base, Cape Canaveral is about the last place in the world he should have gone. No shot has ever been—or will ever be—fired in anger from there. It is a test base, pure and simple. Its relationship to actual combat bases is about equivalent to General Motors' test track's relationship to a great metropolitan freeway.

For a meaningful briefing and an actual feel for missile base operations, Mr. Eisenhower should have gone to some such place as Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. He might have done so last month while on the west coast for the "dinner with Ike" at Los Angeles. It would have interrupted his trip for less than the 6 hours and 47 minutes total elapsed time of his absence from Washington yesterday.

At any event it is unthinkable that the President needs to travel to Cape Canaveral to learn about missiles. The men who have managed the Air Force and Navy missile programs—Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever and Rear Adm. W. A. Raborn, for example—are only minutes away from the President's side, and can fill him in on Atlases, Polarises, and Titans without breaching security.

Mr. Speaker, I join with President Eisenhower in denouncing those who wrongfully claim that he has or would deliberately mislead the American people. My indignation is as righteous as his on that score. But there has existed around the President, as evidenced by this abortive and transparent trip to Cape Canaveral, a group of advisers who have seemed more interested in public relations than facts. Several years ago James Reston, the head of the New York Times Washington Bureau, quoted C. D. Jackson, of the White House staff, as stating: "We're going to merchandise the living hell out of the Eisenhower program."

I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that this approach does a disservice both to President Eisenhower and to the American people. National security is too vital an issue to be run from Madison Avenue. To protect the President, and enable him to fulfill the high functions of his office which are so essential to the very existence of civilization, I say let us get rid of the merchandising, public relations, advertising gimmicks, and all the Madison Avenue boys and let the President tell the facts simply and directly to the American people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say—the President must succeed in providing meaningful leadership. We cannot afford to let the President fail or the Nation will fail. I believe it in my heart that the President will succeed if he will only get rid of the Madison Avenue boys, grasp firmly the reins of leadership, and start on Sunday night to give the full and stark facts to the American people.

Some people have said, Mr. Speaker, that if the President paints too realistic a picture of the crisis we face there will be panic among the people, and we must reassure them instead.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, have you ever seen one single person in this country panicked over the Russian threat? No, of course not. But what you do see throughout the country are millions of complacent people—overstuffed, self-satisfied people who will go on their merry way spending their money on personal luxuries unless they are given the straight talk by the President himself on the crisis we face. If the President would only exert his leadership, these same people would turn around and would work, and sweat, and sacrifice if they knew our Nation were in danger.

There are lots of folks who stand around and bemoan the fact that America is fast losing her moral fiber; well, the President is in a position to stiffen the national backbone, to raise our moral fiber, for the Presidency is more than an administrative job; it is preeminently a position of moral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, February 13, 1960, the National Broadcasting Co. carried an excellent hour-long television program entitled "The Missile Race: Time for Decision." Under unanimous consent, I include the entire text of this program in the RECORD. I would like to call particular attention to the final statement of Frank McGee during this program:

In our study for this program we have found that whereas the President says the people must make the final decision, they are instead generally relying on the decisions that he has already made.

The President of the United States says this country has the military strength that it needs, that in effect enough strength is enough, and that moreover he knows more on this subject than anyone else. There is no one who can effectively argue these points with him. He is a general who has spent all but a fraction of his life in military service. As President of the United States he receives top secret reports on the military strength of this country as well as any of its potential enemies. And yet, there are other generals who will argue these points with him. And there are men in public life who receive at least part of these secret reports who dispute him as well.

The program follows:

THE MISSILE RACE: TIME FOR DECISION

Mr. McGEE. It is 1935. On the desert near Roswell, N. Mex., the American physicist, Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, and some of his assistants are about to fire a rocket. Dr. Goddard had been experimenting with rockets since he was a child, had successfully fired a liquid-fueled rocket as early as 1926.

This experiment was also successful, but the country heard little about it and cared less.

Dr. Goddard used a parachute to float his experimental rockets gently back to earth. This American scientist pioneered for all the world the design, the fuels, and the guidance systems for today's long-range rockets, missiles, earth satellites, and space flights. American newspapers called him "Mooney Goodard," but German rocket scientists who used his findings to build their World War II rockets said he was ahead of us all.

Another early rocket experimenter in America, Dr. G. E. Pendre, says: "A crowning irony is that if his own countrymen had listened to Dr. Goddard the United States today would be 18 to 20 years ahead of its present position in the international space race. There might, in fact, have been no race."

ANNOUNCER. World Wide 60, an adventure in television journalism. Tonight, the topical story of the missile race. Here is NBC News Commentator Frank McGee.

Mr. McGEE. This is a bullet. It consists of a case inside of which is powder that explodes and sends this tiny projectile hurtling toward its target.

Now this is a ballistic missile. Its case is called an airframe, inside of which is fuel that explodes and sends a warhead hurtling toward its target. Thus we see instantly that there is no staggering an incomprehensible difference between bullets, with which earlier wars were fought, and guided missiles, with which any future war will be fought; and yet, the United States has developed this proliferation of missiles as it

seeks to move from one type of warhead to another; and to bring them to their present state of development we have spent \$31,381,000,000.

Now tonight we propose to ask three questions and then answer them insofar as competent and responsible reporters can do so. The three questions: Does this country have the military strength that it needs? If not, why not? Finally, what more can be done?

Now as we ask and answer the first question we will also make some additional discoveries. We will discover, for example, that satellites, or ballistic missiles, are divided by type into groups. All of these on the table here are called surface-to-surface missiles, meaning that they are fired from a position on the ground to a target that is also on the ground. And in this they are exactly like artillery. Well, that's what the Army claimed, of course, as it developed most of these missiles that you see. But that argument sent shivers up the collective spine of the Air Force which claimed in effect that they are not artillery, but pilotless bombers.

The services fought over this bitterly because they realized that their very survival as a service depended on the outcome of that argument. Well, today the argument is largely settled with the Air Force the winner, although the Army still controls some short-range missiles. The Air Force controls those of longer range on which so much, so very much depends.

Some of the longer range missiles travel 1,500 miles, and these are called intermediate range ballistic missiles, or IRBM's. But others travel 5,000 to 8,000 miles. They actually span the oceans, and these are called intercontinental ballistic missiles, or ICBM's. And of these, the most important at this moment is the Atlas. The Atlas is the only ICBM the United States has developed and ready to go.

The first feeble effort to develop this missile began in 1946, 1 year after the end of World War II. But serious work on it did not begin until 8 years later in 1954. During that time we relied almost exclusively on our possession of the atomic bomb and bombers to deliver it for our military defense.

Russia, on the other hand, was doing everything possible to develop missiles while also learning the secrets of the atomic bomb. Our intelligence agents underestimated her ability to do either of these jobs. After we succeeded in reducing the weight of atomic warheads we started seriously to develop missiles as a means of delivering them. Since Russia developed missiles to carry heavier warheads she wound up with more powerful rockets than we have, which is the most glaring advantage that she has over this country today; and today we are told that Russia has about 12 ICBM's ready to fire, compared to our 3. Our intelligence agents say that she will have 35 to 60 by the end of this year, compared to our 15 or 20. Roughly about three times as many as we will have. Now this is the missile lag about which we hear so much. A massive effort is being made to develop other ICBM's, of which the Titan is one. Eleven days ago this missile passed one of its most severe tests. Missiles are built in sections—they are called stages—which separate in flight so the whole missile doesn't have to be flown the whole distance. In this test the first and second stages were separated in flight for the first time, and it was directed to its target by ground controls instead of those located inside the missile. A few days later it failed a test. Both the Titan and the Atlas use liquid fuels which must be pumped in shortly before launching. This takes 15 minutes, just half the time needed by a Russian ICBM to reach its American target. This underscores vividly the desperate need for maximum warning. Because

the fuel must be fed at constant rates, these missiles have enormously complex plumbing systems which can, and often have, failed. Storage of liquid fuels is difficult and dangerous, and at the present, above ground.

Until the Titan and the Atlas are enclosed in concrete silos underground, a program that is under way, they will remain soft targets, which means they are easily destroyed by enemy missiles.

Well, prepackaged fuels offer a partial answer since they can be stored and loaded far more easily than liquid fuels for this type of motor. But solid fuels, which are stored inside the missile itself to remain there for years, are better yet, but they don't always burn easily, making control of the missile quite difficult.

Another ICBM under development overcomes two of these basic weaknesses. The Minuteman will have a solid fuel, and it can also be mounted on railroad cars so it becomes a constantly moving launching base, almost impossible for an enemy to follow and destroy.

Three days ago it was announced that development of the Minuteman is a few months ahead of schedule, and with great good luck could be combat-ready by 1962. Well, that's when Russia's missile superiority will be the greatest. There are those who argue that in view of these facts we should skip development of the Titan and split its money between speeding the development of the Minuteman and building more Atlases, which is already developed, but with so few ICBM's ready today much of our defense rests on the shorter range missiles like this Thor IRBM stationed at overseas bases.

One of the first of these bases to become fully ready is at Feltwell in England. These are the first pictures ever permitted of the base. And only 3 days ago was the general press admitted. Since these missiles can travel only 1,500 miles they had to be placed nearer their potential targets. This meant, of course, that we had to have bases located on the territory of other countries, so great diplomatic effort was put forth to secure them, since they make potential Russian targets of each country where they are located.

Generally a squadron—that's a carryover Air Force term—consists of 15 missiles, and these Thors are almost exactly like the Jupiter which was developed by the Army, which would of course use the term "battalion." Both missiles were developed by the rival services simultaneously, and they fought their most bitter battles over IRBM's. When the Air Force won control of even the Army's Jupiter, the latter, the Army, dropped almost completely out of the missile development picture. Since then the Army has fought a mostly losing battle to modernize its ground forces and maintain sufficient manpower for conventional or brushfire wars.

Russia, we are told, has at least 100 IRBM launching bases. Those missiles of course couldn't reach us in this country, but they could reach our bases overseas.

Republican Congressman LESLIE ARENDS, in a report that President Eisenhower urged everyone to read, indicates that we have four such bases in England and have selected sites for two in Italy. Thus, we lag considerably behind Russia in both the ICBM and the IRBM, the most important of the surface-to-surface group of missiles.

Now all the missiles on this table are called surface-to-air missiles, meaning simply that they are fired from the ground to a target in the air, and in this they are exactly like the old anti-aircraft weapons. Since the Army used to handle anti-aircraft weapons it pioneered the development of these missiles like the Nike-Hercules. The Nike-Hercules is what is called a second generation missile. This means simply that it is based on developments achieved with its parent predecessor the Nike-Ajax. This

missile, intended to bring down invading enemy bombers or fighter planes, is now stationed at bases around principal U.S. cities and is also at bases in Europe and the Far East. This is because we had thought Russia would use bombers in any attack. Instead, she developed the long-range guided missile, and no missile has yet been developed that will intercept and bring down an ICBM.

We have several missiles that can do as the Hercules does, intercept and destroy invading aircraft, but Russia will not attack with aircraft. When our intelligence agents were telling us Russia was building hordes of bombers they were in fact slackening bomber production and concentrating on missiles, yet it is the estimates of these same intelligence agencies that are being cited by some today to support claims that Russia's missile superiority is really not great.

While the Army was developing these surface-to-air missiles, the Air Force and the Navy of course were doing the same thing. Airplanes used to fire guns at each other. When the shift to missiles came along these guns became what we now call air-to-air missiles. The Army never had a role in this, so the conflict here became one between the Air Force and the Navy, and the Navy developed among others of the type the Sparrow air-to-air missile. Well, the Sparrow is not the Navy's best air-to-air missile, and its production will soon be halted in favor of another missile of the same type. But between them, the Air Force and the Navy have developed at least five different air-to-air missiles. The projects and the financing for them were carried on simultaneously. Publicly each service always claims that it is sharing its discoveries with the other services, but scientists working for them have often complained of spending weeks or even months trying to solve a problem that a rival service has already solved.

Today the Air Force is using an air-to-air missile developed by the Navy—the Sidewinder, and that's the only missile, incidentally, that has proved itself in combat. It was used with devastating effect against Russian MIG's employed by Chinese Communists in raids against territory held by Chinese Nationalists. These would be vital weapons in any conventional war, but they would mean little in a war fought with ICBM's.

Well, so far we have seen that the new weapons, although different, actually only parallel the same functions of the old weapons, and in doing so we have partially answered the first question—does this country have the military strength it needs?

It is against this background that the current and often bitter debate on defense is being waged in Congress. The Congressmen and the witnesses in Washington are talking almost exclusively in terms of the large missiles as they argue the principal question of whether enough is being spent for military strength. The Republicans generally say "Yes," the Democrats generally say "No." And the Republicans cite secret intelligence reports to support their view that we are not weaker than Russia. The Democrats say these reports claim one thing in public but another thing in private, and are now based on what an enemy might feel like doing, not what he can do.

Air Force generals and admirals who helped prepare the budget now appear before Congress to say they support it but actually need much more money, and the Army plaintively pleads that it be modernized and get strong in case we do fight an old-fashioned war.

But out of all the confusion a few facts emerge clearly. We are relying on ICBM's, on nuclear-powered submarines with shorter range IRBM's, and on the missile, on atomic bomb-carrying aircraft of the Strategic Air

Command to give us the military strength we need.

So let's examine them separately, beginning with the ICBM's. Russia has more of these than we have and is building them faster. Shouldn't we be building them faster than we are? Well, that's the question put to Air Force Gen. Bernard A. Schriever by NBC Newsman Roy Neal.

"Mr. NEAL. The President's new budget calls for a total of 130 Atlas and 140 Titan long-range missiles. Do you think that's enough for our national defense?"

"General SCHRIEVER. Well, this is a question that I will not attempt to answer directly for the very simple reason that my responsibility is in the field of research and development. That is, bringing the missile to a state where it can be used by the operational command, and in this case, SAC. We have done this, and we have done it in record time. We have exceeded all of our performance specifications. The job of deciding how many we need is something that has to be done at levels above us. There's a lot of war planning information that goes into this. It is a balance of the different systems such as how many airplanes will we have on air alert, how many other systems such as Polaris, tactical units, what contributions they make to the overall deterrent posture. So I am not in a position to say how many we should have in our force.

"Mr. NEAL. Well, we can be specific in your area, research and development. In long-range missiles how well do our developments back up against the accomplishments made by Russia?"

"General SCHRIEVER. Well, I think there has been a very tremendous job done in the ballistic missile programs in this country. I think it is generally accepted that we started after the Russians in the development of the long-range ballistic missile. The combined efforts of the military, scientists, and industry I think has been really outstanding. I mentioned that we have an operational Atlas. This was 4½ years after we started the program, the accelerated program in 1954. We not only have it ahead of the schedule that the expert thought we could achieve back in 1954, but the performance of the Atlas is considerably better than we had laid down for it in that time, at that particular time. And when I say performance I mean range, accuracy, and reliability.

"Mr. NEAL. General, from all that we have read, heard and seen, I find it hard to believe that statement.

"General SCHRIEVER. Well, I can understand that. I think that we don't exploit the things that we do to the same extent that they exploit theirs, and I'll give you an example. Just recently they fired a missile to a range over 7,000 miles, and you may recall that they got a great deal of publicity on that particular shot. Yet several days after that we fired two Atlas missiles on the same day within about an hour, and we got very little press coverage on that particular, very, very highly significant shot of that day."

Mr. McGEE. So we have an ICBM, the Atlas, all developed and ready to go. We will be building them faster, but even so, we could turn them out twice as fast yet. So we will be closing the gap. It's estimated that within 3 years Russia will have 500 ICBM's to our 250.

All right, let's examine the second major component in our missile strength, the nuclear-powered submarine and its intermediate-range ballistic missile, the Polaris. The Polaris is one of the most important and one of the most promising of all the new weapons. It's called an underwater-to-surface missile, which makes it more like a torpedo than anything else. Its great advantage of course is that being on a nuclear submarine

it can be moved to any spot in any ocean or sea in the world for a launching site and then lie there completely concealed for many, many months. The missile itself has been fired from underwater, as you are about to see and the device for launching it from a submarine has also been tested, but as yet it has never been fired from a submarine.

Now where do we stand in the development of this missile and the production of them and the submarines to transport them? These are questions discussed by Adm. William F. Raborn and newsman Peter Hackes.

"Mr. HACKES. Admiral, as I recall, the concept of the Polaris missile and the Polaris submarine predate the first Russian sputnik by some time. Why is it that it has taken us so long to get the first George Washington here actually under way?"

"Admiral RABORN. Yes; the program does predate sputnik. As you may recall, based on the recommendations of the President's advisory group, the President decided we would put ballistic missiles in ships at sea, and we were partners with the Army from about the last part of 1955 to the middle of 1956 in an attempt to see if we could use the Jupiter missile at sea, but unfortunately due to the large amount of liquid fuel, the danger inherent in that kind of fuel, and the confined spaces aboard ship and particularly submarines, we decided that would not be very practical. Fortunately, about that time the Navy had a splendid breakthrough in the amount of energy—that is, the specific impulse we could get from a solid propellant, and that combined with the advancement in the nuclear warhead and the exploits of the *Nautilus* made it a natural to try to pull all those three together. So it was decided then that we should do this. We set for our first operational goal in 1965, so I'm reminded now of your question, why did it take so long; far from taking long, we have knocked 3 years off the 1,200-mile version of this ballistic missile, and its parent submarine, so in the space of some 3 years we have knocked 3 years off the schedule. That's pretty good.

"Mr. HACKES. Well now, there are those who have said in the recent past that you perhaps could have gone faster or could in the future if you had more money.

"Admiral RABORN. Well, this system is afforded coequal highest priority to anything else that is being done in the United States today. The President has assigned this No. 1 priority coequal to several other programs, as you probably know. Now the question of technical development, we have had adequate funds for this. The question of how many you build, that's another matter, and of course we build just as many as they tell us to and give us the funds to do. We hope as we prove ourselves out a little bit more here in the next few months that the full potentialities of this system will be recognized throughout the country and that we will get permission to go ahead with more of the submarines, but we are going just as fast as we can from the technical development point of view.

"Mr. HACKES. Admiral Raborn, to the best of our knowledge do the Russians have in operation or are they developing a submarine similar to this?"

"Admiral RABORN. Well, my personal opinion is that they don't.

"Mr. HACKES. But I don't suppose we can really bank on that?"

"Admiral RABORN. Well, I think so. Our intelligence is pretty good, I believe. This is something of course which we expect will be well within their technical capabilities in the future."

Mr. McGEE. Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, recently told Congress that he was not satisfied with the rate of production of the Polaris and nuclear submarines, and would ask for money to build six more in the next fiscal year. So, like

the ICBM's, they too could be built faster; but unlike the ICBM's, they are not combat-ready and cannot yet be placed on the scales in weighing our military strength against Russia's.

So here we arrive at a preliminary conclusion: Russia does have more missile strength than we have and will continue to be stronger in missiles for perhaps 3 years. However, missiles are not the only weapons, and a missile gap does not automatically mean that we are behind the Soviet Union in overall military strength. To make up the gap we still have the aircraft and bombs and small missiles of the Strategic Air Command, which is the third component in our military strength.

Well, how strong is it? And can it really fill the gap? To report on this here again is Roy Neal:

"Mr. NEAL. Today about 90 percent of the deterrent firepower of the free world is vested in the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force. That force is made up of some 270,000 men at 70 bases, of which 26 are overseas. There are some 3,000 aircraft at their disposal, but their power lies in the bombers they fly—1,200 B-47's, 500 B-52's, all of which can carry thermonuclear bombs to enemy targets. SAC estimates that 75 to 90 percent of the bombers it can put in the air after an enemy attack could hit their enemy targets. The B-52 is the most modern of our bombers; the latest models deliver their payload via missiles with the unlikely name of Hound Dog, an air-ground missile. With it the B-52 can let go its bombs some 500 miles from target.

"The B-47's are now approaching obsolescence and are in the process of being replaced by these B-52's, which in turn are expected to be obsolete by 1965, and for which no replacement is presently planned.

"At present to keep the B-52's effective the Hound Dog missile will be updated by the Sky Bolt which will be much faster and fly much farther when fully developed. The replacement for the airplane, a manned-space bomber No. B-70, has had its development almost eliminated despite the recommendation of key Air Force men like Gen. Thomas Power who state categorically that there will always be a need to fly men over enemy territory, and the B-70 is a way to do it in the future.

"Other experts like General Schriever are concerned with time. Today's decisions will be proved right or wrong in 2 or 3 years. To beat the clock while missiles and planes are being flight tested, bases are built, and crews are trained, and support equipment is produced. Right now to be fully effective our long-range missiles need more warning time and more intelligence information which can be obtained by military satellites if more money for their development is budgeted. Until our missiles are effective and we have enough of them, we must use what we have—aircraft. We must also use our present warning system, which does not give us enough time to get our planes off the ground if attacked by enemy missiles. Those underbudgeted satellites could help in 2 or 3 years; meanwhile the only answer is to keep some planes in the air at all times. Our planes around the world are controlled from the War Room at the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, Omaha, Neb. In that room before the Senate hearing sky-rocketed his views to a controversial climax we asked the boss of SAC, Gen. Thomas Power, can we right now, today, defend ourselves against the Russians?

"General POWER. Well, right at this moment SAC can carry out that mission, and this is proven by the fact that we are at peace and this world has not been subject to an all-out nuclear war. I might add that this is a really good way to keep it.

"Mr. NEAL. On the other hand, General Power, we hear a great deal about our op-

ponents building their military strength. So I think our next question should be, then: How does it look for the near future, say 2 or 3 years from now? How well will SAC be able to do its job then?

"General POWER. Well, we have problems facing us in this deterrent role, but I would like to make this point, that as these problems increase in scope and complexity, our capability has to increase commensurately if we are to deal with future contingencies as successfully as we have with those in the past. Now, the No. 1 problem is the problem of survivability, of SAC's strike capability in the face of a sneak attack by bombers, or missiles, or both.

"Mr. NEAL. Survivability, that's an interesting word. Can you perhaps pin it down a little more closely for us?

"General POWER. Well, it really means exactly what it says. It means that in the face of surprise attack we must survive. Let me put it this way. It doesn't make any difference how big a force you have before you have sustained surprise attack; the important thing is how big a force do you have left after you have sustained a surprise attack, and what is even more important from a deterrent point of view is, how big a force does a potential aggressor think that you will have left after he has subjected you to a surprise attack?

"Mr. NEAL. I see. Well, General, we have talked here up to this point of building strength. Now we are looking to the immediate future, and what would you say was the minimum buildup requirement to maintain our deterrent strength?

"General POWER. I think what you are striving for is what is the minimum deterrent. I get asked this question quite often, and I give a simple answer. I don't know. And I might also add there isn't any other single man in this world who knows what the minimum deterrent is, with the possible exception of Mr. Khrushchev, and he really doesn't know from one week to another because he might be willing to accept more punishment next week than he is this week.

"Mr. NEAL. Could you at least, General, give us some idea of what sort of equipment we should be getting into, what sort of equipment we should be purchasing, what we should be doing for our future? Not necessarily a minimum requirement, in other words, but the type of equipment we need.

"General POWER. Well, really the crux of the problem is warning, when this dictates your posture and your equipment. Well now, warning really takes care of two different situations. One in which you have some warning and you can configure part of your force to react within that warning. Now another situation is one in which you have no warning and you must configure part of your force so it can survive with zero warning. Now we handle this by what we call a ground alert and an airborne alert. The ground alert is designed to get off the ground in 15 minutes. The airborne alert is in the air at all times so naturally doesn't need any warning. We have sufficient warning against the manned bomber threat. We get this through our DEW line, the mid-Canada line, through radar. We are building a ballistic missile early warning system which will go into operation some time later on this year. When we have complete and reliable warning of course our ground alert will be all that's necessary. Until we are sure of that we can take care of the situation through a simple military tactic, namely, the airborne alert.

"Mr. NEAL. Is there no requirement that you can foresee for such things as a satellite program to give still better warning?

"General POWER. Oh, yes; this is a tremendous program and will insure that we get more warning. Now I said a minimum

of 15 minutes is possible. With a satellite working in conjunction with our ballistic missile early warning system we can increase this dramatically.

"Mr. NEAL. How well, sir?

"General POWER. Well, you can practically double the amount of warning you have.

"Mr. NEAL. In other words, give yourself almost 30 minutes.

"General POWER. You can detect them shortly after launch."

Mr. MCGEE. It was General Power's urgent call for an airborne alert that so angered President Eisenhower. That story and the continuation of our report on the missile race after this pause for station identification.

Mr. MCGEE. Critics of the administration point out that we have fewer long-range and intermediate-range missiles than Russia. The administration answered that we have the nuclear bomb-carrying aircraft of the Strategic Air Command to make up the difference. When the commander of these planes cautioned that with no warning system they might never get off the ground and should instead be kept in the air, reporters took that suggestion to the President at his next press conference:

"President EISENHOWER. Too many of these generals have all sorts of ideas, but I do point this out. I have got the Secretary of Defense, whom I trust, and who I know is honest in his study, analysis, and conclusions. That's Secretary Gates. And beneath him assisting him is the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff who I similarly trust, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff with those two are my military advisers, and I have been long enough in the military service that I assure you that I cannot be particularly disturbed because everybody with a parochial viewpoint all over the place comes along and takes and says that the bosses know nothing about it."

Mr. MCGEE. The administration is trying to maintain an earlier system of warfare while developing a newer system, and to move sensibly from one to the other without becoming weak enough to invite attack as the changeover is made. Well, this is an extremely delicate maneuver. And perhaps only the administration with its exact information on our strength and its educated estimates of Russian strength can judge if it is being carried off. But to fully answer the first question that we posed—does this country have the military strength it needs? We will have to say this, we do not have the missiles. We do have the bombers. But today there is no assurance that the bombers will even get off the ground, and since they are the only answer to Russia's lead in missiles we must conclude, no, we do not have the military strength we need.

And that leads us to the second question. Why not? Well, we already have part of the answer. We relied too much on the heavy atomic bomb and the big bombers to deliver them, and we underrated Russia's ability to build any atomic bomb, to say nothing of lightweight ones or long-range missiles to deliver them.

Getting off to a late start, all the services launched similar development projects and fought bitterly amongst themselves, since each realized that in the future only the service that had the missiles would survive. Now this happened under a Democratic administration and carried over into a Republican administration. Ruben B. Robertson, Jr., served as Deputy Secretary of Defense during a critical part of that time. Starting in 1955 here he recalls the climate of those early days:

"Mr. ROBERTSON. The scientists had only recently pointed out great developments in atomic weapon strength in lighter weights, and this opened up a field which had not formerly seemed practical to have ballistic missiles which had much greater values in

these 5,000-mile missiles than the air-breather type of missiles, and it was decided to go ahead with highest priority, and the job was given to the Air Force.

"In that period, however, the President and Mr. Dulles became increasingly aware of the shorter term need. This long-range missile was going to take quite a few years, and it was determined that a quicker job could be done on a 1,500-mile missile, and how could that be done best? And after careful review it was decided that the Army ballistic missile group under Dr. von Braun at Redstone, who had been working on a short-range missile, could be expanded quickly and under major effort have the best chance of being in being. But also, the risk of its not being ready indicated the desirability of double-tracking, so the Air Force was given the second role of bringing into being its Thor missile—the Jupiter and the Thor.

"Now this program, including double-tracking of both length missiles, I believe, was organized in a way to get the maximum speed and effort and be ready to put them into operation. This had the fullest support of the President, Mr. Dulles, Mr. Wilson, and the full priorities of the Government were behind it. These programs were explained to Congress, and I believe after days of discussion it was approved by Congress. Everything possible was done during that period. I personally saw many of these companies, and whole industries were providing this kind of rapid support.

"Mr. HACKES. Mr. Robertson, we hear some talk nowadays and in the recent past that perhaps had we spent more money at an earlier time we would have been further ahead in this whole missile business. Did you feel anywhere along the way during your years in the Wilson regime that you could have used more money to develop faster?

"Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Hackes, certainly during the period as these decisions were reached the President and the whole administration gave the fullest support in terms of the money that was required against the scientific jobs to be done. We moved forward in the ballistic program at the rate of from very low amount of money, a few millions, to two hundred million, five hundred million, a billion and a quarter, and that was moving as fast as the basic scientific work could be done. We were at times asked to take additional money, perhaps five hundred million or a billion more. It could have been wasted; but as far as I could see, carefully following it, there was enough money for the jobs that were needed or could be done at that time."

Mr. McGEE. And now we come to the third and in many ways the most important question: What more can be done? Since the greatest immediate threat is from enemy and long-range missiles, a means of intercepting and destroying them must be developed, and for a report on this here again is Peter Hackes.

Mr. HACKES. Well, the blunt, inescapable fact is that we have no defense now against enemy ICBM's, and we won't have for some time to come. There have been several anti-missile systems to propose. The Air Force once had one called Project Wizard, but it never was given more than a token amount of money, just a study contract. More recently, an advance Bomarc has been proposed by the Air Force as an antimissile weapon. The Army for some years has been working on an anti-missile-missile system to be called Nike-Zeus. It is a controversial system. The Air Force and other factions inside the Pentagon have called it impractical and unproved, and, to say the least, too costly. The Army itself says it can't develop Zeus and its bases for less than \$6 billion to \$10 billion. To date, just under \$600 million has been spent on Zeus, most of it in research and development. Early this month the Nike-Zeus test model was fired successfully

at White Sands, N. Mex. It's a so-called bullet-to-bullet—a missile to knock out a missile system which some experts say is not nearly as good as a vehicle which might set up a field of radiation, for example, which would kill an enemy missile without having to hit it. And Nike-Zeus, if it works, might knock out its enemy nuclear target precariously close to the American cities at which it is aimed, thereby creating a possibly dangerous atomic fallout situation for the population.

Thus, the theoretical battle over how best to develop a workable antimissile system continues. The Army, out to silence its critics and incidentally to remain in the space business, must prove the Nike-Zeus concept is a good one.

Two days ago the Army released a film of what is called the first kill of a ballistic missile in flight—the weapon, the Army's Hawk, a supersonic interceptor missile for antiaircraft use. It was fired at White Sands against another Army supersonic missile, Honest John. As this film reports, the shot was successful, and the Army now says it feels it has established the feasibility of the system which will lead to Nike-Zeus.

The Honest John was shot down from a height of 7 miles. That's about as high as the Hawk will strike a target. But the Russian intercontinental missiles will be far more highly developed than Honest John. They will be flying at speeds of about 16,000 miles an hour, hundreds of miles up in space. It is a far cry from the Hawk's demonstration to the success of Nike-Zeus, although the Hawk firing is a good step in that direction. And at this point it has not yet been decided by the powers that be whether Nike-Zeus can ever become a workable antimissile weapon.

For some important answers to the Zeus question we decided to go to one of those powers, a man whose opinion will carry at least as much weight as any other, the Defense Department's Director of Military Research and Engineering, Dr. Herbert F. York.

"Mr. HACKES. With so many millions already spent on an antimissile weapon, that is, the Nike-Zeus, what is taking it so long to decide whether Nike-Zeus will ever be useful?

"Mr. YORK. Well, there simply are a number of very important technical problems left that we are not going to get answers to, or we are not going to be satisfied with the answers until we can actually see these perform in a real experimental case rather than just on paper. It is going to take a couple of more years to get such tests actually performed.

"On the other hand, we are following it very closely and there could be some reason for changing our minds, at the present time we decided not to go into production on the Zeus. This could perhaps change, even before such steps, if other factors made it seem more important, more urgent than it now seems, made the prospects look better than they now seem.

"Mr. HACKES. Well, if it is going to take some year or two before we can decide whether to go ahead with Zeus, wouldn't it be something of a practical matter to be working at the same time right now with some parallel system to take over if Nike-Zeus is dropped?

"Mr. YORK. Well, we are examining on a more of a research basis and study basis quite a few alternatives to Zeus. None of them are as far along or even as promising as Zeus at the present time. But we are looking into methods for making the intercept closer to launch than so close to the terminal point, looking into other methods for detecting missiles than the method used by the Zeus, other possible methods of making the interception and making the missile kill, as we call it. The collection of all of these other attempts is what is known as

the defender program, which is the program of the Advanced Research Project Agency. These are not parallel to Zeus in the sense that they have roughly equal amounts, they are the same size, or that they could be done in the same time, but they are alternatives to Zeus, and they are being pursued at a level in total of around an additional hundred million dollars a year."

Mr. McGEE. Well, many of these matters are being argued today by Congress. Let's get representative political views on whether enough is being done by turning first to Republican Senator SYLVES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

"Mr. BRIDGES. I think the U.S. Government today as a result of the action of this administration has put national security ahead of all other matters, and I think they should because I think the survival of this country is the most important thing to every American and to the free world.

"Now the proof of the pudding is in the eating. And the proof of the pudding is that after 7 years of the Eisenhower administration this country today has the most powerful military offense in the world, and that is borne out by the fact not only what President Eisenhower, with his vast experience, has said, but also statements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others on whose shoulders the responsibility will fall to defend this Nation in case of an attack.

"In other words, we have got away from the feast or famine policies of the past in defense, and we are in that position today, and as long as we fail to measure on some individual item where comparisons can be made I think that statement is true."

"Question: Senator, you've been extremely critical of the administration's conduct of our missile defense effort. What basically do you feel is wrong with it, and why?

"Senator SYMINGTON. The people of the United States are not getting the facts, and I intend to give the facts consistently. That's my job as a Senator in the Armed Services Committee. Our program is lagging because we will not spend the money to equal Soviet production. We have got good long range missiles, good short range missiles. We have a good new airplane in the B-58, but we are not willing to put up the money in order to stay strong so that we can stay free. I am one of those who believe that permanent peace can only come through disarmament agreement, and that our only chance for successful negotiation is to negotiate from a position of relative strength."

"Question: Does the public play a role in this missile program? Do we lack this so-called sense of urgency in this country?

"Senator SYMINGTON. We lack a sense of urgency only because the leadership doesn't give us that sense. The people are complacent. They are not soft, however, in my opinion. They will do whatever is necessary in order to stay strong so as to stay free, but they have to be led and they have to be told the truth."

"Question. Senator BUSH, in your opinion, are we producing enough of the big missiles to deter an enemy attack? In other words, is the Nation safe?

"Senator BUSH. Well, I certainly don't think the Nation is safe, and I don't think we are going to be safe for a long time to come because there isn't anything that can stop an attack, a launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles from Europe if they want to launch them, and nothing can stop them landing here. I think that we are not producing enough big missiles to deter an enemy attack, but if you look at our overall defensive position and the position that we are developing, not only in connection with the ICBM, but the intermediate range, the Navy missiles, the Polaris missiles launchable from a submarine, when you consider these things together I believe that we are

building a deterrent; I believe we have a deterrent, in the first place, which would make it extremely unwise, in fact highly unlikely that we would be attacked, but as our deterrent is being built up I believe that we will continue to have that protection, but we have got to keep building it up at a satisfactory rate. We can't slack on this, and we are going to have to face the fact that we are going to have a big defense budget not only this year and next year, but for a good many years to come.

"Senator JACKSON. The problem is will we be able to do it next year and the year after? At the moment the Soviets have, and according to our own experts in the Department of Defense representing the administration, they now have and will continue to have a very substantial lead in ICBM's, intercontinental ballistic missiles. Now an ICBM can reach its target in 30 minutes from the point it has been launched to point of impact. A manned bomber takes many, many hours to get to the target. At the moment we have the deterrent capability because the Soviets have a limited number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. But the problem is that next year and the year after they will have a very substantial number of ICBM's. We will not. We will, therefore, be placing in jeopardy our means of preventing war; namely, the preservation of our retaliatory force.

"Now what do we do about it? Well, what we must do is to get those ICBM's for 1961, 1962, and 1963 by putting the orders in now. You see, you can't go down in a bargain basement and buy them. It takes a year and a half to 2 years to get them, and unless we take the action now we won't have them next year and the year after, it's that simple.

"Question. Senator, President Eisenhower disagrees with you, I might say, rather emphatically. He says that we have all the defense we need and that he as a military man knows best about these things.

"Senator JACKSON. Well, frankly there's been too much of this 'Papa knows best.' There are just a long list of generals recently that have opposed the President, disagreed with him violently. I like to remind the American people once again that shortly before Korea Mr. Eisenhower came down to Washington and advised that the maximum amount of money that we could spend on our defense budget was \$14 billion. It wasn't long before we had to raise it to \$40 billion.

"Then we were told by Mr. Eisenhower prior to sputnik that everything was fine, that we didn't need to worry. Then he had to come out after sputnik and admit that we were behind in the missile and the satellite area. So his record has not been perfect and he, like most of us, is fallible; indeed, he is not infallible."

Mr. MCGEE. President Eisenhower says that the people must make the final decision, that if the people inform themselves they will make good decisions. Well, millions of words intended to inform have been written and spoken on this subject, so we thought it would be interesting to learn the present state of public thinking on these most important questions.

"Question. Do you think we are behind Russia in missiles?

"MAN. Well, that's a loaded question because some of our big brass in Washington say one thing and the others say another, and President Eisenhower says something else, so I don't know. Offhand I'm a little leery. I think maybe we possibly are behind.

"Question. Do you think we are behind Russia in missiles?

"WOMAN. From everything I've read, I think that. That's the only thing I have to go by.

"Question. Are you worried about the Russian missile threat?

"WOMAN. Yes; very definitely. And I think everybody else should be too.

"Question. This is Mrs. Stephen Epstein of Atlanta. Mrs. Epstein, what do you think of our missile program?

"Mrs. EPSTEIN. I think that it's a very important thing, and I think that the whole thing has been handled very well. Of course, we are relatively new in field, but I think we have spent a lot of money, but it's a worthwhile program.

"Question. Do you think we're behind Russia in missiles?

"Mrs. EPSTEIN. Well, no; I don't. I think that President Eisenhower says we are not; if he thinks we are not, I'm not one to argue with the boss.

"MAN. Well, I think our missile program is all right. The only thing about it, I think we got a late start behind Russia and I think just give us time and we will catch up with Russia. It might take a year or two, but I think all you got to do is just give us the time. In other words, we just got started later than Russia did on that program and I think that we will catch up.

"Question. Do you worry particularly about the Russian missile threat and program?

"WOMAN. No; I don't, because I think that the people we have elected to our Government are advised and capable of taking care of that, and I think they are.

"Question. Do you have the feeling that we are lagging behind Russia in the missile program?

"WOMAN. Well, according to all reports we are.

"Question. Does this particularly worry you? Does the Russian missile threat bother you personally?

"WOMAN. Well, no, I'm afraid it doesn't personally. I'm afraid I don't let that bother me. There's too many other things I feel like are more important. Maybe they are not, but they are to me personally.

"Question. May I ask you what you think of our country's missile program?

"WOMAN. Well, I think that we are progressing, but I think we need to have more appropriations so we can go farther than what we have. I think we are behind. I think Russia is very much ahead of the United States and I think we need to have more appropriations so we can go ahead.

"Question. Does this fact bother you? Does the Russian missile threat bother you personally?

"WOMAN. Well, I can't say it bothers me personally; no. But as a whole, for my family and for the future generations it does worry me.

"Question. What do you think of our country's missile program?

"MAN. Well, I think they are doing everything possible to get this thing underway. Sometimes you begin to be concerned about them being a little sluggish about it, but I think the powers that be are pretty well on their toes up there. They know what is going on.

"Question. How about the Russians, do you think we are behind them?

"MAN. That's the biggest joke I ever—they are only trying to frame us American people. We're too far ahead of them by a hundred percent.

"Question. How about what they call the Russian missile threat? Are you worried about it?

"MAN. No; not while we got the boys down in Washington. We don't have to worry about none of those guys.

"WOMAN. I really think they should do something about it. Whether they need more money or not I don't know because I haven't studied it enough, but we are behind according to what everybody says, and I would like to see us, you know, be up with them.

"Question. Are you worried about the Russian missile threat?

"WOMAN. No.

"Question. What do you think of our missile program?

"MAN. What do you mean by what I think of the missile program?

"Question. Is it going well?

"MAN. Going well? I just don't think it's going as fast as a place like the United States, as big as the United States, should be going.

"Question. Well now supposing somebody runs for Congress and says we have got to spend a lot more money for missiles. Do you vote for him or against him?

"MAN. Well, I would have to look at the issues first. I mean I'd have to know more about what they want it for and how deep they are going, because I believe there are a lot of other things that are more important here in our own country.

"Question. Sir, do you think we have enough missiles in our arsenal?

"MAN. Well, I don't know. I'm not much on that kind of stuff in general.

"Question. Do you think we're spending too much money for our Armed Forces?

"MAN. Well, no; I don't think we are because it's helping a lot of people working, you know, keeping a lot of people working.

"Question. If we were to have a bigger bunch of missiles would you be willing to pay higher taxes to get them?

"MAN. Well, if it helps everybody work I would, you know. That's the main thing nowadays, to try to keep people off of unemployment.

"Question. Sir, what do you consider the state of the United States missile programs?

"MAN. Well, I'm a newcomer to the States. I just came from London, and I think that they are treating the Russian threat much too lightly.

"Question. Would you spend more tax money to get more missiles?

"MAN. Yes, I think I would. I think you 'got a wonderful country here and it would be a pity to see anything happen for the want of spending a few more dollars.

"Question. Do you think this country has enough missiles?

"WOMAN. Don't ask me, I wouldn't know. They are wasting plenty of money on them anyway.

"Question. Do you think we are spending too much money on them?

"WOMAN. Yes; I do.

"Question. How about the Russians, you're not worried about them spending a lot?

"WOMAN. Well, they are way ahead of us.

"Question. But you don't think we have got much to worry about?

"WOMAN. No."

Mr. MCGEE. On Wednesday of this week, as the debate in Congress grew even more fierce, President Eisenhower decided to visit Cape Canaveral, Fla., to see for the first time a military missile facility. The next day at his press conference the President said he felt much better about our missile program.

In our study for this program we have found that whereas the President says the people must make the final decision, they are instead generally relying on the decisions that he has already made.

The President of the United States says this country has the military strength that it needs, that in effect enough strength is enough, and that moreover he knows more on this subject than anyone else. There is no one who can effectively argue these points with him. He is a general who has spent all but a fraction of his life in military service. As President of the United States he receives top secret reports on the military strength of this country as well as any of its potential enemies. And yet, there are other generals who will argue these points with him. And there are men in public life who receive at least part of these secret reports who dispute him as well.

Well, I have neither the expertness of a long military and scientific background nor

access to the top secret reports that would enable me to choose without error between them, nor has any other reporter. I can only study, as I have, and arrive at a relative judgment. And this would be my relative judgment. Concede the President every claim that he makes, and there would still remain a most precarious balance between the military strength of this country and that of the Soviet Union.

We are spending \$40 billion a year for defense. It would take such a little more to make what might be a vital difference, a little more to build the rockets that they have developed more rapidly than we are doing, a little more to keep SAC strong and effective, and a little more to speed development of the interceptor missiles and the warning systems that we are told are waiting only for this money.

I firmly believe that at the very least this money should be spent. It amounts to this: We have a good insurance policy, we firmly expect to have an even better one, but it would be sheer folly to allow one to lapse before we actually do have the other.

This is Frank McGee, NBC News. Good evening.

At his news conference of February 3, 1960, President Eisenhower stated that the people "can make the decisions. All you have to do is to inform yourselves and you will make good decisions."

I feel that much of the confusion both in the minds of the people and in the statements within the administration itself are due to the need for the firm and clear decisions by the President himself. If the President takes the initiative to make the decisions and would inform the people boldly, clearly and precisely, then the people would be able to get the facts.

In approaching issues of national security, and the space and missile program, I trust that the President will also keep in proper perspective the over-riding importance of education as the basis for our national security now and in the future. More important than the military hardware we build today or the man we put in space tomorrow are the brains of the Nation which will enable us to press onward and constantly improve our technology. We need not only scientists and engineers to compete with the Soviet Union, but we need people trained in the social sciences to help point the way toward higher living standards and to find the means for world peace. And we need people trained in the humanities to help us use intelligently our new-won leisure, and to help raise the moral tone of society. I trust, therefore, that the President will stress that education is the very foundation of national security.

And so, when the President goes on the air Sunday night, the hopes and the prayers of the Nation will be with him. The Nation holds out the fervent hope that he will speak with the all-powerful voice of national leadership.

We all wish for the President good health, clear vision, the power of executive decision, and above all the leadership to inform the people, stir the people, and unify them to move forward to achieve America's national destiny.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I think the gentleman has made a very excellent statement. I would like to submit this thought for the gentleman's consideration. Is there not much more than international prestige involved in this? Was not the statement made before your committee by George Allen on what the effect of this sputnik had been in terms of our commercial relationship with other nations, and did he not testify before your committee that the purchasers in other nations have looked to the Soviet Union more than they had in previous years for the purchase of their mechanical equipment?

Mr. HECHLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is a member now and was a member during the last session of the Space Committee. Did he last year, when the budget for the Space Agency was before the Congress, object in any way whatsoever to the reductions that the Congress made in the President's request for funds for NASA?

Mr. HECHLER. No; I did not.

Mr. FORD. How can the gentleman then complain about lack of leadership in 1960 if he made no effort to remedy the fund deficiencies that the Congress perpetrated in 1959?

Mr. HECHLER. It seems to me that the President occupies a unique position of leadership to articulate the needs for this program. After all, we here in Congress have the function of examining what the President proposes. We have repeatedly on occasions in the past, and I cite the case of the Polaris submarine as one example, appropriated money which was not spent by the executive branch.

Mr. FORD. I would like to correct the RECORD on the Polaris submarine. The money was obligated in the fiscal years in which it was made available. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected, but I believe the gentleman is in error.

Mr. HECHLER. I will cite another example, the case of the Nike-Zeus, where we had testimony before our committee that \$137 million had been appropriated for the fiscal year 1960 for this very vital program, but the executive branch refused to allow it to be spent.

Mr. WOLF. Did I understand that the gentleman has asked to place the entire statement of General Medaris in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. HECHLER. That is correct, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia, who was kind enough to yield me a portion of his time, have permission to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to those who have special orders following the gentleman, and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman, as he said in the announcement sent to all offices in the House and as he indicated here, has been critical of the President's leadership, not only in the space programs, but I gather in certain military programs.

I think it is proper to point out, because according to my information these are the facts, that the Congress must share some blame if there is to be blame passed around. First, over the last six sessions of the Congress, the Congress, has reduced in toto the President's military budget by \$1.9 billion. So if there are any fund deficiencies for programs that are essential now and in the future, the Congress must share certain responsibility in that regard.

Second: In the last two sessions of the Congress the Space Agency has had its budget cut by the Congress to the extent of approximately \$80.4 million. We have heard a considerable amount of criticism in the last few months about the inadequacies of our space program. Much of this criticism has been coming from people in the political arena.

Every time I hear those criticisms I wonder whether that individual in either this body or the other body raised his or her voice to protest these reductions which were made in the funding program the President recommended for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Very few people in either this body or the other body made any effort even to fund the President's space program to the amount he recommended. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. HECHLER. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan I am pleased with his remarks about the funding program.

Mr. FORD. I protested myself the cuts in the Space Agency budget when it was on the floor of the House in 1958 and again last year. The record will so verify.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With respect to what the gentleman from Michigan has stated, let me point out that the President of the United States has had occasion to veto appropriations bills that have been passed by the Congress of the United States. One example was the independent offices bill of the last Congress. Another was the public works appropriation bill. So that if the President of the United States believed that the funds that were voted by the Congress for the Department of Defense were inadequate, he had the opportunity to veto it and sent it back to the Congress, telling them that in his judgment the bill was inadequate for the purpose he had sent it up there for in the first place.

Secondly, with respect to the declaration of the gentleman from Michigan as to whether or not the gentleman from West Virginia had protested against the cut in the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I have in my hand the report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1960

which contains the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and which showed that the cut was \$45 million out of a total appropriation of \$485 million.

With the gentleman's permission I should like to read just how this reduction was distributed. I quote from page 4 of that report under the heading "National Aeronautics and Space Administration":

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The committee has considered budget estimates totaling \$530,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including \$45 million for the fiscal year 1959 and \$485,300,000 for the fiscal year 1960. The committee recommends appropriations totaling \$484,800,000, which is an increase of \$145,894,168 over the obligational authority presently available in fiscal year 1959, including the \$154,619,532 transferred from the Department of Defense shortly after the new agency was created. This is a reduction of \$45,500,000 in total budget estimates. The legislative authorization for these appropriations is contained in Public Laws 86-12 and 86-45.

Salaries and expenses: The \$91,400,000 included in the bill for salaries and expenses is an increase of \$17,251,002 over the comparable amount in 1959, or 23 percent, and is a reduction of \$3,030,000 in the budget estimate. This appropriation finances all salary costs for NASA personnel, most of the expense related to the operation of the NASA research centers, and certain other activities.

The amount approved provides for a staff of 9,836 employees in 1960. This is an increase of 875 over the total number of authorized positions in 1959. It provides for substantial expansion of effort in space and missile research.

Research and development, 1959: The committee recommends \$18,675,000 for research and development under the fiscal year 1959 authorization. The budget estimate is \$20,750,000. The entire item is for the design, engineering and beginning construction of 12 satellite capsules. Funds for 1960 include an additional \$70 million for the balance of such procurement, and for 25 ICBM boosters.

Research and development, 1960: The committee considered a budget estimate of \$333,070,000 for this purpose and recommends \$300 million. This appropriation provides funds for the support of NASA research centers, all costs of operating the Jet Propulsion Laboratory including salaries of its 2,300 employees, research contracts with universities and other organizations, research by contract with private firms for specific areas of activity, and for the procurement and development of specific vehicles.

Language has been included in the bill which will require the specific approval of the Space Committees of the Congress on projects of a capital nature over \$250,000 instead of mere notification. The legislative committees keep the authorized program under their control and this prevents the handing over of blank checks to the agency.

Construction and equipment, 1959: The bill contains \$22,725,000 for this item as compared with the budget estimate and authorization of \$24,250,000. It includes \$9 million for new facilities, improvements to existing facilities, and the acquisition of approximately 70 acres of land for the modernization and expansion of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Construction and equipment, 1960: The committee recommends an appropriation of \$52 million for construction and equipment items for 1960, which is a reduction of \$5,800,000 in the budget estimate. All the

items proposed have been approved but it is believed the NASA can make savings in the total program to the extent of the reduction. If additional sums are needed they can be obtained from other available appropriations under the 5-percent transfer authority included in the bill. Language has also been included requiring the approval of the Space Committees of the Congress for any new facilities which have not been previously authorized. This prevents the handing over of blank checks.

General provisions: The Committee is aware that unanticipated needs may arise in a scientific organization of this type and has included language authorizing the transfer of up to 5 percent between appropriations.

Language has also been included in the bill making the general provisions of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1960 applicable to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration inasmuch as funds for this agency would normally be carried in that bill.

May I point out to the gentleman from Michigan that during the debate on the Space Agency's appropriation in the House last year on June 29, \$18 million of the cut was restored. These additional funds, plus the provision of flexibility which permitted the Agency to shift funds as it needed them, as is shown in the committee's report, gave it, to all intents and purposes, the amount of money that had been approved by the President's own Bureau of the Budget.

My own feelings are that in this race we have with Russia in the missile field, a race toward equality, because I think now we are behind Russia in the missile field, I would have given the full amount that was requested for this appropriation. But the gentleman has been a member of the Appropriations Committee as long as I have, some 12 years.

Over that period of time, the gentleman, too, has engaged in reductions. I think that ordinarily he would have considered, as I think the members of this committee considered, and neither of us was a member of this committee, that the members of this committee did not err too greatly in having made a minor reduction of this type. Perhaps, it was unfortunate that it was done for the Space Administration. I agree with that, but in the total amount of money, taking \$45 million from a total of \$485 million, that is not an unusual amount or unusual thing for the Congress to do.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. May I have a minute to respond to the gentleman from Illinois? The reduction last year made by the Congress totaled approximately 10 percent below the President's budget for the Space Agency. Under no circumstances am I contending that that \$45 million would have catapulted the United States ahead of the Soviet Union in the one area that we are behind, the area of thrust or propulsion. We know that that is going to take several years and a considerable amount more than \$45 million. My only point is this: Some of the critics of the President's space programs, when they have the chance to do something affirmatively and constructively—when they have that opportunity—they never raise

their finger to give assistance. Many, if not all, have never made one effort, to my knowledge, on the floor of the House to even fund the program to the extent that the President requested.

In other words, I question to some extent their sincerity in trying to make the space program better. I simply suggest that some of the criticism might be politically motivated.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that Mr. Eisenhower is the President of the United States; he is the leader of all the American people; he is your leader as well as my leader, and he is supposed to give us leadership as a nation. The gentleman from West Virginia has contended that Mr. Eisenhower has not demonstrated that leadership and he has done so very powerfully by quoting the President's own statements in his press conferences where he has said our international prestige is not at stake in the space race. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan does not agree with the President in that statement. I am sure he will agree that there is clearly involved here the question of our national prestige.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan right there whether he would agree with the statement that our international prestige is at stake in this space race. Would he agree with that or disagree with that statement?

Mr. FORD. I will answer in this way. I have supported the President, as my record will show very substantially, in the 7 years that he has held office. My areas of disagreement with him are few. I said before, and I will say now, I have not agreed with the space program that the administration has sponsored. But, I have a greater area of disagreement with the democratically controlled Congress because it has not even supported the President's program with necessary funds.

Mr. HECHLER. I would say to the gentleman that money is not everything.

Mr. FORD. No; but it buys a lot of hardware and research and development.

Mr. HECHLER. We are engaged in a great battle of psychological warfare in which every man, woman, and child in this country is involved. That is why I am calling for the President to exert the leadership that will make the people of this country realize the crisis they are facing. What we do in the Department of Defense or in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is important, but it is equally a fact and even more important that the people in this country must understand the nature of the crisis and support the work that we are doing. So this is much more than a question of money.

Mr. YATES. Let me point out that there is involved here too the question of psychology. The gentleman from Michigan is talking about reductions in appropriations by a Democratic Congress. I think some of the reductions have been deplorable. But is this not a perfectly natural thing to have done when one considers the psychological impact not only of the President's demands in stressing economy, but of the

former Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, who came before our Committee on Appropriations at a time when the President's budget had been submitted only a few days before, and saying that the budget can be cut? He was the one who said the budget could be cut. And when the President was asked about that, he, too, said he thought the budget could be cut in some respects. The President himself sent up this budget. The President did not protest as to any reductions that had been made by the Congress. He could have vetoed the bills if he thought the reductions were too drastic. He paid no attention to them. As a matter of fact, I would not be surprised if the President did not approve of the reductions that had been made in view of the statements that he had been making.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Polaris submarine, I would like to point out that in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental appropriation, the President recommended appropriations for three Polaris submarines, and the Congress appropriated funds for three Polaris submarines. Now in the fiscal year 1959, the President's budget recommended two Polaris submarines, but the Congress appropriated funds for six Polaris submarines.

Although Congress appropriated the funds in the summer of 1958 for these additional Polaris submarines, the Bureau of the Budget withheld funds for one Polaris submarine until December 30, 1958, and the Bureau of the Budget refused to release funds for three additional submarines until the very last day of the 1959 fiscal year—June 30, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that at this moment the subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on which I am serving is meeting, and I feel it incumbent to attend that meeting.

I ask unanimous consent at this point that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 345)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith submit to the Congress the articles of agreement for the establishment of the International Development Association. I recommend legislation authorizing U.S. membership in the Association and providing for payment of the subscription obligations prescribed in the articles of agreement.

The Association is designed to assist the less developed countries of the free

world by increasing the flow of development capital on flexible terms. The advisability of such an institution was proposed by Senate Resolution 264 of 1958. Following this resolution, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems undertook a study of the question. The Council's conclusions and the favorable response of representatives of other governments who were consulted during the course of the study have resulted in the articles of agreement which satisfy the objectives of that resolution and which I am submitting herewith. The accompanying special report of the Council describes the articles in detail.

We all know that every country needs capital for growth but that the needs are greatest where income and savings are low. The less developed countries need to secure from abroad large amounts of capital equipment to help in their development. Some part of this they can purchase with their current savings, some part they can borrow on conventional terms, and some part is provided by private foreign investors. But in many less developed countries, the need for capital imports exceeds the amounts they can reasonably hope to secure through normal channels. The Association is a multilateral institution designed to provide a margin of finance that will allow them to go forward with sound projects that do not fully qualify for conventional loans.

In many messages to the Congress, I have emphasized the clear interest of the United States in the economic growth of the less developed countries. Because of this fundamental truth the people of our country are attempting in a number of ways to promote such growth. Technical and economic aid is supplied under the mutual security program. In addition, many projects are assisted by loans from the Export-Import Bank, and we also participate with other free world countries in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which is doing so much to channel funds, mainly from private sources, to the less developed areas. While we have joined with the other American Republics in the Inter-American Development Bank, there is no wide international institution which, like our Development Loan Fund, can help finance sound projects requiring a broad flexibility in repayment terms, including repayment in the borrower's currency.

Conceived to meet this need, the International Development Association represents a joint determination by the economically advanced countries to help accelerate progress in the less developed countries. It is highly gratifying that so many other free world countries are now ready to join with us in this objective.

The Association is a cooperative venture, to be financed by the member governments of the International Bank. It is to have initial subscriptions totaling \$1 billion, of which the subscription of the United States would be \$320.29 million and the subscriptions of the other economically strong countries would be \$442.78 million. The funds made avail-

able by these countries would be freely convertible. The developing countries would subscribe \$236.93 million, of which 10 percent would be freely convertible. Members would pay their subscriptions over a 5-year period and would periodically reexamine the adequacy of the Association's resources.

The International Development Association thus establishes a mechanism whereby other nations can join in the task of providing capital to the less developed areas on a flexible basis. Contribution by the less developed countries themselves, moreover, is a desirable element of this new institution. In addition, the Association may accept supplementary resources provided by one member in the currency of another member. Thus, some part of the foreign currencies acquired by the United States primarily from its sales of surplus agricultural commodities may be made available to the Association when desirable and agreed to by the member whose currency is involved.

The articles of agreement give the Association considerable scope in its lending operations so that it can respond to the varied needs of its members. And because it is to be an affiliate of the International Bank, it will benefit from the long and successful lending experience of the Bank. By combining the Bank's high standards with flexible repayment terms, it can help finance sound projects that cannot be undertaken by existing sources. With a framework that safeguards existing institutions and traditional forms of finance, the Association can both supplement and facilitate private investment. It will provide an extra margin of capital that can give further momentum to growth in the developing countries on terms that will not overburden their economies and their repayment capacities.

The peoples of the world will grow in freedom, toleration, and respect for human dignity as they achieve reasonable economic and social progress under a free system. The further advance of the less developed areas is of major importance to the nations of the free world, and the Association provides an international institution through which we may all effectively cooperate toward this end. It will perform a valuable service in promoting the economic growth and cohesion of the free world. I am convinced that participation by the United States is necessary, and I urge the Congress to act promptly to authorize the United States to join with the other free nations in the establishment of the Association.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1960.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 U.S.C. 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HOLTZMAN, New York; Mr. McINTIRE, Maine.

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING THE EISENHOWER AD- MINISTRATION

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Secretary of Agriculture made a most comprehensive and imperative statement regarding our agricultural accomplishments and achievements during the Eisenhower administration. He further amplified and explained the President's recent special farm message to the Congress.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 18, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss our agriculture's problems with you once again.

This is the beginning of my 8th year as Secretary of Agriculture. Since I first assumed office we have met often, and I believe we can agree that we have mutually made substantial gains in some areas but most regrettably have left much to be desired in others. We have a common goal, one especially meaningful to me, a farmer for many years—the goal of building a better, more rewarding, more dependable, present and future for the men, women and children who live on our Nation's farms. I am here today to work cooperatively with you toward this goal.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF AGRICULTURE

It is always exhilarating and deeply gratifying to me to recount the tremendous advances in agricultural technology and efficiency. The remarkable surge in productivity of 1958, when crop output rose 11 percent and total production 8 percent, was followed last year by another 12 months of record output. In 1959, crop production equaled the 1958 record, while livestock production rose about 2½ percent.

All of this is a salute to our farmers, truly America's finest people.

Increasing efficiency

Our farmers and ranchers are working marvels in producing an abundance of food and fiber. Their productivity is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry. Since 1950, output per man-hour in nonagricultural industry has risen at a rate of 2 percent per year. The increase of output per man-hour in agriculture has averaged 5 percent per year. This fact illustrates the futility of attempting to control total production of a few crops by the present system of acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

In 1939, when World War II broke out in Europe, American farmers produced 11.8 million bales of cotton on 24 million acres. In 1959 they produced 28 percent more cotton on some 35 percent fewer acres.

In 1939, farmers produced 740 million bushels of wheat on 52½ million acres. In 1959 they produced about 50 percent more wheat on about the same acreage. In 1958, on comparable acreage, the wheat crop hit 1,460 million bushels—nearly double 1939.

Both land and animals have been made much more productive. There are over 60 million beef cattle and calves on the same pastures and range lands that in 1939 supported only 30 million head.

In 1959 there were about 4 million fewer dairy cows on U.S. farms than in 1939. But each cow produced on the average nine-tenths of a ton more milk, and total dairy production was about 18 billion pounds higher.

For every two eggs a hen laid in 1939, today's hen is laying three.

A man-hour of farm labor in 1959 produced nearly three times what it did 20 years ago. In World War I we produced our farm commodities with 13½ million workers; in World War II, with 10½ million workers. Today there are only 7 to 7½ million farm workers. But total output is one-third higher than in World War II and nearly double that of World War I.

As Secretary of Agriculture, and as one who has himself struggled with the practical problems of farming, I report these facts to this committee with great pride. America's farmers have accomplished results beyond any other section of our country's economy. We should praise them for it.

Benefits to all

Moreover, their unmatched productivity has given all our people far better diets, and helped give them far better health. It has done much to make possible the rising standard of living in the Nation at large. It has released manpower for industry and the professions. It has made food a good buy and kept it a good buy. Our people today purchase much more food for an hour's take home pay than they could a generation ago.

There is probably no field of economic activity in which the United States is so clearly a world leader as it is in agriculture. Never in any nation or civilization have so many been so well fed by so small a proportion of the population. Never has America owed more gratitude to its people in agriculture.

I stress this point because of the growing tendency in some quarters to blame the farmer for agricultural surpluses and the big agricultural budget. With all the forcefulness at my command I say that this is false and unfair. As regards surpluses our farmers have simply done as their Government has persistently urged. They have responded to the governmental incentives of high mandatory price supports and too weak controls, just as all other citizens do and would do. Moreover as farmers well know, a substantial part of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture benefit all segments of the population and are used effectively in international relations.

Stability in agriculture

Of course there are continuing problems and these I will discuss later. But these heartening facts should not be overlooked.

Total agricultural assets are at an all-time high of \$208.2 billion.

Total debt owed by farmers is \$24 billion, or only 11½ percent of agricultural assets.

The net equity of U.S. farmers is \$184.2 billion—an increase of \$33 billion since 1952 and \$141 billion since 1940.

Per capita income from all sources of persons living on farms last year was \$960, \$109 more than the 1947-49 average.

Farm ownership is record high, with two out of three farms free of mortgage debt.

Farm foreclosures are extremely rare—near a record low.

The overall stability of agriculture evidenced by such facts as these does not mean, of course, that farmers and ranchers are free of economic difficulties. On the contrary, many farm people have not shared adequately in the national prosperity of the past decade. And one major cause has been the impact of inflation on farmers' costs of operation.

Inflation

Between 1939 and 1952 the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wage rates, rose from 123 to 287—133 percent. In January 1960 the index stood at 299—up only 4 percent from 1952. But the damage had already been done.

Here is what the immediate postwar inflation did to farmers from 1946 to 1952. Gross farm income increased from \$30 billion in 1946 to \$37 billion in 1952—a rise of \$7 billion. But as compared with the 1946 level realized net farm income had actually dropped by \$800 million by 1952.

The trouble is, agriculture is not like many other businesses, for farmers by and large cannot pass along their increased costs by raising prices.

It is true that during the war demands for farm products increased sharply and farmers' prices rose faster than the prices they had to pay.

But as demand later fell back and farmers' prices sharply dropped, their prices and costs went down only nominally and then soon rose again. Since then the heavy supply situation in agriculture generally and the enormous surpluses of some crops in particular have put a brake on overall price increases of farm products.

Inflation in the nonfarm economy although greatly slowed is still slowly creeping upward. The December 1959 Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index shows prices of services and consumer goods (other than food) up 2.4 percent as compared to a year earlier. The benefits of wider markets for farmers and lower prices for consumers are prevented by persistent cost inflation. In 1959 the retail cost of a typical market basket of farm foods was 13 percent more than 10 years earlier but the farmer received almost 8 percent less for those same foods.

Inflation is constantly dipping into farmers' "keep home" pay. Government can help stop inflation by exercising restraint in its expenditures and sound control over credit, and in this fight a balanced budget is a powerful factor in the fight against inflation. Other segments of the economy, such as labor and management, must do a better job in holding down costs so that farmers' production expenses will not rise further. It will be better still, as productivity improves in industry when savings can be passed along in lower prices.

Farm income

I am deeply concerned about the drop in farm net income last year. It was caused by lower prices of some products, notably hogs, broilers, and eggs, the elimination of the acreage reserve program, and higher production costs.

Realized gross farm income is estimated at \$36.9 billion in 1959. This is about the same as in 1951 and 1952. However, the realized net income of farm operators from farming totaled \$11 billion last year—compared with \$13.1 billion in 1958, but about the same as in 1957.

We look for improvement in some commodities in 1960. Besides record cash receipts from dairying, we anticipate an increase in income from poultry and eggs and a rise in hog prices. I am happy to report that the farm price index went up three points in January. I certainly hope, as our farmers do, that this trend will continue.

PROGRESS OF BASIC USDA PROGRAMS

It is, unfortunately, not generally realized, but much of our USDA expenditures benefit the entire Nation rather than farmers alone.

Attention seems always to center on price and income activities, but the old-line programs of the USDA are of utmost importance to all our citizens. I would like briefly to trace the progress of some of these programs which have far-reaching benefits.

Agricultural research

Aggressive, balanced, and continuous agricultural research is one such program. Problems of production, processing, and marketing continue, and new problems constantly arise. To keep our agriculture sound, we must keep its technology up to date. Thus, we can continue the flow of products from

U.S. farms, ranches, and forests and assure our rapidly growing population of an adequate supply of nutritious, safe, and wholesome food. Scientific research is responsible for much, probably most, of our present-day agricultural progress. Most of our future requirements now appear to be obtainable through constantly improving technology. Continuous research provides that technology.

The field of research is much too broad for adequate review here. Appropriations for research carried on and coordinated by the Department and through funds made available to the land-grant colleges have, broadly speaking, more than doubled since 1952. Nevertheless, more attention is needed for basic research. Later I shall speak more about research on increased utilization of farm commodities and new farm crops.

Extension Service

Of the many factors responsible for the improved living standards which are now at the highest level in history, one of the most important is the know-how of farm management. As this committee well knows, the Extension Service plays the dominant role in the dissemination of information on farm and home management.

The Extension Service has been especially concerned with adjustment problems of people affected by the sweeping changes in agriculture and rural living in recent years.

A recent 2-year comprehensive study of Extension's programs, policies, and objectives revealed nine major program areas where Extension needs to intensify its educational assistance. Extension workers are adjusting their programs in line with these needs.

Marketing

During the past several years the Department has stepped up its efforts to help farmers market their products more efficiently. Through increased emphasis and funds our efforts have more nearly equaled our services in helping farmers.

At the present time there are 37 marketing agreements and order programs on fruits and vegetables in effect compared to 24 such programs on December 31, 1952. During this period 15 new programs have been added and 2 of the existing programs were terminated. The farm value of the commodities covered by these programs totaled \$1,089 million for the 1959 crop. This compares with \$640 million for those programs in effect at the close of the 1952 calendar year.

There are 77 orders now in effect under the Federal milk order program compared to 47 in 1952.

In addition, the Department's regulatory work, market news, inspection, grading and classification, and standardization of farm products all contribute to more efficient marketing. More and better information on agricultural economics and estimated supply and demand is being made available to farmers and the agricultural industry generally.

Soil and water conservation

The conservation of soil, water, and timber resources continues to be among the most important goals of the Department. Conservation is important not only as a means of assuring the permanent productivity of U.S. agriculture, but also as a method of helping achieve balanced farming.

The Soil Conservation Service is providing technical help to 2,847 of the 2,867 soil conservation districts in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These districts include about 95 percent of all farms and ranches and more than 90 percent of the Nation's farmland.

Local organizations over the Nation have submitted about 1,250 applications for assistance in watershed protection and flood prevention work covering more than 89 million acres. The beginning of actual operations has been approved on 212 watersheds

covering about 12½ million acres. Conservation land treatment is progressing satisfactorily on all watersheds.

Owners and operators of more than a million farms and ranches participate in the cost-sharing programs of the agricultural conservation program. Under the ACP farmers and government share on about a 50-50 basis the cost of approved conservation practices.

Our national forests are a vast storehouse of natural resources, embracing 181 million acres in 39 States and Puerto Rico. Improved management and protection in recent years have increased their value and service. New records were achieved last year in the number of recreation visits, the board feet of timber cut, and the number of trees planted. The number of man-caused fires has been reduced by more than 40 percent in the past 5 years.

Farmers Home Administration

The Farmers Home Administration is enabling many deserving farmers to develop adequate-sized businesses, improve their farming methods, make better use of land and labor resources, attain satisfactory living standards and eventually to qualify for credit from regular private and cooperative lending institutions.

During the last fiscal year the amount of loans made and repayments on loans were the highest in the history of the agency. Under its various loan programs the Farmers Home Administration loaned \$361 million during that year and collected \$345 million. I am especially gratified to report that the thousands of farmers and ranchers in the areas that suffered the prolonged drought have done a commendable job of repaying their emergency loans.

During the year 178,000 farmers used the services of the agency and 41,000 during the same time paid their loans in full. Several thousands of additional farmers who called at the local FHA offices for credit were assisted, after their farm business had been analyzed, in getting needed credit from private and cooperative sources. This record year of service was handled by a smaller number of employees than during former years.

Bills are pending in each House which would place the operations of the Farmers Home Administration on a revolving fund basis and permit the Congress annually to review the operations and establish limits on loan authorizations and administrative expenses. In addition, bills have been introduced to simplify the statutory authority of Farmers Home Administration.

Rural Electrification Administration

The electric and telephone systems being financed by the Rural Electrification Administration continue to make good progress. We are proud of the fine record of service to rural people and their communities which has been furnished through this financing. The financial condition of both electric and telephone borrowers continues to strengthen.

Since the REA program began 25 years ago, a total of \$4.1 billion has been loaned for electrification. Of this amount more than one-third or \$1.4 billion has been loaned in the last 7 years.

In the 10-year-old rural telephone program \$633 million has been loaned of which \$552 million or 87 percent has been loaned since 1953.

Sales during 1959 by the rural electric systems totaled 25.3 billion kilowatt-hours. These electric systems connected 139,000 new consumers during 1959. I am sure the committee is aware that five out of six consumers added to the lines were nonfarm consumers.

A substantial part of the loans made to the electric systems continued to be for system improvements to take care of in-

creasing energy loads. More than 27 percent of the 1959 loan approvals financed new generation and transmission facilities.

Bills are pending in each House which would place the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration on a revolving fund basis. This would not interfere with the practice of the Congress annually to review the operations of the electric and telephone loan programs and establish limits and authorizations as in the past.

On this 25th anniversary of the electric program, more than 96 percent of all farms have control station electric service. We believe these systems have sufficiently matured to start paying the cost of money to the Treasury on new loans. At the end of last year the electric borrowers had aggregate net worth of \$602 million or 18.2 percent of total assets.

The President stated in his recent budget message, "It is vital looking ahead that legislation be developed to enable telephone as well as electric borrowers to obtain funds from a mutually owned, financing institution to meet the needs for the future growth of these borrowers. Under this long-range plan loans would also be available from the Rural Electrification Administration to meet special circumstances. The Secretary of Agriculture will work with REA cooperatives and other interested parties in developing such a proposal."

Other activities

Besides the functions of the Department already mentioned, we should take note of the work of our plant quarantine inspectors, and meat inspection service, our pest and disease eradication activities, our Farmer Cooperative Service Crop Insurance, Commodity Exchange Authority and others. All of these provide services not only to agriculture but also to the entire Nation. Some of them such as meat inspection, for example, not only redound to the benefit of agriculture but are in fact primarily in the interest of the general public.

EFFECTIVE USE OF OUR ABUNDANCE

Our Nation has been the most favored in the history of the world in the quality and quantity of its food and fiber production. We rightly should and do regard this as a blessing. Here, also, there are problems. We are thankful for our abundance. We are sharing it. We have directly faced the advantages as well as the problems associated with our bounty.

We are going forward with President Eisenhower's food for peace program. Our efforts center on building upward and outward from the solid foundation of existing programs of which Public Law 480 is the cornerstone.

This has called for a close look at what we are already doing to use our agricultural abundance to help those in need at home and abroad while, at the same time, not overlooking opportunities to develop improved and new approaches.

Exports

Our normal channels of trade are being widened. Our Foreign Agricultural Service estimates that U.S. agricultural exports will be in the neighborhood of \$4.2 billion during the current fiscal year.

Exports at this level would be the second highest in our history, exceeded only by the \$4.7 billion total reached in 1956-57.

The improved outlook since last November results primarily from larger export prospects for cotton, wheat, feedgrains, and soybeans.

Here in capsule form are some of the highlights of the current very favorable export year.

Overseas shipments of feedgrains, soybeans, protein meal, and tallow will be at a record level.

Rice, cottonseed, and soybean oils will be at the second highest level in history.

Lard will be at the second highest level since World War II.

Cotton will more than double last year's total.

Wheat should approximate last year's high level of 443 million bushels.

Stated in another way, the export level of \$4.2 billion is equivalent to the output of more than 50 million acres of cropland. This figure is equal to the harvested crop acreage of Iowa, Illinois, and Michigan.

Dollar sales

U.S. agricultural exports for dollars will be the second highest on record this current fiscal year. Dollar sales will account for about \$2.9 billion, or close to 70 percent of the year's total export movement. The \$2.9 billion compares with dollar sales of \$2.4 billion last year and the previous high of \$3.4 billion in 1951-52.

The upswing in dollar sales is highly gratifying. In this country sales for dollars represent the traditional, the permanent, and the most effective way of moving agricultural products from producers to consumers. The Department of Agriculture has been giving, and will continue to give, top priority to sales for dollars in all operations involving overseas marketings.

Food donation programs

We have made an outstanding record in the field of food donations—moving substantial quantities of our CCC inventories to deserving people here at home and abroad. And, from time to time, we have temporarily stepped into a market with section 32 funds to alleviate a very troublesome surplus. The food commodities acquired under these surplus removal operations have also been moved into domestic consumption channels.

These are some highlights:

1. Since 1953 we have distributed a total of 13 billion pounds of surplus foods, valued at \$2.7 billion.

2. A record number of U.S. citizens—over 21 million—benefited from these food donations last fiscal year. This total included over 14 million school children, almost 1½ million inmates in charitable institutions and approximately 5.7 million needy people in family units. These are distributed by the various States.

3. Some 60 million people in 91 foreign countries received surplus U.S. foods. These overseas donations are made by U.S. voluntary agencies in the name of the people of the United States.

It is important to remember that CCC inventories do not resemble those of a retail store. We have, in fact, only a few food items. The value of CCC's inventories at the end of November was \$8 billion. The value of four items—wheat, corn, cotton and grain sorghum—was \$7.2 billion, just over 95 percent of the total.

In addition to wheat flour and cornmeal, we are currently distributing rice and nonfat dry milk solids to all domestic recipients. Our inventories of butter and cheese, once very large, have been reduced to the point where donations currently can be made only to schools.

We have, however, provided an important item for needy people here at home through the purchase of about 32½ million pounds of lard. More recently, we announced resumption of section 32 dried egg purchases which had moved over 5.4 million pounds of this item to domestic recipients last year.

Commodities are not made available for overseas distribution until all domestic requests are met, so the list of available items is even more restricted in this case.

I want again to provide my assurances that the Department will take every feasible action to see that our surplus foods get to people who can put them to good use.

Food for peace and Public Law 480

A year ago in his special farm message to Congress the President said, "I am setting steps in motion to explore anew with our surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace and the well being of friendly peoples throughout the world—in short, using food for peace."

We have intensified consultations with the other wheat exporting nations of Canada, Australia, France, and Argentina. We had a meeting of Cabinet-level people last May. A Wheat Utilization Committee was formed and has been meeting periodically. The Committee, composed of representatives of the five nations, has just sent a mission to the Far East for 6 weeks to explore possibilities of making more effective use of wheat in that area.

I am particularly gratified that these consultations have led to greatly improved understanding of U.S. objectives in making our agricultural abundance available to those in need abroad. This result alone is a substantial achievement from this undertaking.

The consultations have also emphasized the need for assuring that the proceeds of foreign currency sales are used as effectively as possible to promote economic development—for only as such development occurs is the base for continued expansion of food consumption assured. Also, emphasis has been placed on the need to remove bottlenecks in grain storage, handling and distribution facilities that impede the flow of commodities. Both of these problems are being attacked.

With respect to the improvement of grain storage and handling facilities, emphasis is being given to the use of foreign currency grants to assist in removing such bottlenecks. A recently signed agreement with India provides for using some of the \$102.9 million of rupees to be granted to India for the construction of grain storage and handling facilities in India. These facilities will increase India's capacity to import and distribute agricultural commodities.

Other promising areas for the greater utilization of wheat in underdeveloped countries arise from the possibilities of building up reserve stocks abroad so that supplies are readily available in the event of indigenous crop failures, and the use of agricultural commodities for use as wages on development projects. These are important changes which could significantly help to increase the flow of commodities to areas of need. To this end, we will soon resubmit amendments to existing law for congressional consideration.

Programs which commit the United States to supply commodities for forward periods of longer than 1 year also offer promise in furthering the objectives of the food for peace program. There has been some programs of this kind in the past, but there are additional possibilities. Use of such multi-year agreements could be especially effective in those areas where food deficits clearly exist for a forward period which cannot be financed with the country's own earnings. We are pushing aggressively ahead in this area and hope to have some results to announce during the current session of Congress. In developing such programs care must be given to our own supply position. We should not commit ourselves to deliver supplies of commodities under such programs which are not clearly in excess of commercial needs during the delivery period envisaged. Also, we must insure that any established commercial import base for the United States and other friendly countries is adequately protected.

Since 1954, about \$5.5 billion worth of farm products have been exported under

the Public Law 480 authority. This means that 26 percent of all our farm product exports have resulted from the Public Law 480 program.

Market promotion

Public Law 480 has helped us in a way not generally recognized. With the foreign currencies generated under our Public Law 480 activities, we are carrying on, in cooperation with many U.S. agricultural trade groups, a greatly expanded program of foreign market promotion.

There are many specific examples of the way trade promotion has increased sales of U.S. farm products. But the promotion of poultry sales in Switzerland and Western Germany offers one of the most striking instances of a successful merchandising campaign.

From virtually nothing prior to 1955, sales of poultry to Switzerland soared upward. In the fiscal year 1959-60, Swiss marketings will approximate 20 million pounds. Total export sales for the year are expected to reach 165 million pounds, which should permit us to continue our newly won position as the world's leading exporter of poultry meat.

As I mentioned earlier, Public Law 480 is the cornerstone of the food for peace program. In the months that lie ahead, Public Law 480 will be playing an increasingly larger role in helping us use our agricultural abundance to promote world peace and stability. This is in addition, of course, to the expanded markets and the long-range market development Public Law 480 is making possible in the interests of the American farmers. Certainly Public Law 480, in implementing a huge, active program, is serving the Nation well.

We propose to further implement the President's food for peace program by additional amendments to Public Law 480. These are described later among our recommendations. They relate to food stockpiling in underdeveloped countries and payment in commodities for work done on foreign economic development.

UTILIZATION RESEARCH—PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS

Utilization research and development is a major segment of USDA's overall research program, which also includes studies of farm production, marketing, home economics, and forestry. Funds available for all USDA research have been increased about 100 percent over the past 7 years. The problems facing agriculture still exceed in number and magnitude the current capacity to attack them.

Worthwhile new uses for farm products must be practical uses. The final product must be able to sell consistently at a competitive price. For example, industrial alcohol from grain is technically feasible, but its economic practicality has not been demonstrated. Some of the practical developments in this field are described in appendix III.

The outlook is good for increasing substantially the use of agricultural products. In the case of cereal grain an additional 500 million bushels per year can be used by 1975 if research is able to do its job in the following areas:

One hundred and seventy million bushels for use in paper products. Today only about 20 million bushels of grain are used in these products. Research must modify grains or their starches to endow them with new properties of value in papermaking.

One hundred million bushels for industrial chemicals and other nonfood products. Today, some 40 million bushels of grain go into this market. New chemical products now under development offer potential outlets for an additional 100 million bushels.

Fifty million bushels for use in producing biological agents for pest control.

Two hundred and fifty million bushels in food products. There is opportunity for new

cereal food products. If we ate the cereal products our nutritionists say would be good for us, we should consume by 1970 about 925 million bushels of grain a year as food, compared with 675 million bushels now.

There is a potential large-volume market for agricultural raw materials in the plastics industry. Today's total annual consumption of plastics, about 6.6 billion pounds, may well increase to some 10 billion pounds by 1965. Agricultural raw materials are suitable for the manufacture of a multitude of plastic products, if they can be made economically. We aim to feed farm-grown materials into as much of this expanding multi-billion-pound market as rapidly as possible.

The 1961 budget now before Congress recommends additional appropriations especially for utilization research. Additional local currencies being acquired under Public Law 480 transactions will be devoted to utilization research.

A Coordinator for Utilization Research will also be named shortly, to report directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. He will have the mission of determining how even greater progress can be made in developing and promoting new uses for farm products.

Research can create expanded markets for farm products. It already has. How many new products and new markets can be developed, and how fast, depends on the size and vigor of the effort devoted to the task. Acceptable legislation to improve further the work in this area has passed the House of Representatives.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Members of this committee are aware that the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with other Federal departments and the States, is pioneering a new and fruitful approach to the age-old, chronic problem of underemployment and low income in some of our rural areas.

The rural development approach aims simply at more and better opportunities both on and off the farm. It includes farm, industry, and community development.

The program meets head on the real causes of low income in farming communities—chronic lack of resources, of land, capital, and management ability.

We are now working in about 200 counties in all major regions of the Nation to promote this new program. To look objectively and realistically at the problems of families in these areas is to realize the futility of trying to help these families through traditional price stabilization and other publicly supported farm programs.

There are actually hundreds of thousands of such families. Eighty percent of farm operators in selected rural development counties sell \$2,500 worth of products or less, according to the latest census figures. The value of farm land and buildings is only one-third the national average per farm. Almost one-half the farms in these counties are operated on a part-time or residential basis.

As a matter of fact, folks in some of the towns giving leadership to the rural development program will tell you frankly that full-time commercial family farmers make up less than 5 percent of the population in surrounding rural areas.

You might term the rural development program a vehicle which we are using to work out new and better approaches. It is a program to facilitate, not hamper, beneficial changes; a program to help people in rural towns and communities successfully carry out the projects they desire in their own best interests.

An excellent illustration of what is being done in one county is set forth in appendix II of my statement.

In October, President Eisenhower issued Executive Order No. 10847, setting up the

Federal Committee for Rural Development Program to "provide leadership and uniform policy guidance to the several Federal departments and agencies responsible for rural development program functions." These functions include special community extension services, credit, conservation and forestry assistance, industrial development advisory services, and employment counseling and guidance in rural areas.

An executive secretary to this committee has been appointed to coordinate the many contributions of agencies involved.

Credit resources of the department have been liberalized for farmers in rural development counties who work at nonfarm jobs.

State extension services in all States are making plans to tie rural development approaches closer to regular extension programs in areas with many small, low-production farms.

There are problems, of course, but it is self-evident that after only a few short years of operation the rural development program finds wide support and understanding around the country. Early critics have turned into converts.

The reason is not hard to find. As one leading journal of national opinion puts it, "This program represents the first organized, fruitful effort to devise long-range, widely applicable solutions for one of the Nation's most heart-stirring problems."

PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT

It is the aim both of the administration and of this Committee to assist farmers in meeting realistically the problems created by the changing conditions of recent years.

We feel that considerable progress has already been made. The Agricultural Acts of 1954 and 1956 were forward steps. The Agricultural Act of 1958 provided a new program for corn and made some limited progress for cotton and rice also. But there is need for further and prompt action, especially for wheat and the conservation reserve program.

The conservation reserve

The conservation reserve program can help achieve (1) a better balance of farm production with market outlets; (2) increased conservation of land resources; (3) assistance to older farm people who wish to reduce farm work or retire, and to others who wish to shift to nonfarm employment while continuing to live on farms.

In 1960, over 28 million acres or 6 percent of our producing cropland will be in the conservation reserve and devoted to protective soil, water, and wildlife conserving uses. All of this land otherwise would be adding to our already burdensome surplus.

This program should now be directed primarily at wheat, corn, and other feed grains. America's traditional wheat heartland includes vast areas where conservation measures can be wisely and profitably applied. Over 8 million acres in 423 problem Great Plains counties which produced wheat needed for the winning of two wars have already been returned to the native grasses of the Plains.

Shifting cropland out of agricultural production for a period of years can lead to permanent conversion to uses for which it is better adapted.

In the Southeast and Great Lakes areas, tree planting ranks highest among the conservation uses of the program.

Practices designed especially for wildlife protection have gained the approval of sportsmen and wildlife organizations.

Both urban and rural people are concerned about our future water supply. The millions of acres of trees and grass together with the thousands of water-storage structures under the conservation reserve are trapping our valuable water where it falls and retarding the runoff.

The voluntary aspect of the conservation reserve provides the greatest freedom of choice for farmers.

Two-thirds of the land in the reserve is on farms whose owners placed all their eligible acres in the program. On those farms, all the cropland is out of production—including the allotted acres of major surplus crops.

When all eligible land on a farm is placed under contract, the farm usually goes out of production entirely. Livestock is sold and the pastureland and other noncropland is retired voluntarily. It appears that the present conservation reserve has contributed to improving the production supply situation now found in the dairy industry.

Adequate production adjustment will be practically impossible to achieve through the conservation reserve unless the policy of bringing whole farms under contract is pursued with vigor. If the Congress will provide the needed authority, we believe the task can be accomplished in this less costly way, preserving the independence of our agriculture and guaranteeing the future food and fiber supply of this Nation through good stewardship of our soils.

The President has suggested these improvements in this vital program:

Extend the conservation reserve for 3 years with authorization to place up to 60 million acres in the program

Provide authorization for the use of corn and other feed grains and wheat as payment in kind as rapidly as is practical.

Permit the giving of special consideration to areas where it is desirable to discourage the production of wheat, corn, and other surplus crops.

Expansion of the conservation reserve should be accompanied by other production reducing measures. As, for instance, a gradual reduction in price supports, lest the public be asked to finance reductions in surplus crops on the one hand while providing inducements to maximum production of these crops on the other.

PRICE ADJUSTMENT

Tobacco

Farmers who grow tobacco have been losing markets at home and abroad. As prices of U.S. tobacco increase, foreign buyers change their blends and turn to other sources of supply. They may never be induced to return to our markets. The present old laws result in price supports at continually rising levels. Acreages at home have been severely cut to low levels while acreage and production expand abroad.

As you know, the Congress has just passed a tobacco bill, H.R. 9664, embodying the unanimous recommendations of the various farm and tobacco industry organizations. This bill makes a limited step in the right direction. It recognizes the basic economic facts indicated above. Since this legislation will help prevent a worsening of the situation and will reduce costs, I have recommended that the President approve it. However, it will not provide a total solution to the problems of the tobacco growers. From a long-term standpoint there is still a need for constructive legislation for tobacco within the general guidelines described by the President in his message.

Peanuts

The consumption of peanuts is sensitive to price changes. When price supports go up, the use is cut; when prices are made more competitive, the market expands.

It is clear that the law should be changed in a way consistent with the general guidelines described by the President so that farmers growing peanuts can compete more effectively for markets.

A supplementary approach would be to authorize a marketing agreement and order program. This would make it possible for the various segments of the industry to co-

operate in handling their marketing problems without financial reliance on Government.

Both approaches could be provided in the law, leaving it to growers to adopt a marketing agreement and order program should they at any time consider it desirable.

Wheat

The wheat situation is probably the most critical in all our agriculture. The highlights of this problem are as follows:

1. There are currently almost \$3½ billion of Government funds tied up in wheat. This is over one-third of the total of all farm commodities tied up in CCC inventories and loans.

2. Over 30 percent of the budget for stabilization of farm prices and income is expended for wheat; however, wheat provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from the sales from farm commodities.

3. The net realized cost of stabilizing wheat prices and income for the 1959 fiscal year was \$550 million—\$1½ million per day.

4. Farmers taking advantage of the 15-acre exemption for wheat numbered 690,000 in 1959—a 152,000 increase in the number of wheatgrowers in 3 years.

Unless the wheat problem is corrected soon I am greatly concerned that there will be an inevitable reaction of the general public as to result in the breakdown of all price support programs. This would work hardship upon many thousands of our farmers.

We have used our administrative discretion to improve the wheat situation as much as possible. Over 1.4 billion bushels of wheat have been exported under Public Law 480 since 1955. We are authorizing a wheat payment-in-kind export program which uses the commercial channels of trade and helps wheat prices. Every bushel of wheat exported is subsidized. Currently this is at a 55-60 cent-per-bushel rate.

There is urgent need for corrective legislation. The failure to obtain such action will mean that the wheat problem will continue to worsen. In the President's message on agriculture on February 9 he said:

"I think the American people have every right to expect the Congress to move promptly to solve situations of this kind. Sound legislation is imperatively needed. We must quickly and sensibly revise the present program to avoid visiting havoc upon the very people this program is intended to help. Every additional day of delay makes a sound solution more difficult.

"I have repeatedly expressed my preference for programs that will ultimately free the farmer rather than subject him to increasing governmental restraints. I am convinced that most farmers hold the same view. But whatever the legislative approach, whether toward greater freedom or more regimentation, it must be sensible and economically sound and not a political poulitice. And it must be enacted promptly. I will approve any constructive solution that the Congress wishes to develop, by 'constructive' meaning this:

"First, that price-support levels be realistically related to whatever policy the Congress chooses in respect to production control, it being recognized that the higher the support the more regimented must be the farmer.

"Second, that price-support levels not be so high as to stimulate still more excessive production, reduce domestic markets, and increase the subsidies required to hold world outlets.

"Third, for reasons long expressed by the administration, that we avoid direct subsidy payment programs for crops in surplus; likewise we must avoid programs which would invite harmful countermeasures by our friends abroad, or which, while seeking to assist one group of farmers, would badly hurt other farmers.

"Within these three guidelines, I am constantly ready to approve any one or a combination of constructive proposals. I will approve legislation which will eliminate production controls, or make them really effective, or allow the farmers themselves to choose between realistic alternatives. I am willing to gear supports to market prices of previous years, or to establish supports in accordance with general rather than specific provisions of law, or to relate price supports to parity.

"I recognize that these observations are general in nature. They are intentionally so in order to leave the Congress room for alternative constructive approaches to this problem. If the Congress should so act, I urge an orderly expansion of the conservation reserve program up to 60 million acres, with authority granted the Secretary of Agriculture to direct the major expansion of this program to areas of greatest need."

My views as regards the price-support program for wheat are clear. I prefer the following approach:

"Acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat should be eliminated beginning with the 1961 crop—thus freeing the wheat farmers—and thereupon price-support levels should be set as a percentage of the average price of wheat during the 3 preceding calendar years. The Secretary of Agriculture will furnish the Congress the details of this approach."

I am hopeful that the Congress will see fit to approve constructive wheat legislation as the President's message so urgently recommends.

In keeping with this message, I present this summary of our preferred legislative actions to deal with wheat and the conservation reserve, recognizing, as the President made clear, that other constructive approaches may be preferred by the Congress. I must in candor assert that the President's expressed preference is also mine.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

In my summary of legislative recommendations I include some measures already part way through the Congress. Since the 1958 act embodied constructive legislation for corn, cotton, and rice, except for the expansion of the conservation reserve, I do not propose further legislation affecting these crops at this time.

As already indicated, we most urgently need legislation on wheat and the conservation reserve. I attach a draft bill embodying preferred solution in keeping with the President's message, at the same time emphasizing that the President, as he stated in his message, will approve any constructive solution that meets his general guidelines.

I. Wheat: For wheat we prefer these improvements:

1. Eliminate acreage allotments effective with 1961 crop.

2. Set price supports at 75 percent of the previous 3-year average for 1961, 1962, and 1963 crops.

3. For the 1964 crop and thereafter, set price supports at 90 percent of the 3-year average.

4. Bar sales of wheat from Government stocks except on the basis of 100 percent of the 3-year average price used in determining the price-support level.

II. Conservation reserve: For the conservation reserve we suggest these improvements, if constructive price support or production adjustment legislation is enacted:

1. Extend the conservation reserve for 3 years with goal of 60 million acres in program.

2. Provide authorization for the use of corn and other feed grains and wheat as payment-in-kind.

3. Provide authorization for giving special consideration to areas where it is desirable to discourage production of wheat and other surplus crops.

III. Tobacco: For tobacco, there is still need for constructive legislation that meets the President's general guidelines.

IV. Peanuts: There is likewise need for such legislation in the case of peanuts.

V. Food for peace: I suggest modifications to Public Law 480 to further implement the President's food for peace program (the details to be submitted later).

Title I would be amended to assist underdeveloped countries to stockpile food commodities, principally wheat, to meet consumption needs in times of emergency.

Title II would be amended to permit use of commodities to promote economic development through payment of wages in commodities on development projects. This would be of considerable assistance in backward areas where distribution facilities are limited and purchasing power is extremely low.

VI. Other needed legislation: There are other items needing attention which I would briefly summarize as follows:

1. Sugar: Draft legislation to extend the Sugar Act will be submitted soon.

2. Emergency feed program: The House has approved H.R. 6861 which contains substantially the administration's proposal for State participation in the cost of emergency feed programs. A similar bill, S. 1013, has been introduced.

3. REA interest rate legislation: Establish an interest rate on future Treasury loans to REA not to exceed the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on recently issued long-term marketable obligations. Future electric and telephone loans made by REA would bear the same rate plus one-fifth of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and estimated losses.

4. Farmers Home Administration: I endorse H.R. 7628 introduced by Congressman COOLEY, and S. 2144, by Senator ALLOTT. The purpose of these bills is to simplify the statutory authority of the Farmers Home Administration and bring it up to date in certain respects in order that services rendered farmers may be further improved. There are no changes in the basic objectives of present laws.

I am gratified to learn that this committee is planning to consider this bill later this month.

I recognize that this committee is faced with difficult legislative decisions. My staff and I are eager to cooperate with you. We will supply promptly any further facts you may need, and we will provide the best judgments that can be had from the Department on any and all proposals.

The need for prompt legislative action to ease the problems confronting our agriculture is very great. The longer the solutions to our agricultural problems are delayed, the more difficult they become. Again we offer you our sincere and wholehearted assistance either in connection with our own preferred programs or with constructive alternatives.

For the farmer, for Americans generally, I wholeheartedly pledge, Mr. Chairman, to you and your committee my unreserved cooperation in achieving constructive legislation so urgently needed in this session of Congress.

APPENDIX I: MAN-HOURS OF FARMWORK

The labor input of all farms in the United States totaled about 11 billion man-hours in 1959. This is the lowest figure of any year for which data are available and is a continuation of the longtime downward trend. This is a reduction of 46 percent in the past 20 years and of about one-third in the past 10 years. The long-term decrease has resulted from a combination of many factors, the most significant of which are increased mechanization and reduction in the number of farms. Work on crops has dropped more than for livestock because of current advances in mechanization of operations on

crops. Crops now take less than one-half as much labor as before World War II.

Considerably fewer hours are now spent doing farmwork than just before World War II in all parts of the country. The greatest decreases have occurred in the four southern regions because of the greater than average reduction in the number of farms there and a drop in the acreage of high-labor-using crops. Labor on farms has decreased by the smallest percentage in the two western regions. Even though the input of farm labor in the United States has been reduced significantly, total farm production has continued to increase substantially. Farm output per man-hour in 1959 was more than four times as high as before World War I and is almost three times as high as during the years immediately preceding World War II. The technological revolution in agriculture obviously made it impracticable for all the 30 million people of 1940 and the 27 million of 1947 to remain in farming. Expansion of industry into rural areas, growth of the military, the automobile and modern roads have facilitated the off-the-farm movement.

APPENDIX IA: Man-hours of labor used for farmwork, United States, 1910-59

| Year | Total | Index (1947-49=100) |
|-------------------------|---------|---------------------|
| | Million | |
| 1910..... | 22,547 | 135 |
| 1912..... | 23,319 | 139 |
| 1914..... | 23,727 | 142 |
| 1916..... | 23,107 | 138 |
| 1918..... | 24,073 | 144 |
| 1920..... | 23,995 | 143 |
| 1922..... | 22,900 | 137 |
| 1924..... | 23,323 | 139 |
| 1926..... | 23,878 | 143 |
| 1928..... | 23,356 | 139 |
| 1930..... | 22,921 | 137 |
| 1932..... | 22,605 | 135 |
| 1934..... | 20,232 | 121 |
| 1935..... | 21,052 | 126 |
| 1937..... | 22,097 | 132 |
| 1939..... | 20,675 | 123 |
| 1941..... | 20,043 | 120 |
| 1943..... | 20,398 | 121 |
| 1945..... | 18,841 | 113 |
| 1947..... | 17,196 | 103 |
| 1949..... | 16,201 | 97 |
| 1951..... | 15,170 | 91 |
| 1953..... | 13,897 | 83 |
| 1955..... | 12,751 | 76 |
| 1957..... | 11,379 | 68 |
| 1959 ¹ | 11,054 | 66 |

¹ Preliminary.

Net income from farming per man-hour of farmwork, United States, 1910-59

| Year | Net income from farming ¹ | Man-hours of farmwork ² | Net income per hour |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | Millions | Millions | |
| 1910..... | \$4,701 | 22,547 | \$0.208 |
| 1912..... | 4,619 | 23,319 | .198 |
| 1914..... | 4,493 | 23,727 | .189 |
| 1916..... | 5,711 | 23,107 | .247 |
| 1918..... | 10,277 | 24,073 | .427 |
| 1920..... | 8,860 | 23,995 | .369 |
| 1922..... | 5,528 | 22,900 | .241 |
| 1924..... | 6,548 | 23,323 | .281 |
| 1926..... | 7,230 | 23,878 | .303 |
| 1928..... | 7,116 | 23,356 | .305 |
| 1930..... | 5,700 | 22,921 | .249 |
| 1932..... | 2,597 | 22,605 | .115 |
| 1934..... | 4,550 | 20,232 | .225 |
| 1935..... | 5,380 | 21,052 | .256 |
| 1937..... | 6,220 | 22,097 | .281 |
| 1939..... | 5,382 | 20,675 | .260 |
| 1941..... | 7,402 | 20,043 | .369 |
| 1943..... | 13,902 | 20,398 | .685 |
| 1945..... | 15,149 | 18,841 | .804 |
| 1947..... | 20,114 | 17,196 | 1.170 |
| 1949..... | 16,654 | 16,201 | 1.028 |
| 1951..... | 17,958 | 15,170 | 1.184 |
| 1953..... | 16,692 | 13,897 | 1.201 |
| 1955..... | 14,206 | 12,751 | 1.114 |
| 1957..... | 13,803 | 11,379 | 1.213 |
| 1959 ¹ | 14,026 | 11,054 | 1.269 |

¹ Realized net income of farm operators, including Government payments, plus total farm wages.

² Man-hours of labor used for farmwork, built up by individual farm enterprises by applying average man-hours per acre of crops.

³ Preliminary.

APPENDIX II

The quest for new and wider outlets for farm products as food and as industrial raw materials moved ahead on many fronts in 1959. It was a good year for utilization research.

Wash-and-wear cottons gained wider public acceptance. More than 800,000 bales of cotton are now used annually as a direct result of utilization research in this field.

Use of animal fats in plastics and in livestock feeds continues to increase. The development of fats as an ingredient of animal feeds has resulted in a market that is now consuming about 500 million pounds of fats annually. More recent research promises sizable markets for other products of fats in the near future.

Dehydrated mashed potatoes are on the market in two forms—granules and flakes. About 20 million bushels of potatoes will be used in these products this year with larger markets ahead.

Dialdehyde starches, a new family of industrial chemicals derived from corn were put into semicommercial production by two companies last year. These starches have great industrial possibilities for leather tanning, paper products, and other uses.

High-amylose corn, which yields starch that is more than 50 percent amylose and has attractive industrial possibilities not open to ordinary starch, is now in limited commercial production. A quarter of a million pounds of high-amylose starch was made from the 1958 crop of this new corn; acreage was doubled in 1959.

Chemicals from turpentine totaling about 2 million pounds are being used in the production of "cold" rubber.

APPENDIX IIA

Phosphomannan, a new product produced by fermentation of starch, is attracting industrial interest as an adhesive and thickening agent. This product offers another sizable industrial outlet for corn.

Plastic foams made from castor oil are gaining acceptance by industry. About a million pounds of castor oil were used in these products in 1958. Our chemists have recently developed methods to give these products better water resistance and shrink resistance. This should lead to expanded markets for them.

Other promising recent developments include water-soluble zein, a chemically modified protein of corn, potentially useful in lacquers and printing inks—a breakthrough in the basic chemistry of wheat gluten, which was previously thought to consist of two proteins but is now known to contain six, each with distinctive properties—a new antioxidant for alfalfa, which preserves the vitamin A and vitamin E content of dehydrated alfalfa meal for as long as 6 months—a new cotton card, an attachment for conventional cotton textile machinery, which reduces costs, improves quality, and reduces waste in cotton processing—a new compound, known as coumestrol, which may provide a basis for improved feed additives. Basic research on soybean oil will greatly aid in the development of edible soybean oil products of improved physical and nutritional characteristics.

APPENDIX III: RURAL DEVELOPMENTS IN MADISON COUNTY, ARK.

Rural development in this area got under way about the same time as in most of the original program counties, the summer of 1957. Right from the start, the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service using special funds allocated by the Department of Agriculture, has assigned special personnel to work on the county program. However, the core of leadership is a group of Madison county businessmen, farm leaders, and others who adapt the work to local condi-

tions, and actively promote the goals they themselves decide upon.

In Madison County these goals are really very simple: To capitalize on what farming potential there is—to build up small industries so rural people can add to their meager incomes—to help their fine young people prepare for opportunities in an expanding America.

The rural development program in Madison County, as in so many other areas, has encouraged big strides toward all these objectives. To cite a few:

Some 10 small industries have started up or been expanded since rural development started. One of these is a clothing plant employing 100 people and financed by local capital, another an industry using local woods to manufacture archery equipment.

Countywide effort and attention have gone into providing much-needed services for young people, services which in former days were not available. Career guidance programs were set up in the schools, a youth center established, and stay-in-school campaigns started.

In a county where, according to the 1954 census of agriculture, about half the 2,000 farm operators earn little or nothing from farming and the average value of land and buildings per farm is \$5,000, compared with \$20,000 nationally, this balanced, long-term plan of farm, industry, community, and industrial development is plainly the only answer, the only plan that offers any hope.

APPENDIX IIIA: POLICIES FOR THE LOW INCOME FARMERS

The following quotation is from the Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels, dated December 24, 1959, prepared for consideration of the Joint Economic Committee. The materials represent a sifting by the staff of the extensive hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee over the past 2 years including the hearings related to "Policy for Commercial Agriculture."

"POLICIES FOR THE LOW-INCOME FARMERS

"1. None of the above policies [relating to commercial agriculture] will be sufficient to solve the problem of the low-income farmers. The regions in which they are concentrated pose a similar challenge to the United States as underdeveloped countries overseas. Technical assistance in many forms could be usefully applied.

"The rural development program, which is particularly aimed at farmers that do not produce much for market, should be put on a substantial scale. This program is conducted by five Federal departments and the Small Business Administration, in cooperation with land-grant colleges, and aims to expand off-farm jobs, develop efficient family-sized farms, and provide special programs of education, vocational training, and guidance. It is only by these and related methods that the problem of poverty in agriculture can ultimately be cured.

"We recommend that this program be developed with all possible speed and energy. Given the general overproduction of agriculture and the outlook on farm incomes, we recommend that the program put particular stress on the development of nonagricultural job opportunities and on vocational training for industry. The attraction of industry within commuting distance of these low-income farm areas would be the most effective step for ameliorating their poverty.

"Technical assistance in developing more effective farms and in improving marketing facilities should also be expanded in order to further reduce rural poverty. Educational programs will also prove useful.

"Similar activities by the Bureau of Indian Affairs designed to cure the rural poverty of the American Indians, should also be promoted.

"The programs to provide capital to low-income families, conducted by the Farmers'

Home Administration and other agencies, should also be continued and strengthened, particularly to encourage land acquisition in those areas where consolidation of farms would permit the development of viable family enterprises."

APPENDIX IV: THE WHEAT PROBLEM

The Government wheat program, compulsory under the law, is a major national problem which only Congress can correct.

Under the present program:

1. Carryover stocks total 1.3 billion bushels and are growing.
2. CCC investment amounts to about \$3.5 billion and will increase.
3. Storage, handling, and interest costs to taxpayers are about \$1¼ million per day and going up.
4. Export subsidy costs more than 50 cents per bushel.
5. Most of the feed markets for wheat has been lost.
6. Wheat program expenditures run about 30 percent of the total expenditures for stabilization of farm prices and income but only 6 percent of cash receipts from total farm sales.
7. Number of farmers using the 15-acre loophole totaled 690,000 in 1959—up 152,000 in 3 years.
8. Wheat acreage has been lost in the traditional wheat areas.

ADDITIONAL FACTS

A. The breakdown of the wheat program is not the fault of the farmer.

B. This program has stimulated unneeded production and wasted resources.

C. Unless this wheat situation is corrected now, public pressure may force abandonment of the entire price stabilization program—the good along with the bad.

D. Productivity per man-hour in wheat has increased eight times since 1910-14, making present fixed formulas obsolete.

E. Continuing the present program will mean a further buildup of the wheat surplus by about 100 to 200 million bushels a year.

F. The July 1, 1959, carryover of 1.3 billion bushels if converted into bread would provide 450 loaves for every man, woman, and child in this country.

G. Some 100 to 200 million bushels of wheat used to be fed to livestock each year. This outlet has been largely lost because wheat is priced out of a competitive relationship to other feed grains.

H. Only those wheat farmers with allotments of over 15 acres are eligible to vote in marketing quota referendums. These farmers represent only 40 percent of all wheat-growers. Ten percent of the wheatgrowers produce 55 percent of the crop.

I. Under the stimulus of Government price fixing, more farmers are growing wheat outside the program than within the program.

J. Since 1953 some wheatgrowing States have lost wheat acreage, as follows:

Kansas, 3.7 million acres.

North Dakota, 3.5 million acres.

Oklahoma, 1.9 million acres.

South Dakota, nearly 1.2 million acres.

Nebraska, 1 million acres.

Washington, nearly 900,000 acres.

K. If there were no legal minimum of 55 million acres and the formula in the present obsolete law were applied, the national wheat allotment for 1960 would be zero acres.

SPECIALLY TRAINED TEACHERS FOR THOSE HANDICAPPED BY DEAFNESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which, in effect, will provide for specially trained teachers for those handicapped by deafness, as well as specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists for individuals suffering from speech and hearing impairments. Others have also supported such a bill.

Needless to say, the most important and valuable of this country's resources is manpower. It is the greatest endowment of our democracy, the foundation of our enduring society. This Government is predicated on the belief that every individual is important and worthy of our attention. As such, we must channel our talents and efforts to the conservation and development of our human resources and capacity.

There are in our midst today some 30,000 deaf children of school age with an expected increase of 400 every year, and 8 million Americans of all ages suffering from speech or hearing impairment. The number continues to rise while the number of specialists dedicated to train these people to take their rightful place in our society, with full opportunity to make their own way, is extremely low and constantly diminishing.

To train these schoolchildren, we need some 500 specialists annually. At the moment, there are only 150 such teachers in training. Out of some 20,000 pathologists and audiologists needed to diagnose, train, and rehabilitate our 8 million handicapped, there are only 2,000 available. There is indeed a critical shortage of trained personnel in this field.

If not rehabilitated, this bulk of our population presents and will continue to pose medical, social, emotional, educational, economic, and political problems from which we shall find ourselves in the not too distant future hard to extricate. The problem is serious, real, and immediate. We have to act now.

From a careful scrutiny of reports supplied me and conversations with informed sources, I am convinced that 80 percent of these cases are remediable. Let me give you an example of the kind of thing that can be done in this field. In my own congressional district in Manhattan, the Lexington School for the Deaf is doing the most remarkable job in training the stone deaf to become useful members of the community.

This happens to be a private school, but it charges no tuition and it receives most of its support from the State. It takes children beginning from age 3 or 4 up and gives them a high school education. Many go on to college. By the time they are finished they are equipped to lead normal lives in the adult world and to communicate with others.

The teachers in this school, as in other schools for the deaf, must have very special qualifications. Not only must they have all of the qualifications and attributes of high school teachers in the normal school, but they must be specially trained to communicate with the stone deaf. Do you realize that the young ladies who make this their life work must, after having met all the other standards for high school teaching, take specialized post graduate courses and

pay tuition for this purpose? In the Lexington School there are a number of young ladies who have elected to go on into this post graduate type of educational training. Most of them have to borrow the funds in order to pay the tuition. On top of this, they have to live and, in cities the size of New York, this is not cheap. Fortunately the Lexington School for the Deaf can provide living accommodations for most of these dedicated persons. But food, clothes, and other costs of living must be borne by them. When they are finished and are qualified to take on the task of teaching the deaf, they are paid less than the high school teachers in the regular school system. Can this be right? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Education and Labor saw fit during the recess period to hold hearings on this subject throughout the nation. The subcommittee came into my district and did a splendid job of accumulating the evidence. The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], did a superb job of conducting the hearings, and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], himself was present for most of them. At the invitation of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], I was pleased to sit as a member of the subcommittee. There were many groups who are concerned with the problems of the handicapped that were represented at the hearing. Many of these groups are from my district, and I believe, as I am sure the subcommittee believed, that they made a significant contribution to the subcommittee's information on this whole subject.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of coping with the teacher training shortage in the area of the deaf. It is apparent that individual communities cannot and have not adequately coped with this task.

This bill and similar proposals before the Congress are not a guarantee to cure all these ills, but certainly it is a forward step toward alleviating the plight of a large segment of our less fortunate countrymen who have been disabled by the accident of birth, or otherwise.

This bill merits consideration if we are to put a stop to a continuous draining of our valuable reservoir of manpower.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of American families are depending upon social security in their financial planning for the present and future. The importance of social security naturally looms larger to those who have retired or who will reach retirement age in the near future. Even those who will not reach retirement for 20 or even 40 years are making social security contributions and will be affected by it for the remainder of their

lives. Their families are protected by the survivors' benefits which are paid when wage earners die.

The social security program is paid for by America's workers and their employers. Each employee contributes to the program, and his contribution is matched by his employer, except with the self-employed.

There are some inequities in the program. Because of individual age and the date at which certain types of work were covered, some persons have qualified for payments in fewer years than others. Although not strictly insurance it is generally based upon contributions and benefits are intended to be proportional to the amounts paid in. As the program has been in force more years the inequities will tend to disappear.

Since the social security program so vitally affects the economic life of most citizens, it is the responsibility of Congress to see that any changes in it are unquestionably sound and designed to strengthen the program, making it better serve the needs of American people—not only now but in future years.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT A POLITICAL ISSUE

The history of social security shows that both political parties have supported this program. Although the principle of social security had been under study for some time, it was not enacted into law until the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was continued and developed under President Harry Truman, and has been expanded and strengthened under the two administrations of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. All of us can remember the election of 1952 when General Eisenhower, as a candidate for President, was bitterly attacked with statements that he would destroy social security. A song was even introduced, pleading, "Don't Let Them Take It Away."

Eight years later we see that the social security program has been greatly expanded, improved, and liberalized during President Eisenhower's term of office.

It is deplorable that certain persons for political gain make inflammatory and false statements accusing their political opponents of being against social security. As is often the case, those who make the most violent accusations against the strawman enemy are often, by their actions, themselves the worst enemy of the cause.

So it is with the social security program. While a few from both the Republican and Democratic Parties have expressed fear that social security will not work, will not do the things for which it is intended, and pointed out failures of similar programs in history, the overwhelming majority of the American people of both political parties believe that it must be made to work effectively.

WHO ARE THE ENEMIES OF SOCIAL SECURITY?

There are always those who will practice chicanery for political gain; yet the honest leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties realize that social security is not a political issue but that it has become a real and potent force in the lives of all.

Few people honestly doubt that our Government will pay every retiree the

amount due him by law. The great danger, however, is that by irresponsible actions to gain votes and by unsound spending we may so injure our economy and so devalue the buying power of the dollar that even though the social security retiree receives the number of dollars he has expected, he will be unable to purchase the things that he needs. Those who would wreck the value of the dollar are the real enemies of social security.

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE LAST 7 YEARS

Social security was not taken away or lowered when President Eisenhower became President. Instead, the following improvements have been made in social security during his two administrations. The minimum monthly payment has risen from \$25 to \$33 a month and the maximum from \$85 to \$127 a month. The number of recipients of benefits has grown from 5 million to 14 million and the average payment per month has increased from \$49 to \$73. Today, payments to social security retirees total \$885 million per month while they were \$219 million at the end of 1952. Ministers, farmers, and numerous other trades and professions that were not covered in 1952 are now covered. There are 17 million more Americans covered. Disability retirement under social security was added in 1956. I am merely giving these few figures to show that social security is a recognized program that is continually being developed.

DANGERS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

To an increasing degree, Americans are depending upon retirement income in their later years to protect them from want; they are depending on that income from social security, insurance, private retirement plans, pensions, savings in banks, and Government bonds. In general, the amount a retiree will receive from these sources is a fixed sum. It does not rise with inflation. As the purchasing power of the dollar goes down, his living standard will go down, because he can purchase less and less with his limited income. Those with modest retirement incomes are injured most when the purchasing value of the dollar is weakened.

History is filled with instances of the currency of a country becoming valueless, thus destroying the standards of living of the people. I well remember at the close of World War II when the Chinese rickshaw boy in Shanghai was getting a million Chinese dollars a day yet he could not buy a loaf of bread with that million dollars. Many countries have gone through similar crises.

You say that it cannot happen here. I do not believe that it will, but it could. The interest on our national debt alone is \$9.5 billion a year—which is within \$1 billion of what the Government is paying out in social security this year. As our debt increases, so does the interest we pay on it. As the Government borrows more money, the interest rate gets higher, and up and up the spiral goes. The only one who really gains is the speculator—the others lose.

I am not a pessimist. I believe that we have stopped this increasing Federal debt. Apparently, we have balanced the budget this year, and next year we can reduce the national debt a small amount. That is one of our primary jobs in Congress. In spite of pressures, we in Congress must protect the value of the American dollar.

LOWERED RETIREMENT AGE

The House Ways and Means Committee has before it many bills that would change social security provisions. For years several Members, including myself, have introduced bills to lower the voluntary retirement age to 60 years. My present bill is H.R. 4006. I was pleased that 4 years ago we made some accomplishment when we succeeded in lowering the retirement age for women from 65 to 62.

I am aware that a lowered retirement will increase the cost of the program. However, I believe that if the committee approves retirement at age 60, such retirement at age 60 should be conditional on the retiree giving up his job; this will do much to relieve unemployment. The great majority of those who are physically able to continue work past age 60 will do so—they will receive more in pay than their social security payment would be. Those who would retire at 60 would release a job for someone who is unemployed. Careful consideration should be given to this in this age of automation.

INCREASED PAYMENTS AND DISABILITY RETIREMENT

Careful study should also be given as to increasing the amount of retirement benefits especially for those receiving the lower retirement payments. The committee should also consider proposals to allow those who are more than 72 years of age and who have not had an opportunity to qualify for social security retirement to draw the minimum benefits. Such legislation would greatly reduce the county, State, and national expenditures for old-age pensions under public welfare programs and would raise the standard of living of our elder citizens.

Four years ago a disability retirement was added to social security. This has assisted many needy cases but consideration should be given to clarifying the regulations for this disability retirement. It seems to be quite difficult to qualify under present regulations and procedures.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

I was not in Congress at the time that the original social security law was passed. However, in 1936, I was appointed to the Morgan County Public Welfare Board. From 1937 until I entered the Army in 1941, I served as president of that board. During those years, I became knowledgeable of the needs of our older citizens. I understand the great importance of good legislation and administration in this field.

We must never allow social security to destroy incentives toward industry and thrift. Social security payments should be considered as a floor to help retirees meet minimum needs. This program has lessened suffering and want and

has brightened the lives of millions. It has enabled our elder citizens, our widows and orphans to participate to an increasing degree in our growing economy. With an expanding economy such as ours, we must have those who can afford to buy the products of our factories and farms as well as those who produce. The social security recipients today are purchasing the food and other products of our industries, labor, and farms to the benefit of all.

NO "BOONDOGLING" IN SOCIAL SECURITY

Social security is primarily a cash pension system, created to help pay living costs. The spending of that money is solely the privilege and responsibility of the recipient the same as any other money he possesses. No Federal employee has any control over that money. The fact is that one of the principal reasons that social security has been so successful and efficient is that Federal redtape and "papa knows best" philosophy are held to a minimum in the program today.

However, there are those who would tie other governmental projects onto it—projects that could unleash a crushing weight of Federal supervision and bureaucracy on it. If it is determined that additional money shall be paid to the retirees to help them obtain adequate medical care, it should be paid to them in cash so they may purchase health insurance as they see fit rather than have the social security program hobbled and entwined in Federal regulation. Nothing will destroy the program more quickly than to hobble it with governmental controls and nothing would be further from the American way of life.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Our Government is the custodian of the social security funds to be paid to the retirees now and on into the future. Congress has the sacred responsibility of making rules for the collection and distribution of these funds. Few more solemn trusts have been given to a legislative body. Our handling of that trust will determine whether the social security system will enrich the lives of the widows and orphans, of our disabled and our elder citizens, or whether by unsound actions and selfish bidding for votes we will so wreck our economy and the system that the needy will find the cupboard bare and only bitter disillusionment.

In summary, the social security system will be just as strong as our American economy. We, in Congress, must forever keep America strong.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR THE BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the public spotlight has recently been focused

with marked degree on radio and television. It is axiomatic in the field of mass communication that radio and television are in the nature of a public trust and, as such, the public has every reason to demand from them the establishment and maintenance of the highest possible standards of morality and decency.

Radio and television are constant companions in our homes, and their opportunities to be an influence for the good in our daily lives are limitless. Radio and television permeate in every field of human endeavor—in our homes, in school, in government, in places of religious worship, even in our leisure. They have a tremendous influence in molding the minds of our youth, in swaying one way or the other public opinion.

The role of radio and television is of utmost importance to the development and progress of the Nation and its people. But it carries with it a concomitant responsibility which must be adhered to with tenacity.

It is gratifying to note, Mr. Speaker, that station WNEW in New York City has consistently and conspicuously set the highest standards of morality and decency, in recognition of which the National Conference of Christians and Jews has conferred upon it the most coveted prize in radio and television, the 1960 Brotherhood Award. Radio station WNEW is the only radio station in the United States to receive this highly valued prize this year. Last year it was the recipient of the Peabody Award as the outstanding radio news department in the country. WNEW is radio at its best.

We in New York are proud of this station, its management, and its staff for this singular achievement which is worthy of emulation. Needless to say, the National Conference of Christians and Jews is to be congratulated on its choice and on its role of fostering a climate conducive to the achievement of high standards in public service.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to introduce a bill to create a National Peace Agency. While the bill I am presenting is based upon the excellent bill introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], there are several differences in design.

The most important of these is that the Peace Agency is directed to create a training center in addition to its laboratory. The training center will train, equip, and supply the men who are assigned to enforce any disarmament agreement that the United States reaches. For example, the enforcement teams that are contemplated for an atomic test ban would be set up by the

Agency, under my bill. It has been said that the laboratory for peace would approximate in the peace area what the National Institutes of Health do so well in the line of research on disease. Similarly, the training center for peace would approximate the function of the Public Health Service, whose officers put into action the knowledge that the Institutes have discovered.

My bill would also add specifically to the research aims of the Agency—that of discovering means of controlled disarmament in the field of CBR weapons—chemical, biological, and radiological. These, the most newly publicized terrors of our age, may also be the hardest for which to inspect, and thus the hardest area in which to control any disarmament agreement.

I have also proposed research into the possibility of an international police force, using weapons that would temporarily disable without permanently harming individuals, as one of the purposes of the Peace Agency.

Finally, I have included in my bill such provisions concerning security as will make it clear that the Agency will have access to the most crucial areas of peace work—which are likely to be classified areas—and that only men working in such areas must have security clearance. The results of the Agency's research, since they will be of interest to the whole world in its search for peace, should rarely be classified.

Mr. Speaker, we in Washington are sometimes accused of creating too many alphabet-soup agencies, and undoubtedly we sometimes do. But I cannot conceive of any agency that would have such an impact for good on the United States and on the world as an agency dedicated wholly to research and action for peace. We have our Public Health Service and our National Institutes of Health to wipe out cancer, mental illness, blindness, heart disease, and other major illnesses. War is as terrible as cancer on society, as deadly to life and liberty, as any physical disease. The need for a National Peace Agency is one of the most pressing before us.

DEFEATISM

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of February 9, 1960, by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Today and Tomorrow":

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

DEFEATISM

At his press conference last week the President replied to his critics who are saying that we are behind the Soviet Union. At the end, in response to a question by Mr.

Edward P. Morgan, he went beyond the technical argument about the missible gap and deterrent power to his own philosophical attitude towards the rivalry of the two strongest world powers, the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Mr. Eisenhower's philosophy, if I have understood correctly his impromptu remarks, is that our security is not in jeopardy and that if the Soviet Union is moving faster than we are in the development of certain elements of national power, that is to be expected and must be accepted. For, said Mr. Eisenhower, "let's remember that dictatorships have been very efficient." If we must achieve a "greater tempo" in our development of national power, we shall have to "take our country and make it an armed camp and regiment it * * * and get people steamed up like you did in wars."

After that explanation of why we have fallen behind, Mr. Eisenhower delivered a little lecture on how we should think and talk more about the "values * * * which we do believe"—namely "our own individual freedoms and rights." He went on to say that "our people ought to have greater faith in their own system." By this he seemed to mean that the critics who think our defenses are inadequate and the critics who say that we are neglecting our children and not keeping up with the needs of our population, have less faith than he has in our system.

With all due respect, Mr. Eisenhower is mistaken. It is he who lacks faith in our system. It is he who is saying that we cannot meet the Soviet challenge without changing our system and giving up our freedom. It is he who is telling the country that it cannot afford to meet the needs of our rapidly growing and increasingly urbanized population. It is he who is saying that with a \$500 billion economy, the American Nation will lose its freedom if it devotes to public purposes a somewhat larger share than it does today.

It is he who is saying that our system of liberty is so fragile that it is not tough enough and durable enough to keep up the pace in the great contest of national power.

Again with all due respect, he has sunk into, he has resigned himself to, an attitude of defeatism in which there is no faith that our people have the will, the energy, the resourcefulness, and the capacity to close ranks, if they are summoned to make a greater effort. Mr. Eisenhower is talking like a tired old man who has lost touch with the springs of our national vitality.

The doctrine which the President holds, the doctrine which determines his budget, his program, and his preaching to the Nation is, in the perspective of the world struggle, a most dangerous doctrine. The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people.

If that doctrine goes out into the world, unchallenged and unrefuted here at home, Mr. K. will have the ball which we will have fumbled. We can talk to the end of time about how much we love liberty. But if the masses of mankind understand us to mean that we love liberty in such a way that we cannot keep our place in the world, they will look for guidance and for example to Moscow and not to Washington.

Yet the President's defeatism has no objective justification. The virtues of our system of society are not inseparably tied up with the Revenue Act of 1954 or with a philosophy of government which, when the

President explains it, regards the Federal Government as at best a necessary evil.

The Federal Government is no doubt wasteful, and clumsy, and inflated with bureaucracy, and not wholly immune to the payola. But the Federal Government is not a necessary evil to be talked down to. The Federal Government is an indispensable good which must be held to account and be criticized but with respect and appreciation.

For when we talk about our freedoms and our rights, we should not forget the next sentence in the Declaration of Independence which says "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men" deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for today and next week, on account of official business.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for February 17, on account of official business; attended hearings of the Special Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business that were held in Boston, Mass., with respect to small business problems in the dairy industry.

Mr. BECKER, for 1 week, on account of official business of the House Armed Services Committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF, for 40 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. LESINSKI.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. WHARTON in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. GEORGE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FOGARTY in four instances.

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. HÉBERT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1849. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the administrative expense authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1960, has been reappportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of administrative expense authorization, pursuant to subsection (e)(1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (81 U.S.C. 665(e)(1)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1850. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Joseph Bilenco a. k. a. Joseph Addison Blake, A10191198, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1851. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Pedro Ramirez-Cordova, A1956110, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1852. A letter from the national quartermaster-adjudant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the annual reports covering the activities of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., pursuant to Public Law 85-530, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7987. A bill to authorize the issuance of prospecting permits for phosphate in lands belonging to the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MACK of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:
H.R. 10533. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H.R. 10534. A bill to amend section 105 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to require

that value to the national defense be included in certain survey reports made by the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10535. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10536. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10537. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 10538. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10539. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10540. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to correct certain inequities with respect to supervisory and other postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10541. A bill to modify the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to certain salary levels, position descriptions, and service credit for automatic step increases of supervisory and other postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 10542. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 10543. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10544. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10545. A bill to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 10546. A bill to establish a public policy with respect to oceanographic surveys, and to provide for coordination of the efforts of Federal agencies with respect to oceanographic surveys; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10547. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 10548. A bill to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for

the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 10549. A bill to provide that tips and gratuities received from customers of an individual's employer may be included as part of such individual's wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 10550. A bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for two additional years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10551. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 10552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10553. A bill to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 10554. A bill to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantations, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 10555. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders with respect to certain processed fruits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 10556. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 10557. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10558. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals, birds, and reptiles which are intended for exhibition in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists, and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to further reduce the incidence of brucellosis by providing Federal support to complete nationwide certification and proceed toward the eradication of brucellosis under the brucellosis eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress

of the United States to extend the time limits of the veterans' education program established by the Federal Government pertaining to World War II and Korean conflict veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 10559. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10560. A bill for the relief of See Kwong Ong, Shui Sum Ong, Shun Mei Ong, Sin Kok Ong, and Shun Ngor Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 10561. A bill for the relief of Gehvont Khosrovian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 10562. A bill for the relief of Josephina Data Tamase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 10563. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10564. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. James F. Riche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 10565. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Phillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 10566. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances M. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10567. A bill for the relief of T.L. Cable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10568. A bill for the relief of Francesca Indelicato and Renzo Orazio Indelicato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to confer a medal on John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 451. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 7901, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

341. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council, City of Providence, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island to urge the Veterans' Administration to cause the status of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Davis Park be unchanged; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

342. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lewis W. Hunt, Covina, Calif., relative to a grievance against the Foreign Service personnel in the Rome American Embassy, and to investigate the sale of the property Orenstein and Koppel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed

under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1959 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

- A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) \$190. E. (9) \$561.45.
- A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Aircraft Service Association, 1195 Rancheros Road, Pasadena, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,591.50.
- A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Streets, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,210. E. (9) \$33.10.
- A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$6,844.55.
- A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$390.60.
- A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,579.30. E. (9) \$1,579.30.
- A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$11,992.27. E. (9) \$11,992.27.
- A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,995.20. E. (9) \$24,837.22
- A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$74.25. E. (9) \$4,300.30.
- A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$43.75. E. (9) \$53.15.
- A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$5,132.95.
- A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$11,690.02.
- A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$498.63.
- A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$256.56. E. (9) \$273.87.
- A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$895.55.
- A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City.
E. (9) \$1,097.06.
- A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
E. (9) \$833.33.
- A. Charles E. Babcock, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) 75 cents.
- A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif.
- A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,600.
- A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American National Theater and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$245.06.
- A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theaters, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theaters, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$315.22.
- A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) \$40.71.
- A. Marcia Musicant Bernstein, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Percy G. Black, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Telephone Service Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Mrs. Paul Blanchard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
- A. Chester F. Bletch, 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
- A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Charles B. Bowling, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Roland Boyd, 218 East Louisiana Street, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,826.66. E. (9) \$236.51.
- A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) \$170.
- A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) \$290.
- A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$260.
- A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$8,029.62. E. (9) \$8,029.62.
- A. Mrs. Fred L. Bull, 4312 Rowalt Drive, College Park, Md.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) \$250.
- A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$457. E. (9) \$457.
- A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
- A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., Suite 701 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Unilac, Inc., and its subsidiary, Nestle's Products (Export), Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,884.62. E. (9) \$288.46.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of the United States of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Walter Caven, Post Office Box 717, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Railroads.

D. (6) \$162.20. E. (9) \$269.50.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, New York, N.Y., and Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,500.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$20.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,325.94. E. (9) \$1,325.94.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco 5, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$227.41.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$1,040.40. E. (9) \$1,040.40.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,973.54. E. (9) \$2,295.31.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Robert J. Demichellis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,605.20. E. (9) \$305.47.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,031.25. E. (9) \$76.18.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,125.

A. Douglas, Obear & Campbell, 822 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred B. Driscoll, 719 Oldtown Road, Cumberland, Md.

B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors, International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,560. E. (9) \$1,355.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,607.98. E. (9) \$858.05.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$75.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$294.70.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$135. E. (9) \$384.28.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$200.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$753.81.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Clark Foreman, Post Office Box 1275, Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$145. E. (9) \$1,051.41.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chloe Gifford, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$36.51.

A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Raymond V. Hall, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,068.90. E. (9) \$2,474.62.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,645.80. E. (9) \$124.12.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$225.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$438.66.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,087.50. E. (9) \$7.92.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

E. (9) \$200.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$2,200.

- A. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) \$7,700. E. (9) \$1,391.70.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Post Office Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,649.99. E. (9) \$1,438.39.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 1273, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) \$1. E. (9) \$330.
- A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 1273, Washington, D.C.
B. Representative Advocacy Before Public Servants and Lawmaking Bodies.
D. (6) \$10.
- A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1418 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) \$559.37.
- A. Chester W. Jackson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,126.
- A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.
- A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N.J.
- A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, Inc., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,873.
- A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$327.80.
- A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 535 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif.
D. (6) \$325.65. E. (9) \$325.65.
- A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,802.
- A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,899.90. E. (9) \$5,074.56.
- A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$25.90.
- A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines.
- A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Lynton & Saslow, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Antique & Art Dealers Association, Inc., 59 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$146.15.
- A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$1,847.10.
- A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Veterinary Medical Association.
E. (9) \$498.63.
- A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
- A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,062.50. E. (9) \$243.63.
- A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$425.
- A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$581.76.
- A. Don Mahon, Post Office Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$608.
- A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,051.99.
- A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
E. (9) \$713.16.
- A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,245. E. (9) \$779.82.
- A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Room 512, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$141.37.
- A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and Quinebaug-French Rivers Manufacturers Association.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$296.19.
- A. Silas A. Morehouse, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.
- A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) \$2,600.
- A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$695.20. E. (9) \$812.19.
- A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,879.55. E. (9) \$20,316.63.
- A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$493,477. E. (9) \$20,565.48.
- A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,144.59. E. (9) \$1,917.26.
- A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$16,249.93.
- A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) \$980.61. E. (9) \$980.61.
- A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$39,000. E. (9) \$30,253.65.
- A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,594.90. E. (9) \$1,548.68.
- A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Post Office Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$25.
- A. National Council of Naval Air Stations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.
D. (6) \$418.19. E. (9) \$10.
- A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$323,868. E. (9) \$1,987.98.

- A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,554.45. E. (9) \$11,554.45.
- A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$11,076.
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
E. (9) \$731.29.
- A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,899.40. E. (9) \$12,018.30.
- A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$775.82. E. (9) \$699.78.
- A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,813.58. E. (9) \$3,708.
- A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,416.25. E. (9) \$1,565.71.
- A. John W. Nerlinger, Jr., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. New York Antique and Art Dealers Association, Inc., 59 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Joseph A. Noone, 603 Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$5.
- A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$21.66. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$144.05.
- A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
- A. Robert S. Palmer, Denver, Colo.
B. Emergency Small Miners Committee, in care of Colorado Mining Association, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) \$2,542.32.
- A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 356, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) \$4,624.98.
- A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,813.44. E. (9) \$1,202.89.
- A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) \$5,632.99. E. (9) \$525.
- A. Frederick T. Poole, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines.
- A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,944. E. (9) \$30.
- A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,800.
- A. Gordon M. Gaurnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hays-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
- A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$612.85.
- A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) \$11. E. (9) \$25.04.
- A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$80.61.
- A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$575. E. (9) \$14.50.
- A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; et al.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Kimball Sanborn, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$290. E. (9) \$190.
- A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Salvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$15.60.
- A. Salvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$8,300. E. (9) \$100.75.
- A. Salvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,019.24. E. (9) \$852.52.
- A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,418. E. (9) \$793.66.
- A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$7,740.07.
- A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$17,925.43.
- A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,176.80. E. (9) \$1,443.72.
- A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) \$862.59. E. (9) \$776.51.
- A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
- A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Standard Public Relations, Inc., 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$600.
- A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Hagerstown, Md.

A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$566.13.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

E. (9) \$50.80.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$843.75. E. (9) \$1,033.16.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

D. (6) \$175. E. (9) \$1,155.73.

A. Arthur R. Thurston, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.

B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$36.95.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,460.50. E. (9) \$6,074.96.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York City.

E. (9) \$1,218.87.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$80. E. (9) \$80.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$43.75. E. (9) \$9.40.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$115.20.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,478.07. E. (9) \$2,478.07.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$164.90.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$1,741.66. E. (9) \$45.85.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19-----

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

| P | QUARTER | | | |
|---|---------|----|----|-----|
| | 1st | 2d | 3d | 4th |
| | | | | |

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$.....Dues and assessments
2. \$.....Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$.....Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$.....Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$.....Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$.....Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$.....TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. \$.....TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. \$.....Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. \$.....Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. \$....."Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no":

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

| Amount | Name and Address of Contributor |
|------------|--|
| | ("Period" from Jan. 1 through, 19....) |
| \$1,500.00 | John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y. |
| \$1,785.00 | The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill. |
| \$3,285.00 | TOTAL |

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. \$.....Public relations and advertising services
2. \$.....Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. \$.....Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. \$.....Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. \$.....Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. \$.....Telephone and telegraph
7. \$.....Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. \$.....All other expenditures
9. \$.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. \$.....Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. \$.....TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. \$.....TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. \$.....Lent to others during this Quarter
14. \$.....Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of \$10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

| Amount | Date or Dates | Name and Address of Recipient | Purpose |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|
| \$1,750.00 | 7-11: | Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo. | Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill." |
| \$2,400.00 | 7-15, 8-15, 9-15: | Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C. | Public relations service at \$800.00 per month. |
| \$4,150.00 | | TOTAL | |

- A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,760.12. E. (9) \$48.25.
- A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,366.58. E. (9) \$4,356.58.
- A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$7,309. E. (9) \$9,411.75.
- A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
- A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,171.10. E. (9) \$1,171.10.
- A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
 B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.
- A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$70.25.
- A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
 B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
- A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$2,040.
- A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$7,069.77.
- A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
 D. (6) \$6,782.42. E. (9) \$6,782.42.
- A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$23,788. E. (9) \$23,188.
- A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL-CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$33,508.05.
- A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$12,291.30. E. (9) \$10,887.07.
- A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,114.06. E. (9) \$1,980.20.
- A. American Justice Association Inc., Post Office Box 1387, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5.00. E. (9) \$139.70.
- A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$40,000. E. (9) \$11,954.21.
- A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 D. (6) \$8,737.67. E. (9) \$4,102.52.
- A. American Optometric Association (development fund—legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 E. (9) \$2,274.13.
- A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$482.63. E. (9) \$482.63.
- A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,763.35. E. (9) \$1,608.46.
- A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$312. E. (9) \$9,163.
- A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$71,840.03. E. (9) \$2,005.23.
- A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,481.84. E. (9) \$5,481.84.
- A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$43,056. E. (9) \$22,918.11.
- A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Battery March Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$5,027.99.
- A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$14,247.
- A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$1,562.50.
- A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Warehousemen's Association Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,475. E. (9) \$1,384.62.
- A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$339.46.
- A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
 B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
- A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
 B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
- A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$1,137.55.
- A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
 E. (9) \$4,999.98.
- A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$375.
- A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,760.73. E. (9) \$5,760.73.
- A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,218.65. E. (9) \$2,218.65.
- A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$25.
- A. Richard W. Averill, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$73.45.
- A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Post Office Box 406, Vienna, Va.
 B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,500.
- A. George P. Baker, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Transportation Association of America.

- A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,274.88. E. (9) \$150.85.
- A. Thomas F. Baker.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$2,600.
- A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) \$1,258.73.
- A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Albert M. Greenfield.
E. (9) \$95.72.
- A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$167.50. E. (9) \$11.37.
- A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,600.
- A. James F. Bell, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$66.91.
- A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$4,500.
- A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$97.70.
- A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
- A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Indemnity and Life Insurance Co., 654 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.
- A. David Bishop, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$890.
- A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$220.
- A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$500.
- A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$41.67. E. (9) \$22.40.
- A. Mrs. Paul Blanchard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$40.
- A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,402. E. (9) \$190.25.
- A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$97.
- A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$135.
- A. Charles B. Bowling, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$205.
- A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) \$7.95.
- A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
- A. Vincent L. Broderick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$419.84.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$575.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$126.82.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$356.25. E. (9) \$411.45.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$16.62.

A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$15.59.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$48.25.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$105.33.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$10,737.98.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Retained by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$290. E. (9) \$65.58.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,708.33.

A. Hollis W. Burt, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$42.75.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$1.84.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$473.88.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$27.27.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,423.07. E. (9) \$342.30.

A. Judy Carlisle, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$561.24. E. (9) \$239.10.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$336.50.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,050.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,760. E. (9) \$968.08.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$640. E. (9) \$462.21.

A. Jay H. Cerf, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,300. E. (9) \$1,605.20.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

E. (9) \$56.47.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$3,669.99. E. (9) \$3,505.28.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$86.65.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. William H. Coburn, 315 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Ore.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$650.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$380.33.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$64.65.

A. Albert M. Cole, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$248.57.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sand Products Corporation, 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) \$12.68.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$130. E. (9) \$190.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Committee to Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,825. E. (9) \$8,020.43.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$9,193.82.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 805 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Street, Washington, D.C.

A. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$10,500. E. (9) \$1,100.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$157.64.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,300. E. (9) \$29.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$154.31.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1.43.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; and The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, 121 E. 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$441.20.

A. Laurence A. Crosby, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,402. E. (9) \$351.40.

A. Bryce Curry, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$325.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) \$900.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$656.25. E. (9) \$8.70.

A. Joan E. David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$405.72. E. (9) \$97.62.

A. Charles W. Davis, One North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, One North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$441.20.

A. Dorothy Mondell Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Robert E. Pflaumer, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,125.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Poultry and Egg Producers Association, Lakewood, N.J.
D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Tony T. De Chant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$840.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$135.8f.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,049.50. E. (9) \$424.50.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,501.28. E. (9) \$151.28.

- A. Disabled American Veterans National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1,500.
- A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,750.
- A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$18,802.38. E. (9) \$25,075.08.
- A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$35,302.99.
- A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$30.75. E. (9) \$4.71.
- A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$175.77.
- A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$376.69.
- A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,624.99.
- A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$127.50.
- A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,850.18. E. (9) \$105.
- A. Ben DuBols, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
- A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$255. E. (9) \$12.22.
- A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1.40. E. (9) \$134.69.
- A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$15.
- A. Harold Edwards, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 2454 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$700.
- A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$206. E. (9) \$27.50.
- A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,092. E. (9) \$69.52.
- A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 3025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,000.
- A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$163.90.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,375.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,400.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.
D. (6) \$650. E. (9) \$8.72.
- A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$7,810. E. (9) \$2.40.
- A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$14.06.
- A. Farmers Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$105,359.65. E. (9) \$15,935.70.
- A. Federation of Homemakers, 5610 16th Street, North Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$104. E. (9) \$65.
- A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.
- A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) \$6,099.96.
- A. John B. Fisher, 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor and Aroostook Railroad, Bangor, Maine.
- A. John B. Fisher, 1122 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. John B. Fisher, 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Mrs. F. B. von Courten, 60 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$250.

A. Norman A. Flanigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,287.50. E. (9) \$13.69.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
 E. (9) \$1,856.54.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
 E. (9) \$1,398.25.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
 E. (9) \$1,455.33.

A. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 40 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$8,394.47.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
 B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
 B. The Florida Savings and Loan League, Post Office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$10,909.92. E. (9) \$6,639.90.

A. Clark Foremen, Post Office Box 1275, Washington, D.C.
 B. Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$207.64.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$737.50. E. (9) \$65.55.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$67.60.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
 D. (6) \$1,330. E. (9) \$1,075.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Freedman & Levy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Fred H. Lenway & Co., Inc., 112 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$26,879.60. E. (9) \$6,590.59.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Ore.
 E. (9) \$5.40.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
 B. Minnesota Railroads.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Bigham, Englar, Jones and Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$10.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
 B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association.
 D. (6) \$1,620. E. (9) \$504.04.

A. Chloe Gifford, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
 B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Small Business Men's Association.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$7,594.14. E. (9) \$5,107.78.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$15,547.20. E. (9) \$17,845.39.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$45. E. (9) \$35.09.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
 D. (6) \$6,000.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Washington Indian Association of Washington State.
 E. (9) \$8.
- A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$43.75. E. (9) \$9.40.
- A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- A. Austin H. Gursel, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
 B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
- A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,153.90. E. (9) \$23.40.
- A. Gayle Gupton, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
 B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,560. E. (9) \$519.49.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$8.94.
- A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Haley, Wollenberg & Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 D. (6) \$514.31.
- A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$741.66. E. (9) \$9.77.
- A. Raymond V. Hall, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$407.74.
- A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,104.12.
- A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$133.45.
- A. Harold F. Hammond.
 B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. George F. Hannuam, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$1,094.08.
- A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
- A. Herbert E. Harris, II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,087.50. E. (9) \$37.45.
- A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
 B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
- A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
 B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 D. (6) \$2,238.
- A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$67.98.
- A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,632. E. (9) \$796.50.
- A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
- A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
 B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. John C. Hazen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$37.70.
- A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$6,976.31.
- A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$34.80.
- A. George J. Hecht, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$748.71.
- A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$525.
- A. Charles H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Ore.
 D. (6) \$930. E. (9) \$100.75.
- A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 D. (6) \$1,875.
- A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,943.41. E. (9) \$818.41.
- A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$78.25. E. (9) \$78.25.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$20.83.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
 E. (9) \$93.42.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$79.95.
- A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$218.75.

- A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) \$471.15.
- A. Patrick J. Hillings, 315 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Portland Cement Co., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$55.76.
- A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$200.
- A. John E. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,562.50. E. (9) \$75.
- A. Holland & Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Ideal Cement Co., Denver National Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
- A. Stanley G. Holmes, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$466.67. E. (9) \$30.
- A. Richard C. Holmquist, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$318.75.
- A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$441.20.
- A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association Merchandise Division.
- A. J. Cline House, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,500.
- A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000.03.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Post Office Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,649.99. E. (9) \$1,101.09.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
- A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.
- A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.
- A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$298.75.
- A. George F. Hussey, Jr., 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Standards Association, 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$19,000.89. E. (9) \$19,000.89.
- A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.
- A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$46,031.45.
- A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,156.
- A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$3.20.
- A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) \$502.86.
- A. Chester W. Jackson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,126.
- A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$310.63.
- A. Andrew F. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah
- A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. Daniel Jaspán, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,901.24. E. (9) \$37.84.
- A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
D. (6) \$402.42. E. (9) \$164.60.
- A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,749.98. E. (9) \$233.65.
- A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, Inc., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Gilbert E. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,966.72. E. (9) \$29.55.
- A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
- A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$25.95.
- A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$50.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) \$8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,780. E. (9) \$75.23.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Kelly, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$40.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$150.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$249.85.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$469.31.

A. Ronald M. Ketchan, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$288.50.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,579.18. E. (9) \$1,459.67.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11 Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$221.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$52.50.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$3.60.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$3.60.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 535 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$50.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$600.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$11.36.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,807.66. E. (9) \$23.65.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,802.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Kohler, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$937.50. E. (9) \$69.42.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$2,239.51.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,614.75. E. (9) \$5,139.79.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,000.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,000.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$250.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Building, Fort Worth, Tex.

D. (6) \$1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$150.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$450.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,666.66. E. (9) \$960.23.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$271.25. E. (9) \$4.20.

A. Warren Lawrence, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$100.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,187.50. E. (9) \$15.10.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$21.87. E. (9) \$21.87.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$6,250.03. E. (9) \$4,497.43.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$785. E. (9) \$4.50.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$4,999.98. E. (9) \$5,592.79.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$14. E. (9) \$14.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,707.86. E. (9) \$3,707.86.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$168.75. E. (9) \$11.06.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,500.30. E. (9) \$15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$115.17.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
 B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Lowenstein, Pletcher, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Driver, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. St. James Lumber Co., Pinewood Acres, Inc., and Gayland, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$375.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Western Medical Corp., 415-23 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. H. B. Lockett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$365.75.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,087.50. E. (9) \$14.83.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
 B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$218.61.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$260. E. (9) \$27.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,329.60. E. (9) \$42.65.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$2.84.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$346.77.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
 B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,029.44. E. (9) \$102.50.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$320.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth, Sterling, Kans.
 B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$999.99. E. (9) \$150.

A. Frederick C. McKee, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,477.50. E. (9) \$384.63.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$352.52.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$225.75. E. (9) \$3.15.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$425.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. MacCracken, Collins & Whitney, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Compagnie Aramayo de Mines en Bolivie, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$5.77.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$2,150. E. (9) \$124.13.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,650. E. (9) \$787.63.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1833 S. 7th East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Gracie Terrace, New York, N.Y.
 B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
 B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
 B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$126.08.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,625. E. (9) \$2,475.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,797.84. E. (9) \$95.71.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,051.99.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

* A. Edwin E. Marsh, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$2,750.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$200.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,402. E. (9) \$165.30.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$256.39. E. (9) \$302.40.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$90.73. E. (9) \$24.71.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,205. E. (9) \$195.

A. Mrs. Vera Mayer.

B. National Consumers League, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,214.33. E. (9) \$64.40.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,980.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1023 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.

E. (9) \$203.73.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$1.80.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$25.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) \$1,330.63.

A. G. R. Milburn, Grass Range, Mont.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

D. (6) \$871. E. (9) \$1,044.26.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The C. L. Gougler Co., 705 Lake Street, Kent, Ohio.
D. (6) \$8,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) \$2,200.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$2,553.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,824.99. E. (9) \$415.40.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifer, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$49.83.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$20.50.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$89.96.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.
D. (6) \$168.32.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Group Health Insurance, Inc., 221 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$8.72.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$350.

- A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$251.96.
- A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,056. E. (9) \$167.68.
- A. William J. Mougey, Washington, D.C.
 B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
 D. (6) \$2,600.
- A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$466.89.
- A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
 B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
- A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.
- A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
 B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
- A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,187.08. E. (9) \$1,187.08.
- A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 D. (6) \$13,750. E. (9) \$55.70.
- A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$284.68. E. (9) \$5,950.73.
- A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$7,261.63.
- A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$6,799.04.
- A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$850.
- A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
 D. (6) \$505.28. E. (9) \$419.86.
- A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$22,495.09. E. (9) \$682.50.
- A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
 D. (6) \$933.71. E. (9) \$933.71.
- A. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$483,739.68. E. (9) \$3,253.41.
- A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,185. E. (9) \$3,319.12.
- A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
 E. (9) \$7,000.
- A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$2,186.12. E. (9) \$2,186.12.
- A. National Council on Business Mall, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$600.
- A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
- A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$65.58. E. (9) \$65.58.
- A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$94,803.82. E. (9) \$7,371.65.
- A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$8,902.96. E. (9) \$8,902.96.
- A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$286,468.64. E. (9) \$15,267.19.
- A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$11,076.
- A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Independent Meatpackers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,266.96. E. (9) \$1,890.08.
- A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$393.89. E. (9) \$850.
- A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 D. (6) \$2,238.
- A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$33.44. E. (9) \$38.01.
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,990.46. E. (9) \$2,990.46.
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York City.
 E. (9) \$758.36.
- A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$7,117.54. E. (9) \$7,117.54.
- A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$16,039.92. E. (9) \$11,248.40.
- A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$5,273.77.
- A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$385. E. (9) \$7,646.29.
- A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$604.53.
- A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$250.
- A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$4,672.73.
- A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$34,869.30. E. (9) \$2,824.87.
- A. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$392.35.
- A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
 D. (6) \$649. E. (9) \$1,125.10.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$16,414. E. (9) \$2,750.

A. Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$25,600. E. (9) \$14,001.29.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$944.44. E. (9) \$922.13.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$3,726.46.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Nerlinger, Jr., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$37.46.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.

D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$4,083.37.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$3,000.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$105. E. (9) \$5.71.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$24.64.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Hyman Nussbaum, 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Television Service Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc., 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$30.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.

B. Beneficial Finance Co. and Beneficial Management Corp., 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.

B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$600.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$2,490. E. (9) \$76.30.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (9) \$5,210.05.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$492.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1131 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$681.84. E. (9) \$42.94.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,884.62. E. (9) \$5.21.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$1,624.99.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1278, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,750.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145, 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$21.55.

A. James G. Patton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.

B. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, in care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$37.57.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$66.98.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

E. (9) \$45.96.

A. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,014.40. E. (9) \$1,873.42.
- A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Iris V. Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, International, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$56.54.
- A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$21.95.
- A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., et al.
E. (9) \$10.
- A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,031.
- A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
- A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$70.
- A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
- A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) \$45.96.
- A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) \$73,965.99. E. (9) \$525.
- A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$827.94.
- A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$30.
- A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
- A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10. E. (9) \$52.81.
- A. Walter I. Pozen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,499.99.
- A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,800.
- A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 1211 South Brighton 8, Dallas, Tex.
- A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$376.71.
- A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.
E. (9) \$9.79.
- A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
- A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute Cubano de Estabilizacion del Azucar, acting as trustee for Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
D. (6) \$4,652. E. (9) \$1,250.
- A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Association, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York City; National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn.; and Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$20,249.99. E. (9) \$6,817.54.
- A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) \$10. E. (9) \$2.22.
- A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
- A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) \$150.
- A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$2,440.79.
- A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$136.42.
- A. J. B. Reeves, A.T. & S.F. G.O.B., 9th and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., A.T. & S.F. G.O.B., Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.
- A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,999.98. E. (9) \$26.25.
- A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$33.71.
- A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$575.
- A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Amherst Coal Co., Port Amherst Station, Charleston, W. Va., et al.
D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$7,067.09.
- A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$64,949.48.
- A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$269.20. E. (9) \$10,495.43.
- A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
- A. James P. Richards, 1536 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$331.59.
- A. Leon D. Richeson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Robert E. Pfaumer, Chicago, Ill.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,473.49. E. (9) \$373.52.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,402. E. (9) \$381.05.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$547.18.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$110.75.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$56.

A. Robert Ridgway Rodenberg, 2356 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government of the Dominican Republic, National Palace, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

A. Edward Rodgers, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$396. E. (9) \$28.51

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$4,350.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tax Equality Association, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,490.46. E. (9) \$973.63.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$148.48. E. (9) \$50.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$618.75.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$197.40.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.36. E. (9) \$60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$118.46.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,340.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,325.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., New York International Airport, Jamaica, N.Y.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$205.62. E. (9) \$683.67.

A. Fred G. Seig, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$480. E. (9) \$31.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$44.88.

A. Harold Shapiro, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$14,600. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$283.25.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. City and County of San Francisco.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$2,238.36.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,874.97. E. (9) \$813.52.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$150.

- A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$625.
- A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.
- A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$3,002.40.
- A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
- A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$868.15. E. (9) \$27.64.
- A. Stephen Shlpher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2187.50. E. (9) \$1.20.
- A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$65.
- A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$4,257.
- A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
- A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,413.44.
- A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$26,707.68. E. (9) \$8,510.23.
- A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) \$150.
- A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$455.64.
- A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
- A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. Thomas C. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,800.
- A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$150.
- A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$463.20.
- A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.
- A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.
- A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore Md.
E. (9) \$2.66.
- A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$20,000. E. (9) \$170.60.
- A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,583.33.
- A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,208.33.
- A. Joseph M. Stone, Esq., 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Local 1, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, 333 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$190.
- A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.
- A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$276.22.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,384.62.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$625.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250.
- A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$5.
- A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) \$2,100. E. (9) \$950.96.
- A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) \$235.51.
- A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$410.79.
- A. Television Service Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc., 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$30.
- A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
 D. (6) \$8,273.66. E. (9) \$18,708.79.
- A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
 B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
- A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Massachusetts Indemnity & Life Insurance Co., 654 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., Esq., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.
- A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
- A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$150.
- A. G. D. Tighman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
 D. (6) \$295. E. (9) \$261.33.
- A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$1,014.
- A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$47.85.
- A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$37.50.
- A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
 B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
- A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,600. E. (9) \$33.51.
- A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 N. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,093.75. E. (9) \$27.45.
- A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
 B. General Petroleum Corporation, 612 S. Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.
- A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Ore.
 B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Ore.
- A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
 E. (9) \$41.55.
- A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
 E. (9) \$58.
- A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
 E. (9) \$804.74.
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York City.
 E. (9) \$1,263.90.
- A. U.S. Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$21,747.13. E. (9) \$1,147.70.
- A. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$11,873.34.
- A. U.S. Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. H. Jerry Voorhis.
 B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$300.
- A. Carl M. Walker, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$50.
- A. Leland M. Walker, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,307.72. E. (9) \$45.34.
- A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$97.88.
- A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$119.50. E. (9) \$0.60.
- A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$7,503.40. E. (9) \$4,476.36.
- A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$6,220.47.
- A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
 B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
- A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$250.
- A. Robert Watson.
- A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
 B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$2.17.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$187.50. E. (9) \$42.77.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, D. (6) \$2,184. E. (9) \$436.13.

A. Donald D. Webster, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,375. E. (9) \$120.52.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$27.10.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) \$621.95.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$7,153.44.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$37.50. E. (9) \$87.83.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) \$1.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) \$6.25.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) \$31.58.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Bellevue Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinalt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) \$2.40.

A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,600.

A. Wm. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,700. E. (9) \$348.82.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,507.69.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$204.74.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) \$1.08.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$210.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) \$14.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,741.66. E. (9) \$56.70.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,375.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America et al.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---------|--|--|--|-----|----|----|-----|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Year: 19----- | REPORT | <table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">QUARTER</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1st</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2d</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3d</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4th</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">(Mark one square only)</td> </tr> </table> | QUARTER | | | | 1st | 2d | 3d | 4th | (Mark one square only) | | | |
| QUARTER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2d | 3d | 4th | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Mark one square only) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL.** This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
 - (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) **SEPARATE REPORTS.** An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
- (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

- A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:**
1. State name, address, and nature of business.
 2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—Reports by Agents or Employees. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) if a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

- C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS** in connection therewith:
1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.
 2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.
 3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard B. Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del.

A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Albert M. Greenfield.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.

B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. James Browne, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sidney A. Cohen, 820 Woodward Building NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Reporting Council, 820 Woodward Building NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee To Oppose the Cross Park Freeway From Tenley Circle, Across Rock Creek Park to the Inner Loop, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 500 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 8 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Thomas Dixon, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James G. Donovan, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 8-10 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Gayle Gupton, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Holland & Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Ideal Cement Co., Denver National Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Hughes, Hubbard, Blair & Reed, 1 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Bendix Aviation Corp., Fisher Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Tom Killefer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Klepinger, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. S. S. Associates, 435 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Association of Guatemalan Sugar Mills, 5 Avenida 13-63, Zone 1, Guatemala, C.A.

A. John S. Linen, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.

B. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.

B. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. County Supervisors Association of California, 500 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Hyman Nussbaum, 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Television Service Association of Metropolitan Washington, 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Sanford L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Ridgway Rodenberg, 2356 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government of the Dominican Republic, National Palace, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

A. Robert A. Schulman, Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis Mackay Seavey, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Regional Broadcasters.

A. Samuel Spencer and Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee To Oppose the Cross Park Freeway From Tenley Circle Across Rock Creek Park to the Inner Loop.

A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Hagerstown, Md.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Surplus Property Importers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Television Service Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc., 852 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Gerald H. Ullman, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. The Committee on Legislation for the United Ocean Freight Forwarding Industry, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

A. Harding DeC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.