

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1962

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

Ephesians 4: 25: *We are members one of another.*

Our Heavenly Father, inspire us to think of all mankind as the offspring of God, created by Him and with a capacity to be like Him in spirit.

May Thy love constrain us to believe and feel that the common welfare of the various races and people of the earth must be the concern of all alike.

Grant that men and nations everywhere may put forth a more heroic and concerted effort to enthrone and manifest the principles of friendship and fraternity in all their relationships.

Help us to be more firmly convinced that the very existence of civilization depends upon a community of cooperation among the members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of Him who is Lord of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

WILLIAM FALBY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 1653, an act for the relief of William Falby, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 13, after "loss" insert: *Provided, That the said William Falby enters the United States for permanent residence within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

STAVROS MOURKAKOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1899) for the relief of Stavros Mourkakos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stavros Mourkakos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Stavros Michael Mourkakos. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Stavros Michael Mourkakos shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Stavros Michael Mourkakos."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA STELLA TODARO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2337) for the relief of Maria Stella Todaro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Stella Todaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Maria Stella Todaro. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Maria Stella Todaro shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVY GWENDOLYN MYERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3821) for the relief of Ivy Gwendolyn Myers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ivy Gwendolyn Myers shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Egbert Myers, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, at the end of line 4, strike out the words "the minor".

On page 1, line 5, strike out the first word "child".

On page 1, line 6, after the words "natural-born alien" insert the word "minor".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AHSABET OYUNCYIYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3822) for the relief of Ahsabet Oyunciyanyan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahsabet Oyunciyanyan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Ahsabet Oyunciyanyan. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Ahsabet Oyunciyanyan shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIKOKO SHINAGAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3912) for the relief of Chikoko Shinagawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chikoko Shinagawa, the fiancée of William Liese, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: Provided, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chikoko Shinagawa is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William Liese and that

she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-mentioned persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Chikoko Shinagawa, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-mentioned persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Chikoko Shinagawa, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chikoko Shinagawa as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA LA BELLA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1881) for the relief of Maria La Bella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria La Bella shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Maria La Bella. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Maria La Bella shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM THOMAS DENDY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6016) for the relief of William Thomas Dendy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William Thomas Dendy, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337

of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said William Thomas Dendy shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOREEN JOYCE BADEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9180) for the relief of Noreen Joyce Baden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Noreen Joyce Baden shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Noreen Joyce Baden shall be deemed to be chargeable to the quota for Great Britain."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAUDE HOMANN-HERIMBERG (NEE WAGNER)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9588) for the relief of Claude Homann-Herimberg (nee Wagner).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 352(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1484) shall not have been and not to be applicable in the case of Claude Homann-Herimberg (nee Wagner), a naturalized citizen of the United States: Provided, That the said Claude Homann-Herimberg (nee Wagner) establishes residence in the United States prior to the expiration of thirty-six months following the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3 and 4 and the word "applicable" on line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 352(a)(2) of the said Act shall be deemed to have been and to be inapplicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFERSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 423) for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H.R. 8585) entitled "A bill for the relief of Jefferson Construction Company", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims subject to its rules and pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and the court shall proceed expeditiously with the same and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, such findings of fact, including facts relating to delay or laches, facts bearing upon the question whether the bar or any statute of limitations should be removed, or facts claimed to excuse the claimant for not having resorted to any established legal remedy, and conclusions based on such facts as shall be sufficient to inform Congress whether the demand is a legal or equitable claim or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. EDWIN ALLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2836) for the relief of C. Edwin Alley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Edwin Alley, of Fairfax, Virginia, \$2,500 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising out of an assault on March 26, 1960, in the Old Post Office Building in Washington, D.C., involving guards employed by the General Services Administration. Suit may not be instituted on such claims under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5: Strike "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000".

Page 1, lines 7, 8, and 9: Strike "arising out of an assault on March 26, 1960, in the Old Post Office Building in Washington, D.C., involving guards employed by the General Services Administration" and insert "and against any employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim, by reason of an incident on March '6, 1960, in the Old Post Office Building in Washington, D.C.".

Page 1, line 11, and page 2, line 1: Strike "Code: Provided, That" and insert "Code. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be subject to any claim, by way of subrogation or otherwise, for reimbursement of workmen's compensation benefits paid on account of the incident referred to in this Act, and".

Page 2, lines 1 and 2: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEPHEN A. ESKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6014) for the relief of Stephen A. Eskin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Stephen A. Eskin (RA11369272), United States Army, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$325.69, the amount which he was paid for travel expense incurred by him under travel orders which were revoked. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Stephen A. Eskin (RA 11369272), United States Army, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$325.69" and insert "324.69".

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LECLIL A. SIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6655) for the relief of Leclil A. Sims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Leclil A. Sims, of Delta, Alabama, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$1,561.60, the amount by which he was overpaid, through administrative error, during the period from July 5, 1958, through March 12, 1960, as an employee of the Refrigeration Unit, Post Engineers, Fort McClellan, Alabama. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leclil A. Sims, an amount

equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$1,561.60" and insert "\$1,561.00".

Page 1, line 6, strike out "July 5, 1958" and insert "June 22, 1958".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERBERT B. SHORTER, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7365) for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in the Act of October 9, 1940 (31 Stat. sec. 71a), or in any other limiting statute, the application made by Herbert B. Shorter, Senior, of Pompano Beach, Florida, received by the General Accounting Office on April 29, 1957, for additional retainer pay for the period from February 1, 1940, to April 28, 1947, for United States Navy Fleet Reserve service shall be held and considered to have been timely filed and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to consider that claim and pay any amount found due the said Herbert B. Shorter, Senior, for the period covered by the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLENDAL W. HANCOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8452) for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Glendal W. Hancock of Sacramento, California, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of \$664.51 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army and the United States Air Force for the period from February 22, 1946, to May 31, 1958, which he received as the result of an erroneous computation of creditable service for longevity purposes.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Glendal W. Hancock, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$664.51" and insert "\$787.93".

Page 1, line 8, strike out "February 22, 1946, to May 31, 1958" and insert "September 29, 1942, through January 31, 1960".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON ANNENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9599) for the relief of Solomon Annenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay, out of current appropriations available for the furnishing of prosthetic appliances, to Solomon Annenberg, of Naugatuck, Connecticut (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-21497050), the sum of \$650, as reimbursement for the cost of an artificial limb procured by him after the Veterans' Administration had erroneously refused to furnish him an artificial limb to which he was entitled: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11 and page 2, line, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTELLE L. HEARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9834) for the relief of Estelle L. Heard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$880.23 to Estelle L. Heard, of Danville, Virginia, in full settlement of her claims against the United States for compensation for damage to her 1958 Chevrolet sedan sustained in an accident which occurred on March 12, 1961, near South Boston, Virginia, when her automobile was struck and seriously damaged by a United

States Army truck and trailer. This claim has been determined not to be cognizable under the tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code on the ground that the Army driver was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the collision: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM W. JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9942) for the relief of Mrs. William W. Johnston.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANCIS L. QUINN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10525) for the relief of Francis L. Quinn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Francis L. Quinn, of Concord, Massachusetts, the sum of \$300. Such sum represents reimbursement to the said Francis L. Quinn for paying out of his own funds judgments rendered against him in the Middlesex District East Cambridge, Massachusetts Court, as the result of an accident occurring when said Francis L. Quinn was operating a Government motor vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the United States Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON C. JENSEN AND BRUCE E. WOOLNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11578) for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Don

C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner are hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the amounts listed opposite their names, representing unaccounted for outstanding balances in their accounts while serving as disbursing officers of the United States: Don C. Jensen, \$415.99; Bruce E. Woolner, \$804.73.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them on account of the outstanding balances referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH A. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10308) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act, Leroy Johnson shall be presumed to have elected, upon his retirement from Congress January 2, 1957, to receive a reduced annuity and an annuity equal to one-half his life annuity payable after his death to his widow, Elizabeth A. Johnson.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TING-WA WONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Dr. Ting-Wa Wong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ting-Wa Wong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 11, 1958, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH DAVID WOODEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1962) for the relief of Kenneth David Wooden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the

minor child, Kenneth David Wooden, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Harold Hoover Wooden, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of Kenneth David Wooden, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIA LONGFIELD-SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2011) for the relief of Antonia Longfield-Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Antonia Longfield-Smith, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. John W. Longfield-Smith, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TINA JANE BELAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2099) for the relief of Tina Jane Beland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Tina Jane Beland, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Marcel Albert Beland and Lottie Beatrice Beland, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Tina Jane Beland shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVA LONDON RITT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2143) for the relief of Mrs. Eva London Ritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Mrs. Eva London Ritt shall be held and considered to be and to have been on July 30, 1961, within the purview of section 354(5) of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section

352(a)(2) of the said Act shall be deemed to have been and to be inapplicable in the case of Mrs. Eva London Ritt, a naturalized citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the said Mrs. Eva London Ritt establishes residence in the United States, as defined in section 101(a)(33) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, prior to the expiration of thirty-six months following the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIPE O. PAGDILAO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Felipe O. Pagdilao.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEMITRIOS DUNIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1609) for the relief of Demitrios Dunis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demitrios Dunis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of Vasilikie D. and Gus Harry Dunis, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "sections 203(a)(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 101(a)(27)(A)".

On page 1, line 5, after the words "the natural-born" strike out the word "son" and substitute the words "alien minor child".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LESLIE M. PATERSON ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1469) for the relief of Mrs. Leslie M. Paterson, Janet Paterson, and Mary Paterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, Mrs. Leslie M. Paterson, the widow of a United States citizen, and her daughters, Janet and Mary Paterson, shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That,

for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202(c) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the cases of Mrs. Leslie M. Paterson, Janet Paterson, and Mary Paterson."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANTISEK TISLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6833) for the relief of Frantisek Tisler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Frantisek Tisler lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States on September 1, 1959, shall be held to be included in the class of applicants for naturalization exempted from the provisions of section 313(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as such class is specified in section 313(c) of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FERDINAND A. HERMENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10371) for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 352(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not apply to any period of residence of Ferdinand A. Hermens, a naturalized citizen of the United States, in Germany after April 30, 1962, and prior to May 1, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSINA LUISI (SISTER MARY ROSINA) AND MARIA FATIBENE (SISTER M. VALENTINA)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10960) for the relief of Rosina Luisi (Sister Mary Rosina) and Maria Fatibene (Sister M. Valentina).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosina Luisi (Sister Mary Rosina) and Maria Fatibene (Sister M. Valentina), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11665) to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 11665, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas presiding as Chairman pro tempore.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 31, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] had 6 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] had 7 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as is necessary to offer some explanation of this legislation in the nature of a communication from the Department of Agriculture, which administers the hot school lunch program.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1962.
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: This is in reply to Mr. McCord's request for additional information with respect to section 11 of H.R. 11665, now pending before the House of Representatives. Specifically, we understand that certain questions have been raised concerning the discretionary authority this section of the bill would provide to the Secretary in the use of funds for special school lunch assistance to schools which draw attendance from economically needy areas.

As representatives of this Department testified before the Subcommittee on General Education, the purpose of section 11 is to make special provision for those communities and those children that are least able to take advantage of the school lunch program. These schools draw their attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and where a large proportion of the children would need to receive free or substantially reduced price meals if an adequate school lunch program were to be operated.

Our experience has demonstrated that the amount of cash assistance that can now be provided to these States under the regular school lunch assistance program, together with the limited amount of funds that such communities can provide, is not sufficient to finance the cost of serving school lunches to all of the children in the school who need to receive lunch at no cost or at a token charge of, perhaps, a few pennies or 5 or 10 cents. The funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 would be used to provide these schools with sufficient Federal cash

assistance to permit the needy children to have the benefits of an adequate school lunch.

The broad discretionary authority contained in section 11 is not intended to change the basic administrative pattern of the national school lunch program. The responsibility for the selection of schools for section 11 assistance, and the disbursement of section 11 funds, will be left in the hands of State educational agencies, except in the 29 States or territories where State law makes it necessary for the Department of Agriculture to deal directly with private schools in the administration of the current school lunch assistance program. Rather, this discretionary authority is designed to give the Department time to work out with State educational agencies the most effective and practical policies and procedures for identifying those schools in need of special assistance and for disbursing the special assistance funds to such schools, within the framework of existing school lunch administrative patterns of the various States.

The terms and conditions relating to the expenditure of section 11 funds will be published in the Federal Register as part of the Federal regulations governing the operation of the national school lunch program. They will apply equally in all States and territories and to the federally assisted school lunch programs administered by State educational agencies as well as to such programs in private schools which must be administered by the Department of Agriculture. As indicated in the report which accompanied H.R. 11665 (No. 1673), these terms and conditions will (1) establish a reserve of section 11 funds for each of the States and territories; (2) require that schools wishing to obtain section 11 assistance make specific application for such assistance; (3) outline the factors to be considered by State educational agencies and the Department in approving schools for section 11 assistance; and (4) establish a maximum per-meal rate of cash assistance that may be paid to approved schools by the States or the Department out of section 11 funds.

The method of administration, therefore, follows the policies and procedures now in use in the administration of the current program of Federal school lunch assistance. Likewise, schools approved for special assistance will be required to meet the same operating standards required of other schools receiving Federal school lunch assistance.

Thus, basically, the discretionary authority contained in the bill is designed to permit State educational agencies working in close cooperation with the Department to explore administrative techniques, to identify those schools in need of special assistance and to determine, on the basis of operating experience, the extent of the need for such assistance among the various States and territories, and the amounts of special assistance the majority of such schools may require.

We intend, if such authority is granted to the Department for fiscal 1963, to undertake a detailed evaluation of the results obtained under this authority, together with recommendations for further changes in policies and procedures. We would intend to keep the subcommittee informed concerning our evaluation and recommendations, looking to the period when the experience of State educational agencies and the Department would permit a more definitive legislative authorization for such a program of special school lunch assistance.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. DUNCAN, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman from West Virginia has said, a number of questions were raised when this bill was discussed last week with respect to the proposed revisions suggested by the committee. In particular, criticism was leveled against section 11. This section, in my opinion, was a very undesirable and unnecessary blank check with respect to substantial new funds to supplement the existing program. The gentleman in a statement described this criticism as Republican obstructionism.

I want to assure the Members that there is no effort on the part of any Republican to obstruct the passage of reasonable legislation. I do feel, however, that we need a more adequate discussion of the proposed revisions of law.

The change, for instance, will adversely affect the District of Columbia. There is a very substantial reduction in the amount of money available for the District of Columbia, which will be offset to a small degree by an additional amount to be received because of the milk which the District is supplying schoolchildren here.

Even more fundamental is my objection to the proposed section 11. The gentleman from West Virginia has read extensively from a letter from the Department of Agriculture. This points out how they would administer these funds if they should be authorized and appropriated.

If a new program of considerable size is to be enacted, we ourselves should put in legislative guidelines to aid the Secretary. We should not be forced to rely on what the administrator of the program thinks he would do.

As an example, it seems essential that we indicate how active the State educational agencies would be with respect to the needed aid. We should provide some kind of criteria to determine how funds would be made available to the so-called needy school districts, and under what terms. Without any guidance, and the report indicates the necessity for guidance on pages 6, 7, and 8, we are simply providing in effect a new program. It will seek to supplement what apparently are going to be continuing inequities, in spite of the proposed amendments to the legislation we now have.

I might say that the letter from the Department of Agriculture in no way lessens my objection to the section. Instead, it underlines the necessity for us to strike out entirely this language in section 11. At the very least we should provide some assistance to the Department in working out, as they say, effective and practical policies and procedures for identifying the schools which are in need of this special assistance, and for disbursing these funds.

As I have already indicated, we suggest guidelines only by this reference in the debate. Of necessity this must be sketchy. Without legislative provisions, there is no assurance that present administrative procedures will be followed with respect to the new funds. There is no ceiling on the amount of funds to be authorized. Indeed, there is no indication now just how extensive the need may be for supplementing existing pro-

grams. It seems premature for us to advocate a new program along these lines. As I said last week, I am as anxious as anyone to see as many schoolchildren as possible fed adequate meals, but I do not think this is a proper way for us to proceed to achieve that end.

In my opinion, we should proceed with the proposed revisions of the act, and strike entirely the new program represented by section 11. I repeat, I propose to offer an amendment to strike entirely that language. This in no way prejudices the other suggested changes. These changes, I might say, to summarize what we said last week, are an attempt to put the aid where it is needed, in the so-called needy schools, and to give certain other areas less. In that process of giving less—the State of Alaska will get substantially less, and particularly the District of Columbia—we should guard against creating new inequities in the effort to see that the existing funds go further and do more than they do today.

In any event we should not authorize the establishment of a new program without any kind of an indication as to how this program is to be conducted.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat, I will offer an amendment at the appropriate time to strike out section 11 from the bill. We can then proceed with the consideration of these proposed revisions, to which I think there is no substantial opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the National School Lunch Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 3. For each fiscal year there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') to carry out the provisions of this Act, other than section 11."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPORTIONMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 4. The sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the authorization contained in section 3 of this Act, excluding the sum specified in section 5, shall be available to the Secretary for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods for the program in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year not less than 75 per centum of the funds made available for such year for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods under the provisions of section 3 of this Act. Apportionment among the States shall be made on the basis of two factors: (1) the participation rate for the State, and (2) the assistance need rate for the State. The amount of apportionment to any State shall be determined by the following method: First, determine an index for the State by multiplying factors (1) and (2); second, divide this index by the sum of the indices for all the States (exclusive of American Samoa for periods ending before July 1, 1967); and third, apply the figure thus obtained to the total funds to be apportioned. If any State

cannot utilize all funds so apportioned to it, or if additional funds are made available under section 3 for apportionment among the States, the Secretary shall make further apportionments to the remaining States in the same manner. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, (1) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, one-half of any funds available for apportionment among the States shall be apportioned in the manner used prior to such fiscal year, and one-half of any such funds shall be apportioned in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, and (2) for the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1967, the amount apportioned to American Samoa shall be \$25,000 each year, which amount shall be first deducted from the funds available for apportionment in determining the amounts to be apportioned to the other States."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 5 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(b) Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "and less the amount apportioned to him pursuant to sections 4, 5, and 10" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "less the amount apportioned by him pursuant to sections 4, 5, and 10, and less the amount appropriated pursuant to section 11".

SEC. 4. Section 10 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "the same proportion of the funds as the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, attending nonprofit private schools within the State is of the total number of persons of those ages within the State attending school" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of lunches, consisting of a combination of foods and meeting the minimum requirements prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 9, served in the preceding fiscal year by all nonprofit private schools participating in the program under this Act within the State, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the participation rate for the State".

SEC. 5. Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act is redesignated as section 12 and subsections (c) and (d) thereof are amended to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, neither the Secretary nor the State shall impose any requirement with respect to teaching personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, and materials of instruction in any school.

"(d) For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) 'State' means any of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa.

"(2) 'State educational agency' means, as the State legislature may determine, (A) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (B) a board of education controlling the State department of education.

"(3) 'Nonprofit private school' means any private school exempt from income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(4) 'Nonfood assistance' means equipment used by schools in storing, preparing, or serving food for schoolchildren.

"(5) 'Participation rate' for a State means a number equal to the number of lunches, consisting of a combination of foods and meeting the minimum requirements prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 9, served in the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program under this Act in the State, as determined by the Secretary.

"(6) 'Assistance need rate' (A) in the case of any State having an average annual per capita income equal to or greater than

the average annual per capita income for all the States, shall be 5; and (B) in the case of any State having an average annual per capita income less than the average annual per capita income for all the States, shall be the product of 5 and the quotient obtained by dividing the average annual per capita income for all the States by the average per capita income for such State, except that such product may not exceed 9 for any such State. For the purposes of this paragraph (1) the average annual per capita income for any State and for all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the average annual per capita income for each State and for all the States for the three most recent years for which such data are available and certified to the Secretary by the Department of Commerce; and (ii) the average annual per capita income for American Samoa shall be disregarded in determining the average annual per capita income for all the States for periods ending before July 1, 1967.

"(7) 'School' means any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under and, with respect to Puerto Rico, shall also include nonprofit child-care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 6. The National School Lunch Act is further amended by inserting immediately after section 10 thereof the following new section:

"SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he deems to be in the public interest, to provide special assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, for the purpose of helping such schools to meet the requirements established in this Act concerning the service of lunches to children unable to pay the full cost of such lunches."

SEC. 7. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1962.

Mr. BAILEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On Page 7, strike out lines 1 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 11 (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of \$10,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary, to provide special assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, for the purpose of helping such schools to meet the requirements established in this Act concerning the service of lunches to children unable to pay the full cost of such lunches.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish the terms and conditions under which State educational agencies shall approve schools for such special assistance and under which such agencies shall disburse to approved schools the funds appropriated pursuant to this section.

"(c) The terms and conditions established pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall be used by the Secretary in supplying special assistance to nonprofit private schools in any State in which the State educational

agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this Act to nonprofit private schools in the State or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such nonprofit private schools."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 97]

Addonizio	Gilbert	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alexander	Gonzales	O'Konski
Alford	Granahan	Osmer
Alger	Grant	Peterson
Arends	Gray	Philbin
Ashmore	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Barrett	Gubser	Rains
Boland	Hall	Reece
Boykin	Hansen	Roberts, Ala.
Brewster	Healey	Robison
Buckley	Hébert	Roosevelt
Coad	Hiestand	Roudebush
Collier	Hoffman, Mich.	Rousselot
Colmer	Hollifield	St. Germain
Cook	Holland	Santangelo
Corman	Horan	Saund
Curtis, Mass.	Jarman	Seely-Brown
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	Sibal
Dent	Karsh	Sisk
Derwinski	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Devine	Kee	Spence
Diggs	Kilburn	Thomas
Donohue	Kitchin	Utt
Dooley	Libonati	Vanik
Durno	Loser	Vinson
Evins	McIntire	Weiss
Fallon	McMillan	Whitten
Fenton	Marshall	Zelenko
Flood	Meador	
Fogarty	Miller, N.Y.	
Fulton	Moorehead,	
Garland	Ohio.	
Gavin	Moulder	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11665) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 338 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the problem facing the committee at this time pertains to section 11. I had, previous to the rollcall, offered an amendment changing the present section 11, which reads as follows:

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he deems to be in the public interest, to provide special assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, for the purpose of helping such schools to meet the requirements established in this Act concerning the service of lunches to children unable to pay the full cost of such lunches.

It was my purpose in offering the amendment to section 11 to mollify the feelings of the minority members of the

committee that possibly the Secretary of Agriculture was receiving too much authority.

The purpose of my amendment was to spell out guidelines for the Secretary and limit his authority.

During the rollcall I had an opportunity to talk to the minority members of the committee and they have an approach to section 11 which I as chairman of the committee and the members of subcommittee have no objection to. I assume that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] will offer the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I may say to the gentleman that I think this amendment he has offered is a step in the right direction. As the gentleman has indicated, I myself do not feel that the guidelines which are provided, which seem both desirable and necessary, are sufficiently spelled out in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia.

It is therefore my purpose, and after the gentleman has concluded, to offer a substitute for the gentleman's amendment. My substitute, I might say, attempts to incorporate the guidelines indicated in the report on the bill. In other words, the Agriculture Department has already indicated how they plan to carry out this new program. It has been my feeling that we ought to incorporate those basic ideas into legislative language.

My amendment, therefore, will go somewhat further than the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, but it will simply attempt to carry out what is basically being proposed by the Department, should funds be made available for this supplemental program. I think the chairman of the subcommittee is in agreement with me regarding the advisability of putting certain limits on the amounts to be authorized, and the desirability of incorporating specific guidelines which will help the Secretary in setting up this program.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey the purpose of setting up the hot lunch school program in 1946 was to make school lunches available, particularly in the areas where they had difficulty in carrying on a program of that kind. The purpose of section 11 of this bill is to try to bring to the 15 or 18 what might be called needy States a little bit of assistance that will help them to see that the children do not go hungry at lunchtime. In a situation like that existing in my State, for instance, 31 out of every 100 meals served last year were free meals because the children's parents were not able to participate. They were fed anyway. The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would seek to set up guidelines in support of the new program.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 7, beginning with line

2, strike out all down through line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 11. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each succeeding fiscal year, to provide additional funds to certain schools (selected on the basis of factors set forth in subsection (b)) to assist such schools to serve free and reduced price lunches. From the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount as may be necessary, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, for apportionment to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. Such amount shall be apportioned among Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa on the basis of (1) the relative numbers of free and reduced price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program under this Act in such places and (2) the relative assistance need rates of such places. The remaining amount of such sums appropriated for any fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States (other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) on the same bases. For purposes of this section, American Samoa shall be deemed to have an assistance need rate equal to such rate for Guam, for periods ending before July 1, 1967.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), funds apportioned to each State under subsection (a) shall be paid to selected schools in such State to assist such schools to serve free and reduced price lunches. Such schools and the amounts of such funds that each shall from time to time receive shall be determined by the State educational agency on the basis of the following factors: (1) The economic condition of the area from which such schools draw attendance; (2) the needs of pupils in such schools for free or reduced price lunches; (3) the percentages of free and reduced priced lunches being served in such schools to their students; (4) the cost of lunches in such schools as compared to the average cost of school lunches throughout the State; and (5) the need of such schools for additional assistance as reflected by the financial position of the school lunch programs in such schools.

"(c) In the case of any State which is not permitted by law to disburse funds paid to it under this section to nonprofit private schools, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to such State under this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of free and reduced price lunches served in the preceding fiscal year by all nonprofit private schools participating in the program under this Act in the State bears to the number of such free and reduced price lunches served during such year by all schools participating in the program under this Act in the State. The Secretary shall select nonprofit private schools in each such State and shall determine the amounts which shall be paid to each such school from time to time from amounts so withheld, or the basis of the same factors set forth in subsection (b)."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated during the debate last week, I had intended to offer an amendment to strike section 11 entirely from the bill. I felt giving the Secretary of Agriculture such complete discretion with respect to handling funds for an entirely new program in the school lunch area would be very undesirable.

I am still of two minds as to whether it would be better to strike section 11

altogether, or to modify it as this substitute amendment proposes to do. I feel that a new program such as this may well be helpful in areas where real need exists. It is for that reason that I have decided, at least for the moment, until we see whether the substitute is successful or not, to offer an amendment which would simply tighten up the authority given the Department of Agriculture.

The gentleman from West Virginia has offered an amendment, which my substitute also provides, which would limit the funds for this new program in the first year to a maximum of \$10 million. However, the gentleman from West Virginia simply says that the Secretary shall establish terms and conditions under which a State educational agency shall distribute this new money. My amendment, as you have just heard, would spell out in some detail how this money would be made available. This is determined basically on two grounds: first, the relative number of free and reduced price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year and, second, the relative assistance needs rates of such places.

In addition, the substitute seeks to clarify who has the basic responsibility in determining which schools shall get funds. The gentleman from West Virginia simply proposes that the Secretary shall establish terms and conditions under which State agencies shall approve applications. That does not make it clear whether the State has the basic responsibility, or whether it is the Secretary of Agriculture.

My amendment, on the other hand, says that the State educational agency shall make the determination about the funds. They shall consider certain factors, and I shall reiterate briefly what those factors are. They do not have to be exclusive, and other factors could be considered:

First would be the economic condition of the area from which such schools draw attendance.

Second, the needs of pupils in such schools for free or reduced-price lunches.

Third, the percentages of free and reduced-price lunches being served in schools to their students.

Fourth, the cost of lunches in such schools as compared to the average cost of school lunches throughout the State.

Fifth, the need of such schools for additional assistance as reflected by the financial position of the school lunch programs in such schools.

This, admittedly, is still providing a certain amount of flexibility with respect to a new program. We are not sure how it will operate. We do not yet know how extensive is the need, above and beyond what we have already been providing. This at least would provide some legislative guidelines I think. These are essential to what may well be a valuable addition to our school lunch program.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge that we adopt the substitute. Then, I hope, we can proceed to debate the proposed revisions of the act.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman for his presentation. I would like to ask, under the provisions of your substitute, how would Guam and American Samoa be taken care of, because they are now in this legislation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I would assure the chairman that American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are to receive not more than 3 percent of the total allotment. That money is to be distributed as it is in the States, on the basis of the relative number of free and reduced-price lunches and also the assistance need rates. In the case of American Samoa, at the end of subsection (a), American Samoa shall be deemed to have an assistance need rate equal to such rate for Guam, for the period ending before July 1, 1967. In other words, there will be specific provision made to provide funds for those named territories.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] may continue for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Section 11(a), subsection 1, provides for the relative number of free and reduced-price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year. That is what I am concerned about, because for the preceding fiscal year Guam and American Samoa were not included in the program.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure that I understand the purport of the gentleman's question, or was it an observation?

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I shall get to the question.

On the basis of the relative numbers of free and reduced-price lunches served during the past fiscal year by these schools participating in the program is the language, but there were no schools participating in this program in Guam and American Samoa.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We do still have the other alternative, the relative need rates of such places. I might say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] that what the proposed thrust of the other revisions of the act involves, is to reduce the amounts, as will be the case in the District of Columbia where there has not been participation. Schools will get less in areas where there has not been provision either for reduced-price lunches or free lunches. It has been felt that we may thus encourage a greater degree of participation in the serving of such lunches, if we do provide less funds.

Mr. POWELL. We will have a further amendment, a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] at the proper time, and I hope for the gentleman's support. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What the gentleman is attempting to do here is to establish guidelines which the authors of this legislation say that they want to establish anyway; is that right?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct. The Department of Agriculture has indicated—and the proposed program is outlined in the report on the bill at pages 6 through 8—how they would handle it. It is my feeling that we should set some of those guidelines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It is my hope that this language will provide specific outlines to the Department with respect to this new program.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the Department of Agriculture has already indicated that it is in favor of this?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe that any of the suggested guidelines differ in any way from what the Department says it was planning to do. It says it is not planning to disturb the existing administrative handling of these programs, and that the responsibility will lie still with the States. However, unless we spell this out in the language of the amendment, they might feel free to change their program substantially, and there would be no restrictions placed upon them. I think that would be most undesirable.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the question asked by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, I do not purport to be an expert on this, but I suggest we look at the hearings on page 15 of the testimony by Mr. Davis, an Under Secretary who administers this program. He says that all of the States have the national school lunch program, including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam. So Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, it would appear to me, have a record at which to look in apportioning the funds provided for in the gentleman's amendment. However, we are adding for the first time American Samoa, as I understand it, and there is a provision to take care of American Samoa. That would seem to be the explanation to the question posed by the

chairman of the full committee. But, perhaps, there is more to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Again I might say to the gentleman that I am no expert in this field, either. The report on the bill, unfortunately, does not clarify just how the special reserve for the territories would be handled. In any event I would assume that we are not prejudicing the case for the territories through the use of the language proposed in the substitute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further, the point I want to make is that Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam have been participating in the program and have a record as far as the distribution of free lunches and reduced-price lunches is concerned.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman said that the question of the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], was directed to the problem raised by the two criteria which they set forth to be used in determining apportionment among the territories and among the States.

The two criteria are the relative numbers of free and reduced-price lunches served during the past fiscal year, and the relative assistance rates of such places.

So, if no free lunches were served here because there was no school lunch program or if many lesser free lunches were served than needed to be served because of financial difficulties of the State or territory, they would not be entitled to share in the apportionment according to the needs; is not that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No, I think the gentleman is incorrect. The second part of the provision, the relative assistance needs rates, would qualify such areas. Any territory that did not have any on-going school lunch program, in my opinion, would be provided automatically some funds, to be made available for use there.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman uses the term "relative assistance needs rates," is he not talking about the equalization formula found in the earlier part of the bill and not at all about the situation that I am asking about which has to do with areas that have not served free lunches heretofore?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The definition of assistance needs rates, I might add, is on page 5 of the bill, beginning on line 19. It would seem to me that this language would make available funds to a territory which does not have an on-going school lunch program, even though they did not have any program. As I have said, the whole thrust of the proposed changes is to encourage participation of States and territories in school lunch programs. So I do not think we

are going to prejudice the case of any territory.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to ask the Chair whether it is in order to have an amendment to a substitute for an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the Chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: Amend section 11(b) after "the relative numbers of free and reduced price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program under this Act in such places."; and insert

"(2) the need of students in such places for the free or reduced price lunches."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, he proposed to amend subsection (b) of subsection (a). Subsection (b) is on page 2 of my amendment, and I have the feeling that the proposed amendment may have been read incorrectly. This is an amendment to section 11(a) of my substitute.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered as an amendment to subsection (a) of section 11 of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: Amend section 11, paragraph (a) after: "the relative numbers of free and reduced-price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program under this Act in such places."; insert:

"(2) the need of students in such places for free or reduced-price lunches."

And renumber accordingly.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would base the apportionment of funds under the special assistance provision among the States and territories upon two factors: one, the relative numbers of free and reduced-price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program in such places and, two, the relative assistance need rate of such places.

The relative assistance need rate referred to by the gentleman is defined on page 5 of the bill. It refers to the equal-

ization formula, familiar to all of us, which is based upon the per capita income of the State.

The amendment I propose would insert a third criterion to be considered with the rest. You would then consider, one, the number of free or reduced-price lunches being served; two, the need for such lunches, whether or not an appropriate number of them were served during the past year; and, three, the assistance need rate.

My reason for offering this amendment is that we found during the hearings that in a number of States and places having the greatest need, a large number of free or reduced-price lunches were not being served because the local community just was unable to finance the number of reduced-price or free lunches that should have been served. We perpetuate the difficulties of such communities unless we insert this third criterion, which looks at not only the number of free or reduced-price lunches being served but also at the relative need for meals of this type in the State.

For my part, I am willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey with this modification. However, without this modification, I believe his amendment defeats one of the purposes of the special assistance fund as found in the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I notice the criterion of the average annual income in each State. The people of Alaska, for instance, have a comparatively high income but the cost of living is so high in my State that I think Alaska would lose to a certain extent under the formula set forth in this bill and go below what it has been getting. Is it the gentleman's interpretation that the special assistance fund provided for on page 7 of the bill would allow for adjustments with regard to Alaska and in similar situations elsewhere?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. In response to the question of the gentleman from Alaska I wish to call the attention of the committee to pages 7 and 8 of the committee report, which deals with the situation in Alaska and expresses the belief and intention of the committee that the special assistance fund be used to assist in solving the more serious problems in Alaska. This portion of the report also indicates the intention of the committee to reevaluate Alaska's special needs in light of experience gained under the new formula.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has proposed a third test for the distribution of any funds that may be made available for the new program, which would necessitate somebody, presumably the Secretary of Agriculture, considering the need of students in various places for free or reduced-price lunches, in addition to the actual number of free or low-

priced lunches and in addition to the assistance need rate.

I may say that if we have to require the Secretary, before he distributes any funds, to determine where the needs are, we are back to where we began; that is, the entire job of deciding how this money is going to be distributed—and this is the crux of the question—is on the shoulders of the Secretary.

As an example of what I mean, the State of Michigan might have no need in comparison to the demands of many other States with respect to their students for free or low-priced lunches.

Even though they could qualify on the basis of the number of free meals served, they would be disqualified under the basis of the criteria now proposed. The place for determining how the need factor is to be considered is after the apportionment of funds has been made to the various States, and I have indicated on page 2 of my amendment that the State educational agency should have the responsibility of taking a look at the actual need in addition to the other factors which I pointed out. Even with the incorporation of a third factor in this part of the program, after determining how the funds should be distributed, we would end up with the very tangle that we are seeking to resolve by this whole substitute.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I wish to indicate to the House, as the gentleman has intimated in his statement, that the language I attempt to insert in paragraph (a) is taken from the gentleman's paragraph (b). It is a criteria which the gentleman from New Jersey proposes to be used by the States in determining which of their school districts shall get how much of these special funds.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman does not require that the State educational agency should take that into consideration as one of the several factors in determining which districts are most in need of funds. But, to have the determination before the money is distributed at the Federal level, to inject the Federal Government into a determination as to whether students need or do not need this money would be to destroy what should basically be the States' responsibility. That is why I put it in the bill and I am very glad the gentleman pointed it out because it clarifies the very criticism I am making of his effort to put it in a part of the proposal which would distribute the funds from the Federal level to the State.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. This proposal would be particularly helpful in reference to a rather unusual situation existing in Alaska.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. To which proposal does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BAILEY. That is where the price of food is so high and the cost of meals

is so exceptionally high. Would this not give some additional leeway in handling this problem?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure. We discussed the problem that the District of Columbia has with reference to the proposed revisions in our school lunch program and also the report indicates that Alaska may well have difficulties. Of course, for the money to be made available, the new program itself may well benefit Alaska if they can state their case and come in with a justification as to why they need some assistance.

This has nothing to do, I might say, with the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan to add a third test for the distribution of funds from the Federal level to the State level. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia agrees with me that this would be very unwise language to incorporate in the allotment formula. Would the gentleman from West Virginia care to comment as to the wisdom of adopting the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the gentleman from New Jersey will agree with me that the purpose of this legislation and the purpose of revising the hot lunch program is to see to it that meals are made available wherever there is a need for them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think that is a very broad statement. We have no idea whether \$10 million is going to achieve that laudable end, but certainly we are seeking to make our money go as far as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from West Virginia has completed his statement, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would gather from the gentleman's response to my earlier question, that he feels the criteria proposed by me which is taken from his subsection (b) is a perfectly valid criteria. It is one where you require the States to examine in determining which of their school districts shall receive funds. You think as a criteria that is just dandy, but only when the decision or the criteria is applied by a State official rather than a Federal official apparently.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will say to the gentleman, if we should allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make the basic determination as to where the need is, we would be back to the wholly inadequate language that is presently, or which was originally proposed in section 11. I would think it would be far better to strike the whole program and send it back to our committee and thrash this out in committee than to come up with

no guidelines. I would not think that we are providing guidelines, if we make it necessary for him to consider the needs of students in Michigan before he makes any allotment to Michigan because the basic problem is that there are presumably needs everywhere. Participation, and assistance need should be the tests on which to distribute funds to the 50 States and 2 territories, in my opinion, and I remain in firm opposition to the gentleman from Michigan, much as I respect his judgment in most cases.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his kind words, but I just wanted to put "need" in both cases. If he were going to put in "need" as the basis of determination for the District, I think we should make the same determination when we apportion funds among the States. That was the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The gentleman from New Jersey pointed out that the valuation by State authorities would determine to some extent what assistance the local schools would get. The gentleman did not, however, remark about my former inquiry addressed to the gentleman from Michigan in regard to the special assistance fund. May I have the gentleman's observation on that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would suppose this new program authorized by section 11 would be of some help to Alaska which presents a peculiar problem. Consideration was given as to whether a formula should be developed which would take into consideration the high cost of providing food in the gentleman's area, but it was felt that that would be difficult to incorporate into a basic formula, even though it is a very real factor in Alaska. It is for that reason I decided against eliminating section 11 altogether, because I do feel that the proposed change may work hardships, and I should be most reluctant to have what we consider to be changes in the right direction in effect create new inequities.

So I would say to the gentleman from Alaska that I would think my amendment would be helpful to his State.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(Upon request of Mr. GRIFFIN and by unanimous consent Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am somewhat confused in considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. O'HARA. I think it might be helpful to fix attention upon the proposal by the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion the funds among the States, which they had recommended in section 11, and on page 6 of the report. In

paragraph B at the bottom of that page they say:

It is proposed, therefore, that an apportionment formula for the division of such funds be based upon the number of free or reduced-price meals being served to needy children, adjusted for the ability of a State to finance such meals as measured by the relationship of the national average per capita income to the per capita income of the various States. Because of the atypical situation in the territories (Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa), a special reserve would be established for them.

The gentleman has used that phrase in his amendment, "relative need for special assistance."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems to me the gentleman has tried in his amendment to use the same criteria that the Department of Agriculture has actually said it would use. If we put this language in the bill we are essentially agreeing with them. I agree that the gentleman has stated it correctly. My thought is to incorporate what the Department of Agriculture said it would finally use as its test for the distribution of this new money.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then after apportioning the money among the States on the basis of need, according to the gentleman's amendment the States would divide that assistance on the basis of the need of the students. That is one criterion.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to add apropos the comments of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] that if he had read on to the bottom of the next paragraph (C), he would have found that 25 percent of the funds would be held in reserve by the Department to be equitably distributed among those States demonstrating a need for funds in excess of their initial and reserve apportionments. That is not tied in to the distribution formula for the other 75 percent spoken of by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that is one of the objectionable features of the proposal of the Department of Agriculture, in my opinion, because in effect it makes it a slush fund. It says that 50 percent shall be allocated, 25 percent held in reserve and given to areas which are not defined, and an additional 25 percent will also be held in reserve. I think that is a very undesirable way to handle it from an administrative point of view, and certainly from a legislative point of view it would be most undesirable.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Michigan to the Frelinghuysen substitute, and I would therefore request that we support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] as a substitute, pass it, and then agree to the Frelinghuysen substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) there were—34 ayes, 31 noes.

So the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment, as amended.

The substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. BAILEY, as amended by the substitute.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike section 11 from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: Beginning with page 6, line 20, strike all down and through line 10 on page 7.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity for offering this amendment to strike all of this new section 11 as just amended, but it seems to me what we have done is simply to restate what the original language appearing on page 7 of the bill would have provided. This will give the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he wants it or not, the basic responsibility for making an apportionment of funds under this new program on the basis of the needs of the students for free or reduced-price lunches. That is a hopeless task for any Secretary to do. As a practical matter, the report indicates that they plan to share that responsibility with the States, but now we have deliberately placed it on the Secretary. We have excluded any responsibility on the part of the States, and it seems to me we are launching on a program which will not only be new but which would be a thoroughly undesirable effort. We have within our grasp a reasonable solution to this problem to distribute whatever funds may be made available on the basis of the actual participation by the various States and also the basic needs of the States. And, I underline "the basic needs of the States," not of the schoolchildren in the States. If we confuse the issue by saying that the needs of the children themselves must be determined before we make any distribution to the States, we are back with what I consider a most undesirable program.

Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity for belaboring this problem as long as we have, because it is not a question of providing more assistance to the areas of greatest need. We are in general agreement that that is a desirable goal. We hope that the changes in the formula of distribution of the existing pro-

grams will be helpful, and I myself feel that a new program such as section 11 also could be helpful. But, it cannot be helpful, in my opinion, if we insist on giving, without any indication as to how he is to make this determination, the responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture. It is for that reason that I think we should reject entirely section 11. We should see how that operates and not how the provisions of the program will affect such areas as Alaska and the District of Columbia. And, also we can make a determination as to the extent of in-met needs, in which the Federal Government might help. We will not be in any sense prejudicing the ongoing program. We will be merely taking a good look on what we are establishing as a Federal responsibility in this field.

As I say, I offer this proposal to strike section 11 entirely with some reluctance but only because we have, with all good intentions, deliberately avoided what I was seeking by my substitute.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will object to that before the request is even made.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close at 2 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question comes first on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have that opportunity after this motion is disposed of.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor at 16 minutes of 2 in the afternoon would circumscribe debate on this bill or any other bill. This is symptomatic of what is going on in the House of Representatives these days. Too few Members seem to want to do any work at all on the House floor. We are getting out of the habit of giving decent consideration to legislation. Are we to expect this sort of thing from here on to the end of this session? Why should there be a limitation of debate at 16 minutes of 2 in the afternoon? I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the committee, to tell me why he imposes this kind of a gag rule on the House of Representatives, if he cares to do it. Apparently he does not.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to section 11 of the bill because of the delegation of power and blank check it gives to the Secretary of Agriculture. I am surprised that my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], is trying to sustain section 11 of the bill, in view of his attitude against delegation

of power with respect to the Trade Agreements Act.

I was in hopes the gentleman would lend his support to striking a sweeping delegation of power out of this bill, in view of what I am sure he will be saying on the floor of the House about 10 days or 2 weeks hence when the free trade bill comes before the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, these delegations of power to appointed officials of Government to establish policy and to spend money as they see fit are coming with all too much frequency.

Mr. Chairman, this section does not belong in this bill or in any other bill passed by the Congress of the United States. As one who has supported school lunch programs in the past I urge that it be stricken out or amended as the gentleman from New Jersey proposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, without questioning in any way the sincerity or good intentions of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] I would like to observe that the actions of the gentleman from New Jersey on this particular part of the school lunch amendments demonstrate the dilemma in which the gentleman finds himself. In his amendment to cure what he seems to believe are the defects of section 11, he inserts the very same criteria to which he objects. He says to the States, "You shall consider not only the number of free lunches being served by the school districts in determining to which districts you shall distribute these special assistance funds. You shall also consider the relative need of students in these districts for free or reduced-price lunches." In other words, how many schoolchildren in these districts do not have the financial wherewithal to pay the standard, going rates for their school lunches and how many such children attend schools that do not have the financial ability to provide reduced-cost meals.

Mr. Chairman, by accepting my amendment to the Frelinghuysen substitute we apply the very same criteria to the Federal Government when it apportions the funds among the various States. We say, "Look at not only the number of free lunches being served, but at the number of needy students, whether or not they were in the last fiscal year receiving free lunches, in determining your apportionment among the States."

Mr. Chairman, these decisions will not be made by the Secretary of Agriculture on a ouija board. He will propose regulations and criteria which will be published in the Federal Register. I am sure there will be hearings on the proposed regulations. They will be worked out in consultation with the school lunch officials in each and every State.

This is not going to be a grab bag. We do not believe, as the gentleman from New Jersey apparently does, that this is an unwarranted delegation of power. It

is simply a recognition of what the gentleman from New Jersey has, himself, recognized by his failure to frame his own amendment to take care of this problem. Indeed, appropriate language is not easy to frame legislatively.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman has just underlined the basic dilemma which we are facing, not only the gentleman from New Jersey, but all of us, because he is pointing out that there is a problem with reference to needy schools. My question, and the reason I am very strongly opposed to the amendment which has been accepted, is that we as a practical matter are imposing an intolerable obligation at the Federal level to make a determination with regard to the number of needy students in each of the 50 States before distributing any funds.

The Department of Agriculture itself says that the program they had planned to set up under the discretionary authority in section 11, would permit State educational agencies to explore techniques to identify schools in need of such assistance and the extent of the need for such assistance among the various States and territories.

This would seem to indicate more clearly than the gentleman is willing to do that the States should have the basic responsibility.

Subsection (b) of my proposed amendment would place the authority where it should be placed, at the State level. It should not be necessary for the Federal Government, before it apportions any fund, to make a determination as to how many needy children there are in the various States and how needy those children are. From a practical point of view the census makes no such kind of tabulation. There is no way in which to resolve the question of how you are going to weigh that factor in relation to the others. For instance, if need was not found in the State of Michigan, the gentleman's State would not get the amount of money to which it otherwise would be entitled. You are bypassing a basic State responsibility and you are creating an administrative impossibility. It is for that reason that I pleaded, unfortunately without success, for the enactment of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks for the benefit of those who are grossly misinformed or grossly ignorant concerning the matter before us.

This legislation was introduced early in 1961. Hearings were held under the subcommittee chairmanship of our distinguished and beloved friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], in August of 1961.

Executive sessions were held in January and February of 1962. The bill was reported out of the subcommittee unanimously. The gentleman from New Jersey happened not to be present at that particular meeting, but the other members of his party who were present voted in

favor of it. Then the bill was presented to the full committee and it was unanimously reported by the full committee; not a single member of the minority, including the gentleman from New Jersey, who was then present, voted against it.

On May 9, a clean bill was introduced. On May 14 it was referred to our committee and again, in executive session, reported out unanimously, and again with the gentleman from New Jersey voting in favor of it. Then it went before the Committee on Rules where all the members of the committee, Republican and Democrat, who appeared before the committee and spoke in favor of it. It was again unanimous.

Now we have just accepted the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, except for the amendment to that substitute by the gentleman from Michigan.

Even the committee report was unanimous. There were no minority views.

May I say that if you adopt this new amendment to strike this section the net effect will be that you will kill aid, especially to needy children, in those school districts where the school districts do not have the funds to provide free lunches at all.

If you want to have that on your conscience, then go ahead.

I call for the defeat of this Republican effort to kill free school lunches to those children who need them most.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman from New York, I think, has put the matter very well. I should like to call attention to another fact. The gentleman from New Jersey has expressed doubt that the Secretary could determine how many needy students there were in each State. Yet he requires the States to determine the number of needy students in each of their school districts. The Department of Agriculture can add. If they add together the determinations of the States of the number of needy students in each of their districts, which they are going to have to make under subsection (b) of the gentleman's proposal, they will have arrived at the number of students in each State needing free or reduced-price lunches and can make their apportionment accordingly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the full committee [Mr. POWELL], has just stated that we have been grossly misinformed about the contents of this bill. I am not sure whether he has been discussing anything said on the floor or in previous discussions but, as far as I know, there has been considerable enlightenment with respect to the value of certain provisions of this bill and I think there has been, with good reason, attention called to the value of this section 11.

The fact that our full committee reported it out in its present form does not indicate that we have recommended good legislation, because what the committee has already done with this bill

has suggested we did not take a good look at certain provisions of it.

I should like to reiterate in closing that we do all have a responsibility for establishing sensible programs. The gentleman from New York is misinforming us, I am sure unintentionally, when he says that if we should strike section 11 from this bill the needy children will not receive aid under this program. We have had a school lunch program for years and presumably those who are being aided are those who need it most. So the fact is, whether or not we are incorporating a new provision to provide additional assistance, we are certainly under a continuation of this program providing aid, which has proven itself to be of value and which can continue to do so.

I see no reason why we should be stampeded into hasty action because of this feeling that if we do not we have acted against the schoolchildren of this Nation. What we are trying to do is determine what is a fair division of responsibility between the Federal Government and our State governments. In my opinion, the State agency should have the initial responsibility of making the determination as to where the additional assistance should go. It should not be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. The present Secretary has plenty of problems of his own without adding still another one in this particular form. I would hope that we will in some way either be able to consider what we have done with this section 11, or that my amendment to strike the whole thing entirely from the bill will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRIFFIN), there were—ayes 43, noes 41.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BAILEY and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 62, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Brooks of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11665) to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 657, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 11665, to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 7, beginning with line 2, strike out all down through line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 11. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each succeeding fiscal year, to provide additional funds to certain schools (selected on the basis of factors set forth in subsection (b)) to assist such schools to serve free and reduced price lunches. From the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount as may be necessary, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, for apportionment to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. Such amount shall be apportioned among Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa on the basis of (1) the relative numbers of free and reduced price lunches served during the preceding fiscal year by schools participating in the program under this Act in such places and (2) the relative assistance need rates of such places. The remaining amount of such sums appropriated for any fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States (other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) on the same bases. For purposes of this section, American Samoa shall be deemed to have an assistance need rate equal to such rate for Guam, for periods ending before July 1, 1967.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), funds apportioned to each State under subsection (a) shall be paid to selected schools in such State to assist such schools to serve free and reduced price lunches. Such schools and the amounts of such funds that each shall from time to time receive shall be determined by the State educational agency on the basis of the following factors: (1) The economic condition of the area from which such schools draw attendance; (2) the needs of pupils in such schools for free or reduced price lunches; (3) the percentages of free and reduced priced lunches being served in such schools to their students; (4) the cost of lunches in such schools as compared to the average cost of school lunches throughout the State; and (5) the need of such schools for additional assistance as reflected by the financial position of the school lunch programs in such schools.

"(c) In the case of any State which is not permitted by law to disburse funds paid to it under this section to nonprofit private schools, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to such State under this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of such free and reduced price lunches served in the preceding fiscal year by all nonprofit private schools participating in the program under this Act in the State bears to the number of such free and reduced price lunches served during such year by all schools participating in the program under this Act in the State. The Secretary shall select nonprofit private schools in each such State and

shall determine the amounts which shall be paid to each such school from time to time from amounts so withheld, on the basis of the same factors set forth in subsection (b)."

Mr. ASHBROOK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with. It is the Frelinghuysen amendment as discussed in the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on this I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, further consideration of this bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. LANGEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 11635, an amending measure that goes a long way toward correcting a situation which has kept the national school lunch program from being the complete success that was intended. The Committee on Education and Labor is to be commended for recognizing that the school lunch program is an investment in the health of our Nation.

Certainly the school lunch program now is considered an integral part of our overall educational system and serves not only to contribute to the mental and physical well-being of our schoolchildren, but also has a tremendous impact on our agricultural and overall economy.

It has long been my feeling, which has been made known to my colleagues in the past, that a school lunch dollar is better utilized if directed toward the student who participates in the program rather than toward a school population in general. That is why it is so heartening at this moment to see a measure before us that will distribute these important funds on a more equitable basis and bring about efficiency in the operation of the program.

In essence, this bill changes but one of the two factors in the formula used to allocate school lunch dollars. The other factor, which takes into consideration the economic condition of the State, will continue to do just that. The change we are asked to consider today is whether the first factor should reflect the number of students actually participating in the program or continue the present inequitable practice of ignoring the participating students in favor of a broad base of total students enrolled in our schools.

The great State of Minnesota is a good example of what has happened in the distribution of these funds under the

present system. When the President signed the National School Lunch Act in 1946, the maximum reimbursement was set at 9 cents per complete balanced plate lunch. Because of increased participation throughout the country, the national average reimbursement per lunch is just over 4 cents.

In Minnesota, where 51 out of every 100 youngsters enrolled in our schools partake of the lunch at school, the reimbursement is less than 3 cents per lunch. You can readily see what this means, particularly in the face of higher labor, food, equipment, and other operating costs.

Since the real objective of this program is to serve a nutritionally sound lunch at a price within the ability of the average wage earner to pay, it is becoming increasingly difficult to break even in such areas as Minnesota. The formula proposed in this amending legislation today will go a long way toward a more equitable distribution of funds to the States where the students actually participate in the program.

In so many of our aid programs, foreign and domestic, we in the Congress voice our concern over appropriated moneys that are either wasted or are not used properly by the recipients. Today we have a real opportunity to correct the inequities of one domestic program. Perhaps the world will be watching, and will take note.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Tuesday, June 12, to file a report on the bill H.R. 11970, the Trade Extension Act of 1962, including minority views.

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

There was no objection.

THE OLD AND THE SICK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, "A program of Government-sponsored health insurance, for the aged or any other part of society, is quite within the proper role of Government and in fact answers the plain demands of social justice."

In these calm and reasoned words, the lead editorial of the Pilot, official organ of the archdiocese of Boston, dated May 26, 1962, discusses the broad outlines of national health insurance along the lines suggested by the administration.

The Pilot dismisses as groundless the fears expressed by a minority that the pioneering legislation proposed is a kind of halfway house on the way to socialism.

Public debate on this issue will dispel misunderstandings as to the purpose, the coverage, and the functioning of a health insurance program.

The Pilot, in general terms, endorses medicare as a part of the social security program. The editorial goes on to state:

One warning should be made in connection with it, however. We must not spend our efforts trying to write a perfect bill or we will have no bill at all. It will be possible to amend and adjust the provisions of any bill at a later time and meanwhile its benefits can be applied to those in need.

Some form of health insurance legislation for the aged is inevitable.

The Pilot urges the Congress to provide for it in 1962. The editorial in its entirety follows:

THE OLD AND THE SICK

The President has placed his full support behind a program for medical care of the aged and he plainly intends to get some favorable action out of the Congress during this session if possible. At the same time he has stirred up vocal opposition in some quarters, notably among some physicians and in the American Medical Association.

Most Americans will find it difficult to understand all of the technical aspects of the King-Anderson bill or any other one proposed for enactment. In simple truth, only the experts can draw up and administer a program as large as this one, building into it in the process those factors which will make it work effectively and those safeguards which will protect it from exploitation. The man in the street should not feel badly if the complexities of a national health insurance plan are beyond him; they make the going difficult even for the legislators who must vote on them. Certainly, editors and nonprofessionals generally, can do very little but comment on the wide picture as they discern it.

For our part we would like to endorse some plan of medical care for the aged and leave it to the experts to work out the details. Furthermore, and still in general terms, we would like to endorse some plan along the social security line which seems to us to have demonstrated its effectiveness already. More than this, we think that something should be done promptly and not postponed until all the arguments on one side and the other can be reduced to harmony. Elderly people in our country are not receiving the medical attention they deserve, and they cannot afford to wait any longer. Finally, we believe that the Government program, whatever it is, should retain private choice of physician and hospital and should complement voluntary health plans, not replace them.

What of the opposition? Surely the several physicians who have spoken against the bill are not either cruel or stupid, nor can they be considered misinformed. Perhaps the basic difference here is one of philosophy more than anything else and the fear that legislation of this sort is a kind of halfway house on the way to socialism. As we see it, this is miles away from the present set of facts, and the fears are groundless. A program of Government-sponsored health insurance for the aged or any other part of society, is quite within the proper role of Government and in fact answers the plain demands of social justice. What has been proposed does not suggest that Government take over medical care or institutions; these remain private as formerly, only the payment is arranged by the health insurance program.

The dispute which has occupied the front pages of our papers is essentially helpful and we hope that it will continue. One warning should be made in connection with it however. We must not spend our efforts trying to write a perfect bill or we will have no bill at all. It will be possible to amend and adjust the provisions of any bill at a later time and meanwhile its benefits can be ap-

plied to those in need. The Congress can pass a reasonably good bill following the general lines we have spoken of and, at a future time, refine what aspects of the program seem faulty or inequitable. Medical care for the indigent aged we must have, and the time to get it is now.

THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS FIGHTS COMMUNISM WITH FAITH AND FACTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Ancient Order of Hibernians is alert and vigorous in its opposition to communism. It realizes that we must know the nature of the enemy; its objectives and its devious methods; to unmask, repudiate, and defeat this conspiracy against God and against mankind.

With effective realism, the Ancient Order of Hibernians is keeping its members informed as to the meaning and the dangers of communism.

As an example of its patriotic service to the cause of freedom, I bring you its indictment of communism, and its call for continuing vigilance and expanding knowledge to combat the insidious techniques of conquest employed by the Reds in their campaign to undermine the free world.

It was prepared by John P. Ryan, chairman of Catholic Action for the National Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, and distributed to members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians throughout the Nation:

Pope Pius XI said we should study and inform ourselves on communism. This is a challenge to all Americans of every faith. We should know how this insidious organization works.

In 1903 Lenin took Marx's ideas and established the Communist Party with only 17 supporters, but in 1917 this organization with only 40,000 trained agents took over all of Russia. Since that time this criminal conspiracy has enslaved over 1 billion human beings.

Americans and America have not grasped the fact that this is a total war with these people. The indifference and ignorance of the tactics, strategy, and objectives of the Communists is their greatest asset.

They have instigated civil wars in almost every country they have taken over and in the others they used infiltration and then coalition governments. Each of these nations had armies, however the armies fought each other or were infiltrated or agitated so that the Communists took over their countries without using their armies.

Lenin's plan has been summarized as follows: "First we shall take eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia, finally we shall encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We shall not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

As to this blueprint it is working. Eastern Europe and Asia have fallen. The proposed encirclement has started with Cuba—90 miles from the Florida coast. All through South America the Communist Party has a good fast hold and we Americans stand by, giving concessions here and there and pouring our money into countries which

are dominated and controlled by pro-Communist governments.

J. Edgar Hoover has attempted in numerous articles and speeches to alert the people of this country to the methods of this organization. He stated 4 months ago that there were some 200 known or suspected Communist front and Communist infiltrated organizations under investigation by the FBI. He said "They have infiltrated every sphere of activity, youth groups, radio, television, motion pictures, churches, schools, educational and cultural groups, the press, also nationality minority groups, and civil and political units."

He has said on numerous occasions that "the Communist threats from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within."

The Reds are stepping up their propaganda campaign in the United States from abroad. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reports that the Communists shipped in 14 million packets of materials last year against 6 million in 1959.

The Russians have committed heinous crimes and enslaved 1 billion people. They intend to keep right on causing crisis, threatening us with their armies and navy, taking small countries from the free world as concessions and encircling the United States until that fateful day which they have promised in 1973 when they take us over.

We are all patriotic, we are free, we are Catholics. We must study and inform ourselves on communism and remember that we cannot do business with murderers, liars, and thieves.

THE NLRB AND CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1962, a small handful of Republican members took to the floor for 6 night hours and staged "Operation Spring Thaw." This operation, concededly political, was intended as its sponsors stated, "to cut away the snow job the administration has been piling on the American public through its blizzards of propaganda."

The New York Times account, correctly in my opinion, described "Operation Spring Thaw" as a cross between a filibuster and a national political rally with the speeches stating "the case against the political enemy in excessive terms calculated to stir the emotions of the faithful."

We were not taken unaware. The harbinger of "Operation Spring Thaw" came the preceding day when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDBUM], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] launched an attack on the National Labor Relations Board preceded by a press release timed to call attention to their presentation. The release, and the subsequent speeches, claimed that the Labor Board had "all but gutted" the Labor Act; that Labor Board decisions had "eroded and all but repealed" key provisions of Taft-Hartley; and that the Labor Board had circumvented the intent of Congress by "tortured interpretations," "ingenious innovations," and "nimble footwork."

This language, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your viewpoint, was put with the rest of "Operation

Spring Thaw" into the editorial deep freeze when the callous price increase announced by United States Steel drove all other news from the headlines.

Why, then, do I bother to reply? There are two reasons:

First, the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Michigan attacked the Labor Board as an institution. Their joint address looked back over a 25-year period, and their criticism began with the events leading up to the rejected Smith amendments of 1940. The Roosevelt boards, the Truman boards, the Eisenhower boards, and the Kennedy boards were impartially scathed. This is not surprising, as there has been consistency in decisions through the Board history. Philip Ray Rodgers, an Eisenhower appointee and a former assistant to Senator Taft, testified last summer to the Pucinski subcommittee that he had served on the Board since 1953 with 11 different members representing various backgrounds and personal predilections; and throughout this period there had been 96 percent unanimity of agreement in the thousands of contested cases up for decision.

Unfortunately this attack on the Labor Board as an institution plays into the hands of that small group of employers whose frontal assault on the Board and the act it administers failed when Mr. Chief Justice Hughes and his Supreme Court colleagues sustained its constitutionality. Since that early period in 1937, however, the flank attacks have continued unabated. Currently, the guise is to sharply reduce the effectiveness of the act by transferring important Labor Board functions to the district court judges scattered throughout the country. The caseload, and relative inexperience of the district judges in this field would, if I may borrow the term, "gut" the uniform and effective application of the law. I cannot stand silent in the face of such devastating prospects.

Second, the area of labor relations, as the gentleman from Georgia tells us in his opening remarks, "is a complicated field, highly charged with emotion and closely linked with the public welfare." The Labor Board members are on the firing line, and "get it good" from the disappointed litigants, and from the courts of appeal on review. It seems unfortunate when the Labor Board members are further subjected to attack from the floor of the House.

Labor Board members are agents of Congress, appointed for 5-year terms at yearly intervals. They administer an act of our making, subject to review by the courts. If we in Congress are dissatisfied with the interpretations given our act by the Labor Board, or by the courts, we have a regularized process for correction. We can amend the act—we have made major overhauls at 12-year intervals—and we can, through the committee process fully and fairly investigate the need for legislative revision. That is the course we followed last spring when the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] conducted lengthy investigations. Witnesses made charges, those charged were permitted to answer, Demo-

cratic and Republican members participated in the questioning and colloquies; a report was issued with opportunity for minority views. A seasoned judgment was thus assured, with a minimum of individual hit-and-run sniping.

The need for congressional restraint from individual attack is well recognized. The gentleman from Georgia put the point well:

Let me emphasize here that it is not our purpose to retry in the House those cases which give rise to our concern. We do not consider it a proper function of Congress to litigate such matters on the floor of the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 10, 1962, p. 6191).

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] added that—

It would not be proper or appropriate for Congress to assume a judicial function with respect to particular cases. It is important to our very system of government under separated powers that Congress should respect the right of every judicial officer to make his decisions secure in the knowledge that he will not be subject to a later inquiry into the mental processes by which he arrived at particular decisions (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 10, 1962, p. 6191).

I suggest that in the future we follow the precept, not the example, of my colleagues and refer such grievances to the appropriate subcommittees for thorough, bipartisan, and fair consideration. It is only thus that we can be assured of the independent judgment we expect from those in the executive branch who administer our laws.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] that "Operation Spring Thaw" belongs in the deep freeze; but I, too, feel compelled to make a few remarks so that the comments of my friends MESSRS. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN will not be considered the last word by Congress on a disputed and controversial issue.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] comments:

We who serve on the legislative committee to which labor legislation is assigned have come—unhappily—to one major conclusion.

The conclusion is:

The intent of Congress is frustrated and circumvented by decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

A number of cases are cited for this proposition. As I have examined several of the decisions criticized, I have found them thoughtful, carefully reasoned, and demonstrative of a clear purpose to carry out the language of the act and the intent of Congress.

I cannot agree that they "frustrate" and "circumvent" the intent of Congress. Nor do I agree with the gloss my colleagues attempt, nunc pro tunc, to put upon the statute we enacted in 1947 and in 1959.

I agree that the interpretations they now seek to impose retroactively upon the statute may be the interpretations they then had in mind and sought to

write prospectively into the statute when it was pending legislative business. I do not agree that they were successful then. Our Labor-Management Relations Acts have been controversial and hotly contested. This controversy resulted in compromise. It is to rewrite history for any faction to claim complete success. Let me illustrate:

The core of the Landrum-Griffin comments is that Congress intended in Taft-Hartley and again in Landrum-Griffin to ban all secondary boycotts. Here are the words of Mr. LANDRUM:

Perhaps the most notable of these loopholes have been those in the area of secondary boycotts. Congress in 1947 thought it had banned all forms of secondary boycotting. In fact, any reasonable reading of the 1947 statute and its history leads inescapably to that conclusion.

What are the facts on this matter? Did we in Congress, as claimed by MESSRS. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN, believe that we were banning "all forms of secondary boycotting"? The answer is found on the face of the Taft-Hartley Act. Two separate provisions of that law specifically authorize secondary boycotts in narrowly defined situations; and as might be expected in compromise legislation regulating controversial matters, the general provision against secondary boycotts is hedged and limited by carefully chosen words of art. Foremost, perhaps, is the limitation concerning the object of the prohibited secondary boycott which is explained in four complicated and technical subparagraphs. In short, my colleagues misconstrue and rewrite history when they claim, as they do, that Congress thought that "it had banned all forms of secondary boycotting" in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The language of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Sand Door* case (357 U.S. 93, 98-100), sheds further light on the common understanding of these secondary boycott provisions:

Whatever may have been said in Congress preceding the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act concerning the evil of all forms of secondary boycotts and the desirability of outlawing them, it is clear that no such sweeping prohibition was in fact enacted in section 8(b)(4)(A). The section does not speak generally of secondary boycotts. It describes and condemns specific union conduct directed to specific objectives.

It is relevant to recall that the Taft-Hartley Act was to a marked degree, the result of conflict and compromise between strong contending forces and deeply held views on the role of organized labor in the free economic life of the Nation and the appropriate balance to be struck between the uncontrolled power of management and labor to further their respective interests. This is relevant in that it counsels wariness in finding by construction a broad policy against secondary boycotts as such when, from the words of the statute itself, it is clear that those interested in just such a condemnation were unable to secure its embodiment in enacted law.

Less than a year ago Mr. Justice Frankfurter reiterated in the *General Electric* case (366 U.S. 667) that not all so-called secondary boycotts were outlawed in section 8(b)(4)(A).

The problem raised by these [secondary boycott] cases—

Continues Mr. Justice Frankfurter— affords a striking truism that it is the business of Congress to declare policy and not this Court's. The judicial function is confined to applying what Congress has enacted after ascertaining what it is that Congress has enacted. But such ascertainment, that is, construing legislation, is nothing like a mechanical endeavor. It could not be accomplished by the subtlest of modern brain machines. Because of the infirmities of language and the limited scope of science in legislative drafting, inevitably there enters into the construction of statutes the play of judicial judgment within the limits of the relevant legislative materials.

I do not intend to quarrel, although I do not agree, with my colleagues concerning the merits of individual cases. That I leave for the courts. My point is simple: that the Labor Board decisions in the area of secondary boycotts do not reflect nimble footwork and ingenious innovations to open loopholes in the act. In my mind, the Labor Board decisions reflect an honest and sincere effort to interpret a series of provisions which resulted from legislative compromise and hence are complicated and highly complex.

While I hesitate to belabor this point, I think it ironic that their first concrete illustration of nimble footwork in the area of secondary boycotts refers not to a Labor Board decision, but to a unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court written by Mr. Justice Burton, one-time Republican Senator from Ohio, *N.L.R.B. v. International Rice Milling Company, Inc.* (341 U.S. 665).

These few examples lead to another point where I am in disagreement with my good friends MESSRS. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN. I believe that the Labor Board operates in a "goldfish bowl" type of situation, ever mindful of our mandates, and with one eye cocked on the courts.

My colleagues seek to maximize the seriousness of the alleged Labor Board creation of loopholes by minimizing the importance of the role played by the judiciary. Congressman LANDRUM tells us:

The courts defer to the so-called expertise of the Board, and have been reluctant to upset its decisions. In practical effect, therefore, the Labor Board is all too often a court of last resort—and when it carves out a loophole in the law, that loophole invariably stays open.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that if this were actually the case—and I might say, following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, as an employee of the National Labor Relations Board, it was my fortune to spend 5 years observing the courts overturn almost completely the entire previous line of Board decisions since the original passage of the Wagner Act in the 1930's.

They not only passed on issues, they not only passed on points of law, they passed on the facts and they did so

by virtue of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act from which I quote:

If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken, the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaged in any such unfair labor practice then the Board shall state its findings.

And so forth. With the use of this one word, "preponderance", the courts of our land chose to upset many legal tenets that the Board held for years, and they chose to pass on the facts, and they indicated no reluctance whatsoever to do so. And as an employee of the Board at that time, I would say that the gentleman from Georgia simply has not looked at the past history of what the courts actually did.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I agree with the gentleman from California, and with further reference to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia's [Mr. LANDRUM] assertion that the Board carves out loopholes which the courts will not close, I would like to point out some facts. They are not hard to ascertain. They are set forth in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and in the Labor Board annual reports. In 1960 the Supreme Court reversed six Labor Board decisions and reversed five of them. In 1961 the Supreme Court passed on the merits of nine Labor Board decisions, and reversed six of them.

In 1960 the U.S. Court of Appeals reviewed 125 Labor Board decisions and enforced only 54, or 43 percent in full; 38, or 30 percent in part; and reversed or remanded to the Board 33, or 26 percent.

Does this record indicate that the courts are reluctant to upset Labor Board decisions?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's references to the gentleman from Georgia and his assertions about the National Labor Relations Board are supported very strongly by the statistics which the gentleman has just read. As a matter of fact, the burden of my whole speech was that the National Labor Relations Board has been wrong. And what the gentleman from New Jersey has just said emphasizes the fact, because the Supreme Court sent them back.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Since I did not understand the gentleman's language well enough, since I quoted it I will requote it. Maybe he can explain the nuances which I failed to gather. The gentleman said:

The courts defer to the so-called expertise of the Board, and have been reluctant to upset its decisions.

He said further:

In practical effect, therefore, the Labor Board is all too often a court of last resort.

Now, again, nunc pro tunc the gentleman asks me to yield and says that is not what he intended at all. He says

that what he intended to say was the reverse of what he said earlier.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will yield briefly, if the gentleman from Michigan will allow it.

Mr. LANDRUM. What the gentleman said was exactly what he intended to say.

It is that the great mass of the cases coming to the National Labor Relations Board are not reviewed by the appellate courts. This is shown by the statistics, as the gentleman has just so clearly pointed out, that upon the small volume of cases that are appealed the Supreme Court and the circuit courts of appeals have reversed the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman wants to have it both ways. Apparently the gentleman is suggesting now that the court of appeals and the Supreme Court grant certiorari when none is asked for in order to review Labor Board decisions on which no review is asked. The statistics are absolutely undeniable, and I am glad my friend from Georgia concedes them. In 1960 the U.S. courts of appeals reviewed 125 Labor Board decisions and enforced only 54 in all, 38 in part, and reversed or remanded to the Board 33.

The record bears out the statement. Whatever the gentleman intended to say, of course he understands better than I.

I pointed out earlier that the first concrete illustration of alleged circumvention of congressional intent in the Landrum-Griffin comments was the Supreme Court decision written by Mr. Justice Burton for a unanimous Court. This was described as "a strange holding that boycott activity was not concerted if carried out by a series of individual acts."

The second concrete illustration of typical loopholes in secondary boycott provisions was the holding that certain people did not fall within the technical definition of employer and employee. Accordingly, agricultural employees could be made the targets of secondary boycott action. MESSRS. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN did not tell us that this line of decisions followed a court reversal of a board holding, to the contrary.

Among the individual Board decisions singled out for attack is *Plauche Electric* (135 NLRB No. 41) holding that the picketing of employees of the primary employer at a neutral situs where these employees spend most of their working day does not become unlawful merely because the employees could be picketed at a separate situs for a fraction of their working time. This, say Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN, is the first step away from the Washington Coca-Cola doctrine. What Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN did not tell us is that three different courts of appeals in five different decisions had repudiated the Washington Coca-Cola doctrine before the Labor Board decided to do so. Would Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN have the Labor Board flout and ignore the court rulings on the subject? Why, then, did we authorize judicial review?

Illustrations can be repeated. My point is simply that the process of judicial review is well oiled and in good working order. The courts do pass upon the merits of Labor Board decisions, sometimes affirming, more often of late, reversing. Loopholes created by Board decisions can be and are plugged on appeal.

If we are dissatisfied with the way in which the courts construe our statute, the proper procedure is to amend the statute, not to attack the Labor Board whose decisions, if erroneous, can be corrected by judicial review.

We should keep ourselves informed of the developments at the Labor Board, as we keep ourselves informed of the developments at the other agencies. We should revise our labor act when the courts put their imprimatur on a Labor Board interpretation we did not or could not anticipate. Ours, subject to constitutional limitations of free speech, due process, and so forth, is the last word. I only request that it be constrained pending full, and bipartisan, study through our normal avenues of discussion.

The Board members are chosen to give their best independent judgment on complex and difficult legal and industrial relations questions. From all the reports that have come to me from various impartial observers, they seem to have been doing an enormous volume of work with integrity, conscientiousness, and good judgment. They have attained record levels of case production and have reduced their backlog very substantially, and they have been handing down many decisions which enforce the remedies given by the law against both unions and employers which violate it.

The Board may err; even Homer nods. But to substitute a broadside attack on the Board as an institution for informed and enlightened discussions as to how specific problems may best be met ill suits the needs of our times as experienced over a good many years.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his contribution. I think it is a very useful contribution made more valuable by the experience of the able gentleman from New Jersey on the House Committee on Education and Labor throughout his service in the Congress. His words are entitled to particular weight as he was one of the leading participants in framing the conference report of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for taking this time in order to put in proper perspective the role that the National Labor Relations Board is playing today under the administration of its Chairman, Mr. Frank W. McCulloch.

A year ago today I presided over hearings on the administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board. One thing I learned during that series of hearings was that the problems involved in administering the law are nettlesome

with the quality of quicksilver. The problems in isolation have thorns; they flow into one another with never-ceasing fluidity. The problems must be grasped; but they must be grasped as a whole.

Our colleague from Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN, recently discussed a small handful of cases and saw a pattern whereby the policies laid down by Congress, in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, are being distorted and frustrated. I have examined a much larger number of cases and find a different pattern: a pattern whereby the NLRB attempts to effectuate the policies of Congress by a careful application of the law to the varying factual situations, the close borderline situations, which daily confront the Board. I am satisfied from studying the record of the Board during the past year that it is in fact carrying out the admonition my committee voiced after our investigation last year. We said then that we do not want a pro-labor nor a pro-management National Labor Relations Board. We want a Board that will be fair and base its decisions on an impartial interpretation of the law. It is my judgment we now have a such a Board.

Mr. GRIFFIN gives special attention to the NLRB administration of the secondary boycott provisions. I have examined 27 of the important Labor Board decisions, and I attach synopses of these decisions—with the vote of participating Board members. I believe a fair reading of these synopses will show that the Board has not, as claimed, carved out sizable boycott loopholes.

JURISDICTION

Let me briefly mention three cases involving jurisdiction.

The Landrum-Griffin amendments make it unlawful for a union to induce or encourage any individual employed by any person engaged in commerce or in an industry affecting commerce to engage in a strike or a refusal in the course of his employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, etc., products of the primary employer, that is the employer with whom the union has the dispute. Despite this language, the NLRB held in *Kisner & Sons*—case No. 5 in the attached synopses—that there is no need to allege or prove that the secondary employers on a construction site are engaged in commerce because any participation in the construction industry is sufficient to create Labor Board jurisdiction.

In *H & K Lathing Co.*—case No. 18 in the synopses—the NLRB asserted jurisdiction when it was alleged that the union engaged in secondary picketing at four different job sites—the combined value of these job sites amounted to slightly over the Board's required \$50,000 standard—even though the subsequent evidence showed that there had been unlawful activity at only three of the job sites—the combined value of the three jobs did not reach the Board's \$50,000 requirement.

In *John J. Reich*—case No. 23 in the synopses—the Board asserted jurisdiction and found the required \$50,000

amount by totaling 13 different painting jobs done by the primary employer during a year's time, and by accepting the charging party's estimate of the value on two of the jobs which had not been completed or paid for.

These three decisions on jurisdiction do not indicate to me that the Board is seeking to carve out sizable boycott loopholes. It indicates just the contrary—that the Board is going out of its way to protect the small independent contractor from the predatory practices of a few local unions.

INDUCE OR ENCOURAGE

The first offense listed in the secondary boycott section of the act occurs when a union induces or encourages the employees of neutral employers to engage in a strike or in a refusal to work when an object is forcing the neutral employer to cease doing business with the primary employer. Has the Labor Board construed the statutory term "induce or encourage" in a fashion to carve loopholes?

Under the decisions, a union unlawfully induces or encourages neutral employees:

First. When its members tell neutral employees that "You know it's wrong to handle that flooring. You will bust our union if you handle it." *Carolina Lumber Co.*—case No. 2 in the synopsis.

Second. When a union pickets a building project on Sunday when the neutral employees are not even present. *Spar Builders*—case No. 4 in the synopsis.

Third. When a business agent tells an estimator employed by the prime contractor on a job that the union wished the prime contractor would not subcontract the sheet metal work to nonunion subcontractors. *Kisner and Sons*—case No. 5 in the synopsis.

Fourth. When minor union officials on the job refused to handle hot cargo and told their coworkers:

You don't have to handle no scab freight. *Overnite Transportation Co.* (case No. 13 in the synopsis).

Fifth. When a union picketed the job site where the primary employer repaired equipment with signs containing the word "scab." *Friden, Inc.*—case No. 20 in the synopsis.

On the other hand, the NLRB has held that a union does not unlawfully induce and encourage the employees of neutrals to join their strike:

First. When the striking union pickets neutral department store with signs: "Help Us Keep Our Jobs—Buy Mattresses Made Locally by Upholsterers Local 61." *Minneapolis House Furnishings*—case No. 6 in synopsis.

Second. When the union business agent told members at union meeting that they had a right as individuals not to work on struck goods. *Tampa Sand & Material Co.*—case No. 11 in synopsis.

Fourth. When union—up to 70 persons strong—patrolled in elliptical line before main entrance of arena distributing handbills urging patrons to protest to municipal authorities the use of non-union labor within. *William J. Burns, Int. Detective Agency, Inc.*—case No. 26 in synopsis.

I cite these decisions as representative of the work done by the Labor Board during the past year. Some of the cases are helpful to the union, some are helpful to management. There is no pattern; other than a pattern of deciding each case on the merits.

Illustrations can be multiplied. For example, it sometimes becomes crucial to determine whether a given individual is an employee or, alternatively, an independent contractor. Compare L. B. Wilson, Inc.—case No. 14—radio disk-jockey an independent contractor—with Floyd W. Drake—case No. 15—driver-owners of cement trucks are employees.

It sometimes becomes important, even crucial, to determine whether an object of union picketing is to force or require an employer to recognize and bargain with the picketing union. Compare Kisser & Sons—case No. 5 in synopsis—

unlawful objective found despite union disclaimer of interest—with Calumet Contractors—case No. 12 in synopsis—disclaimer of union interest found valid.

It sometimes becomes crucial to determine whether the union picketing at a common situs—that is, a place where work is done by employees of both primary and secondary employers—is protected primary activity or forbidden secondary activity. Compare Friden, Inc.—case No. 20 in synopsis—picketing is forbidden secondary activity—with Plauche Electric, Inc.—case No. 22 in synopsis—picketing is protected primary activity.

An examination of the decisions in their entirety permits the observer to match one case with another on closely related facts. The conclusion to be drawn is that the Board approaches each situation on a pragmatic, not a conceptualistic, basis and calls each case as it

sees it without fear or favor, without bias or prejudice, in an honest and sincere endeavor to effectuate the statute as written by Congress. For this we should be thankful.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, may I say that the synopsis of the cases I have mentioned, indicating the individual votes of the individual Board members, some of whom are holdovers from the old administration, show the extent to which this Board has gone in doing an outstanding job of fairly administering the labor laws of this country.

I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan again for taking this time so that we might put these facts before our colleagues.

The synopsis of the 27 recent secondary-boycott decisions by the NLRB follows:

Synopsis of 27 recent "secondary-boycott" decisions by the NLRB—Sec. 8(b)(4) (secondary boycott) cases

Key to chart: All Board members did not participate in all cases; an "X" mark indicates agreement with majority opinion; "C" signifies concurrence; "D" signifies dissent

	McCulloch	Rodgers	Leedom	Fanning	Brown
1. <i>Riss & Co.</i> , 130 NLRB 943:					
(a) Strike is primary, not secondary, at "common situs"		X	X	X	
(b) Union "induces and encourages" when it physically impedes		X	X	X	
(c) Union "threatens and coerces" employer when it physically restrains employees		X	X	X	
2. <i>Carolina Lumber Co.</i> , 130 NLRB 1438:					
(a) "Individual employed by any person" includes lower echelon managerial persons		C	X	X	
(b) Job foremen are "individuals" and therefore it is unlawful for union to say, "You know it is wrong to handle that flooring. You will bust our union if you handle it."		C	X	X	
(c) Project superintendent is a "person," not an "individual employed by any person," and therefore it is not unlawful for union to tell him that "it would not object" but that it "would rather that he didn't use" lumber from a struck concern.		C	X	X	
3. <i>Brewers City Coal Dock</i> , 131 NLRB 228: (a) Assistant supervisor on large construction project a "person" rather than an "individual employed by any person" and therefore not unlawful (does not coerce or restrain) for union to tell him that sand came from "struck" plant and it "didn't know if the men would handle the sand or not."		X	X	X	
4. <i>Spar Builders</i> , 131 NLRB 1052:					
(a) In light of all circumstances, Sunday picketing with signs addressed to "consumers" unlawful; "induces and encourages" "individuals employed by any person" to engage in strike.		X	X	X	
(b) Inducing individuals (employees) to cease work "coerces and restrains" their neutral employer to cease doing business with "struck" employer.		X	X	X	
5. <i>Kisser and Sons</i> , 131 NLRB 1106:					
(a) When construction contractor with whom union has dispute is in interstate commerce, not necessary to allege or prove that "neutral" secondary employers are also in interstate commerce.	X	X	X	X	X
(b) Picket sign "Sheet metal work on this job done by nonmembers of local 299" is unlawful secondary, not lawful "primary" activity.	X	X	X	X	X
(c) "Job estimator" is "individual employed by any person" so unlawful inducement for union to say it "wished" prime contractor would use union subcontractors.	X	X	X	X	X
(d) Construction superintendent a "person" and it is unlawful "restraint and coercion" for union to say he "would in all probability have a picket on the job if he hired nonunion subcontractor."	X	X	X	X	X
(e) Purpose of picketing is to compel collective bargaining, despite disclaimer by union that it any longer wished to represent employees of picketed subcontractor.	X	X	X	X	X
6. <i>Minneapolis House Furnishings</i> , 132 NLRB No. 2:					
(a) "Consumer picketing" of department store protesting sale of foreign-made products does not "per se" "induce or encourage" department store employees to cease work.	X	D	D	X	X
(b) Picketing here unlawfully "coerced and restrained" store owner to cease doing business with nonarea manufacturers.	X	X	X	X	X
(c) Handbill distribution urging customers to buy locally made furniture is "publicity" protected by proviso to sec. 8(b)(4).	X	X	X	X	X
7. <i>Southern Construction Corporation</i> , 132 NLRB No. 49:					
(a) Subcontractor on job, not contractor, is primary employer of subcontractor employees, and picketing of prime contractor is unlawful "secondary" action.	X	X		X	
(b) Union "restrains and coerces" prime contractor when it warns he "might have trouble" if he hires nonunion subcontractors.	X	X		X	
(c) Picket signs "Phillip Abshire pays substandard wages. Dispute with no other employer" "induces and encourages" all employees on job to cease work under circumstances here present.	X	X		X	
8. <i>Lohman Sales Company</i> , 132 NLRB No. 67:					
(a) Union handbilling of retail outlets requesting consumers to boycott cigarettes distributed by struck employer is protected "publicity" as distributor employer "produces a product" which is "distributed" by the retail outlets.	X	D	X	X	X
(b) Handbills were for purpose of "truthfully advising the public" even if incorrect as to unimportant details when "there is no evidence of an intent to deceive and there has not been a substantial departure from fact."	X	X	X	X	X
9. <i>Packard Bell</i> , 132 NLRB No. 94: (a) It is "picketing" rather than protected handbilling when handbills are distributed in sight of car which has on it a placard.	X	X	X	X	
10. <i>Tree Fruits Labor Relations Committee</i> , 132 NLRB No. 102:					
(a) Picketing of retail outlets urging consumer boycott of apples sold within does not "induce or encourage" the retail employees to cease work.	X			X	X
(b) Such picketing "threatens, coerces and restrains" the employer to cease handling the apples. This is the "natural and foreseeable result of such picketing."	X			X	X
11. <i>Tampa Sand and Material Co.</i> , 132 NLRB No. 124:					
(a) Secondary employer purchasing concrete from struck concern was "threatened and coerced" when business agent said, "We can't put up with this very much longer."			X	X	X
(b) Threats by "job stewards" are attributable and binding upon union.			X	X	X
(c) Not unlawful "inducement or encouragement" for union official (absent threat or promise of support) to announce at union meeting that members as individuals have right to refuse to work on "struck work."			X	X	X
(d) Unrenounced comment by union member during heated meeting of union members not binding upon or attributable to the union.			X	X	X
12. <i>Calumet Contractors</i> , 133 NLRB No. 2: (a) "Area standards" picketing not unlawful as 8(b)(4)(C) forbids only picketing with the objective of obtaining "recognition and bargaining."	X	D	D	X	X

Synopsis of 27 recent "secondary-boycott" decisions by the NLRB—Sec. 8(b)(4) (secondary boycott) cases—Continued

Key to chart: All Board members did not participate in all cases; an "X" mark indicates agreement with majority opinion; "C" signifies concurrence; "D" signifies dissent

	McCulloch	Rodgers	Leedom	Fanning	Brown
13. <i>Overnite Transportation Company</i> , 133 NLRB No. 12: (a) Union officials "induced and persuaded" coworkers to refuse to work when they themselves refused to work and commented that "You don't have to handle no scab freight." (b) Secondary activity by union to obtain bargaining rights not unlawful when engaged in by union which "has been certified as the representative of such employees"; but NLRB order that company bargain with union not "tantamount" to NLRB "certification" of the union.		X	X		X
14. <i>L. B. Wilson, Inc.</i> , 133 NLRB No. 72: (a) Union resolution that "no member * * * is allowed to work at or through facilities of WCKY" is lawful "primary activity" as all members of union were "primary" employees. (b) Diskjockey was not an "individual employed by any person," but was an independent contractor despite fact that all diskjockeys, singers, etc., "are organized into an exclusive source of supply."	X	D	D	X	X
15. <i>Floyd W. Drake</i> , 133 NLRB No. 116: (a) Drivers of cement trucks (who own the trucks) are "individuals employed by any person," rather than "independent contractors." (b) Union does not "coerce or restrain" prime contractor when it gives notice of prospective strike action against subcontractor on job.			D	X	X
16. <i>The Stephens Company</i> , 133 NLRB No. 134: (a) It is unlawful "restraint and coercion" for union to give unqualified threat to retail outlet that it will be picketed if it handles goods of "struck" distributor. (b) It is lawful "primary" activity if picket threat is qualified: "In strict conformity with the standards for primary ambulatory picketing as enunciated by the NLRB." (c) Unlawful secondary activity by certified union during economic strike not protected by statutory exemption as activity was not designed "to force or require" employer "to recognize and bargain" with union. Employer recognized and bargained with union; merely disagreed as to terms of contract.			X	X	X
17. <i>Middle South Broadcasting Co.</i> , 133 NLRB No. 165: (a) Lawful "primary" activity for union to picket at display room of advertiser when broadcasts of "struck" radio station are regularly and extensively beamed from display room. (b) "Do Not Patronize" leaflets urging a consumer boycott of advertisers on "struck" radio are protected by the "publicity proviso." (c) Radio station "produces a product" "by adding its labor in the form of capital, enterprise and services to the automobiles" which it advertises for the secondary employer retail distributor of the automobiles.	X	D	D	X	X
18. <i>H. & K. Lathing Co.</i> , 134 NLRB No. 43: (a) Determine jurisdictional amount on basis of complaint, not on basis of facts proved at hearing. (b) When primary employer not in interstate commerce, the entire operations of all secondary employers at the location affected by alleged conduct will be considered.		X		X	X
19. <i>North Western Construction of Washington, Inc.</i> , 134 NLRB No. 46: (a) Distribution of "unfair list" to union members protected by "publicity proviso" (b) Electrical subcontractor on gas station construction job "produces a product" distributed by the prime contractor.	X	D	X	X	X
20. <i>Friden, Inc.</i> , 134 NLRB No. 61: (a) Unlawful "secondary" action for union to picket office buildings where secondary employers do business when primary employer not doing work there, even if union attempted to picket only when it believed primary employer was at work. (b) Picket line unlawfully "induced and encouraged" employees of "neutral" employers under test of <i>Minneapolis House Furnishing</i> . (c) Picketing "threatened, coerced and restrained" neutral employers to cease doing business with primary employer.			X	X	X
21. <i>Great Western Broadcasting Corporation</i> , 134 NLRB No. 141: (a) A television station "produces products" advertised on its station so "publicity proviso" protects handbilling of businesses which advertise.	X	D		X	
22. <i>Plauche Electric, Inc.</i> , 135 NLRB No. 41: (a) Lawful "primary" activity to picket at retail establishment where employees of the primary employer spend practically their entire working day even though they may report for a few minutes at the beginning and end of each day to the regular place of business of primary employer.	X	D	D	X	X
23. <i>John J. Feich</i> , 136 NLRB No. 11: (a) Jurisdictional amount ascertained by adding together cost of all jobs (13 here) done by painting contractor for concerns in interstate commerce. (b) Union "induces and encourages" its members to refrain from work with a motion, "we discontinue business with John Reich, Painting Contractor, because he will not live up to our working agreement." (c) Son in father-son partnership was an "employer" forced to join labor organization despite contrary finding by Federal court that son was an "employee." (d) Union attempt to enforce valid contract is not immune from liability when its actions constitute a violation of the "cease handling" or "cease doing business" provisions of sec. 8(b)(4)(B).	X	X		X	
24. <i>Houston Armored Car Company, Inc.</i> , 136 NLRB No. 9: (a) Ambulatory picketing of "struck" employer's trucks when they stopped for "pickup" is lawful "primary" activity even though the trucks return to home office 5 or 6 times a day. (b) An armored car company "produces products" for its customers when it picks up and protects their cash receipts.		D		X	X
25. <i>New York Herald Tribune, Inc.</i> , 136 NLRB No. 19: (a) Union "induced and encouraged" its members to cease doing business with neutral employer when it instructed them to seek observance "of the traditional right of its members not to handle the struck work." (b) No specific intent necessary when "an object" of activity is "to disrupt or seriously curtail the existing business relationship" between a "neutral" and a "struck" employer.	X	X	X	X	X
26. <i>William J. Burns Int. Detective Agency, Inc.</i> , 136 NLRB No. 34: (a) Under the circumstances, a union does not "induce or persuade" employees of "neutrals" to cease work when it sponsors a "handbilling" patrol of up to 70 persons in an elliptical line before entrance to area. (b) "Purpose and intended impact of the above-described conduct was to 'threaten, coerce or restrain' neutral employer to cease doing business with nonunion subcontractor.	C	D			
27. <i>Wiggin Terminals, Inc.</i> , 137 NLRB No. 3: (a) Dispute of longshoremen is with "importer," not with stevedoring company, so union engages in unlawful "secondary" activities when it induces "slow down" on job to force stevedore to alter business arrangements with the "importer" customer.	D	C	C	X	X
	X	X	X	D	D

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving us the benefit of his subcommittee's study of the Labor Board with his committee during the last session of Congress.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I shall yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan in yielding to me briefly. Let me say that, although obviously I do not agree with the analyses and the evalua-

tion of many of the Labor Board's decisions as they are put before the House here today, I do respect the right of the gentleman from Michigan, and his colleagues on that side of aisle, to disagree with my point of view.

Without attempting at this point to get into the merits of various decisions, I

should like to focus attention upon the importance of the decisions by the National Labor Relations Board. In many respects there is only a very limited check on the Board as far as judicial review is concerned.

For example, let us suppose that one takes a case into a Federal district court, and the district court decides against him, and then he does not appeal that decision to the next higher court. He may fail to appeal because of a lack of funds. Or, in some cases, the issue may be settled or become moot. The decision rendered is the settled law only in that particular Federal district court jurisdiction.

Now, if a similar dispute should arise in another district court jurisdiction, another litigant could have the issue considered in that district court. If the district court decided against him, the litigant appeal to the court of appeals and the previous adverse decision in another jurisdiction, which by default was not appealed, would not preclude him.

Now, contrast that situation with the National Labor Relations Board procedures under which we have one so-called tribunal which is the court of first resort for all unfair labor complaints throughout the country. When a dispute comes to the Board, and the Board decides adversely to a litigant, it can be said, "Oh, yes, he has the right of appeal." And he does. But, consider what happens if the legal question in the particular case becomes moot or the litigant does not have the funds to appeal, or for some other reason does not appeal from the Board decision. Then that decision of the National Labor Relations Board becomes the law of the land, and from there and then on all other litigants are precluded from taking a similar case before the Board. Thereafter, if the General Counsel of the Board is presented with a similar set of facts, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] well knows, the General Counsel will refuse to issue a complaint and, in effect, will say, "No. The National Labor Relations Board has ruled on those facts." It does no good at that point to say, "But the Board was wrong and would be reversed upon appeal." At that point, there is no way to get the merits of the case before the Board or to appeal to the courts.

So, I make the point that the right of judicial review with respect to Board decisions can amount to very limited protection under the procedures that have been established, as compared with rights in the areas where cases are handled by Federal district courts.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I regret that we do not have more time so that I could yield to the gentleman for fuller comment. His name has been mentioned frequently in order to properly identify the subject to which we were directing our remarks. I think the gentleman will agree that we were directing our remarks to the ideas expressed by him and not to the gentleman personally. I respect him as

a very able member of the committee, and I thank him for his observations.

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

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is only one point I would like to make and that is a followthrough of what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] said. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may be in the right church but the wrong pew. He is attacking the Board and has suggested that the Board has carved out loopholes in the law, and then in his remarks that he offers now points out certain weaknesses in the basic law. I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] certainly made a strong point when he said, "If you have any quarrel, then you ought to quarrel with the law, and if you want to strengthen the law, propose such an amendment to the Congress." But, it is not fair to attack this Board, which, as proved conclusively by the synopsis I have attached to my remarks, has been calling them right down the middle. It is not a promanagement Board; it is not a prolabor Board; it is a pro-American Board. It is calling the shots as it sees them, based on the merits of each individual issue as it arises.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I also wonder what is the difference between the procedure used by the Board with respect to complaints and the procedures in any other Federal regulatory agency. I do not see that there is any difference. I wonder what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] would propose as an alternative to the National Labor Relations Board? I might suggest adding the proviso that the Labor Board does not cover all labor cases, but only a very limited area of the entire problem of labor disputes.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] has other points to which he may want to go, and does not wish to take all of his time on this point. I would say there are a number of recommendations that should be considered, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. I wished to make the point that the decisions of the NLRB are very important, and in many instances amount to the decisions of a court of last resort.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] refer to the General Counsel and not the Board?

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] will yield fur-

ther, I shall be glad to respond to the request for suggestions for improvement in the procedure. One way in which we could improve it would be to provide judicial review in a Federal district court, for example, of a refusal by the general counsel to issue an unfair labor practice complaint. Another possibility would be to set up regional labor boards.

Another possibility would be to transfer NLRB jurisdiction in unfair labor practice cases to the Federal district courts. All of these suggestions have been advanced and are worthy of consideration.

While I may not agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], I wish to assure him that I am interested in what he and others have to say on this subject and I shall read their remarks in the Record. I regret that, because of another commitment, it will not be possible for me to remain on the floor during the remaining portion of the special order.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It was the contention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], at the very outset of his remarks, that we have different standards in the different district courts, and the gentleman based his entire attack upon the Board by showing how important the decisions of the Board are, because they are national in scope, in contrast to the restricted decisions that emanate from the various district courts.

Now the gentleman says we ought to turn it over to these restricted Federal district courts. I think what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is suggesting would result in a patchwork quilt national labor policy with different interpretations and different standards of labor management relations, in each of the geographical areas served by the more than a hundred Federal district courts. I cannot think of anything that would produce more chaos and more labor unrest in this country than to follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to hear a debate between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] on this very point. I understand that we well might see a continuation of these long-range colloquies on the floor of the House—and I hope at that time we have an opportunity to go into these matters more fully.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am wondering in what respect is the gentleman from Michigan referring to the refusal of the General Counsel to issue complaints?

I would certainly welcome this as an exhibit. I think such a collection would show great liberality in the issuance of complaints, not any denial of rights.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I appear here this afternoon as a former employee of the National Labor Relations Board. I was for 5 years a field examiner. I do not presume that I am here as an expert in the higher echelons of law giving, but I am here as one who has read and reread this act many, many thousands of times, one who has slept on this legislation many evenings, and one who has gone into the towns and communities of this country taking testimony and affidavits. I do not purport to be a great expert in the judicial process. But, certainly, I am one who has been on the firing line in this respect, and know a little something about it. If I am anything here this afternoon, I am here as a spokesman for that lowly being known as the civil servant, the one who seeks to enforce the will of the Congress, with the best will in the world, with every desire to enforce the law that can be possibly mustered, who reads through interminable pages of the Record, which I am beginning to find out to a greater and greater degree oftentimes do not reflect the true state of affairs, or true facts, who must, amidst the many possible interpretations of the law, seek to apply them to the particular, tortuous and complex cases that he is assigned to and come up with a right answer, or a good effort at a right answer.

In the literally hundreds of Board employees whom I have known and have done business with and trafficked with, I have found the highest degree of intelligence, the highest degree of effort and devotion to do right by their Government, to do right by the agency they represent, to do right by the general public, labor, and management. We employees of the Board yield to no one in the respect we have shown for this law, whether it was the Wagner Act of 1935, the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 or the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. We have done the best we possibly could under any and all of the law, enforcing them to the best of our knowledge and ability.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned prominently in his remarks Gerald A. Brown, the former regional director of San Francisco where I was employed, the 20th region of the national Labor Relations Board, who is presently a Board member. He is the highest type exemplar of what I have been speaking of. I propose, in a few moments, to have another word to say on this subject. But I appear here this afternoon as a representative of those civil servants who serve this Government, who seek to do their work well in the face of constant, never-ending criticism from those who have never known that side of the fence, but only know the congressional side.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure you I have the highest regard for Congressmen. They seek to do their duty on matters which sometimes they only dimly understand. They seek to make general laws to fit all situations, and only under the bitter experience of time do we find many of their panaceas are faulty. Those who are in the civil service must

do the best they can to interpret these imperfect laws. It is unfortunate that the mean acrimony on both sides cannot be mellowed by a better understanding of the limitations imposed upon each of them.

My colleagues, Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN, quite rightly told us that:

The importance of adhering to congressional intent is a matter of compelling importance in all laws. In no area is it more vital than in labor legislation.

The gentleman from Michigan further said:

All of us will concede that in the application of any law to varying factual situations close borderline situations will be confronted.

As one who has had experience in this field let me say that almost each case presents borderline situations. Therefore, most of these decisions are difficult to reach. They require vast hours of effort, thousands of hours of our time traveling, going out to witnesses, hundreds of hours spent in interviewing witnesses, thousands of hours spent reading the laws and the labor reports in our field, so that we can come up with these decisions.

These so-called borderline situations are the order of the day rather than the exception. The physical facts of any Board case differ from the physical facts of any other case. That is why it is so difficult for field examiners, for attorneys, for trial examiners and for the Board to reach a decision. Exceptions to "ruling" case become the rule rather than the reverse because of the difference and the uniqueness in each one of these cases as they come to us.

My colleagues then warn that:

There is reason to wonder whether the NLRB—which was created by Congress—even concedes the constitutional authority of Congress to formulate and establish policy in the labor-management field.

The cause for alarm stems from a press release concerning a speech—an extrajudicial pronouncement my colleagues term it—given by Board Member Gerald A. Brown.

My colleagues quote from this press release Mr. Brown's statement that—

In my view the Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal.

And conclude therefrom that this extrajudicial pronouncement seems to articulate an attitude on the part of some Board members which indicates very little regard for the policymaking role of Congress.

I have read not only the full text of the press release which my colleagues inserted in the Record, but I also have read the entire speech of Board Member Gerald A. Brown.

I feel that anyone who would read this speech line by line would be convinced that here is a very thoughtful presentation of Board dilemma, unusually perceptive, of a gentleman who has given a great deal of consideration to the problem of labor relations. It is given in a manner which contains none of the rancorous and pretentious dogma that beclouds so much of labor relations debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point the full transcript of the speech be made a part of the Record. A careful reading of this speech will be a profitable and rewarding experience.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE NLRB ON THE NEW FRONTIERS

(By Gerald A. Brown)

Since I became a member of the NLRB in April 1961 I have been asked many times what my impressions of the job were. This was usually accompanied by an observation that anyone who would leave San Francisco to come to Washington must be deficient in good judgment. In any event, while finding it necessary to run twice as fast in order to stay in the same place on the treadmill on which I found myself, I have tried to piece together my varied reactions. Without wishing to appear pedantic, I am firmly convinced that proper perspective involves allocating specific problems to their appropriate place in the stream of history.

My own view is that the history of civilization indicates that virtually the only certainty of life in almost all areas is change. The earth is spinning in our small universe, and every moment is different from the last. Change inevitably brings conflict. This requires continual reappraisal, from which, I hope, comes progress. Thorstein Veblen's thesis that inevitable technological changes compel constant readjustment of the institutional arrangements made by mankind has an application in labor relations. Use of the scientific method which has characterized the 20th century is based in substantial part upon experiment and observation. This, too, has significance for the NLRB, and as I shall indicate a little later, adds some coherence to the changes which have been taking place in Federal labor law.

In view of the volume of cases which we have decided, it really is a distortion to concentrate on a few areas where changes in policy have occurred. Moreover, I find it strange that so many people should be amazed that changes in Board membership should result in some changed interpretations of a changed and complex law. We are not clerks punching buttons to obtain some preordained decision.

During my time in Washington, I have become progressively disappointed at what has gradually snowballed into a general tendency among commentators on the labor relations scene to describe the new Board members as recipients of the debt owed organized labor by President Kennedy and to analyze and explain the Board's decisions as predictable pronouncements of "Kennedy's Democratic, pro-labor Board."

To be sure, I am aware that the rulings of the Board during President Eisenhower's administration were oftentimes greeted with such shibboleths as "conservative, Republican, promanagement" and therefore subjected to a caliber of criticism similarly lacking in penetration. Let me hasten to add that my disappointment does not stem from any personal fear of criticism. I have been in this business too long to be surprised when the losing party in a Board proceeding yells bias to divert attention from the merits of his case.

But responsible reporting requires something more—even where the criticism may be justified.

My dislike of such "label pinning" stems from the fact that its appeal is directed at exacting blind emotional instead of well-founded rational responses. For those who view virtually all disputes as battles between labor and management, there is an almost

irresistible temptation summarily to classify each and every decision as a victory for one contestant at the expense of the other.

The inherent weaknesses in adopting such an approach are twofold. Firstly, not all Board decisions are susceptible to so simple a breakdown. Shocking as the thought may be in some quarters, employers and unions frequently take similar positions with respect to issues or a given Board case.

Second, more often than not, label pinning beclouds the real issue at hand. The General Motors case recently received widespread publicity as a Board pro-labor decision, although I personally view it as a relatively unimportant case. There, a legal issue was presented involving a detailed analysis and interpretation of the precise language of section 8(a)(3) of the statute as well as a study of the legislative history thereof. We were asked to determine whether a so-called agency shop fell within the limits of permissible union security provisions. It is just as ridiculous categorically to dismiss the General Motors ruling as a political payoff to the United Auto Workers as it would be to equate the original Board decision with a payoff to General Motors.

I welcome criticism of this, or any other decision, but do wish it would be directed to the merits of the case, to the substantive issues involved, and to the Board's rationale. These are the common grounds upon which some useful understanding can be attained.

Political affiliation of the individual Board members remains an irrelevant factor. Granted, reasonable men may differ as to their interpretation of a statute, but this difference should not merely rest upon whether a Board member gallantly rode into office on the back of a donkey or on an elephant. While I am currently one of three Democrats on the Board, statistics clearly show that the voting pattern constantly varies from case to case and cuts across party lines. Indeed, it may be noted that two Eisenhower and two Kennedy appointees constituted the majority in the General Motors case. But President Kennedy has not appointed messengers for any one vested interest to serve as members of this Board.

Before turning to some analysis of the changes, a word about my concept of the role of the NLRB is appropriate. We are an administrative agency entrusted with translating a general public policy formulated by Congress into varied and changing factual situations. While we, of course, are limited by the statute under which we operate, extensive discretion is granted to permit accommodations to the changing patterns. The labor problems of 1962 resemble those of 1935 only in a semantical sense. The shadows of the future portend an increasing tempo of change—not only from the continuing technological revolution or automation, but from the impact of the developing new countries and other phases of our international relations. In an address to the International Trade Fair, Under Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz recently observed, "The public interest includes, perhaps most significantly today, the achievements of the Nation's full capacity for economic growth. We have paid more attention in the past to stability than to growth, reflecting a characteristically larger concern about fears than opportunities. Yet stability without growth is as inadequate a goal as growth without stability. And growth today is not just an opportunity, it is a necessity."

The NLRB is charged with the promotion of a public policy which is, in essence, the encouragement of collective bargaining as the democratic method of solving labor problems. This does not mean that we are despots making up our own rules to promote ends to our liking. Nor, despite frequent appropriate use of the analogy, are we umpires applying fixed rules to two or more contestants in a game. As the Supreme Court said in the

General Electric reserved gate case on May 29, 1961, after noting that a statutory provision in question could not be literally construed: "The nature of the problem, as revealed by unfolding variant situations, inevitably involves an evolutionary process for its rational response, not a quick, definitive formula as a comprehensive answer. And so, it is not surprising that the Board has more or less felt its way, during the 14 years in which it has had to apply 8(b)(4)(A), and has modified and reformed its standards on the basis of accumulating experience. One of the purposes which lead to the creation of such boards is to have decisions based upon evidential facts under the particular statute made by experienced officials with an adequate appreciation of the complexities of the subject which is entrusted to their administration."

Such a statement could have been made about many of the act's provisions.

Thus it is impossible merely to enforce the statute as written. In many areas the words are unclear and in others guidance comes only in most general terms. The Board has always been compelled to develop a substantive body of industrial law from such terms. Consistency comes not from following the same rule inexorably but by adhering always to the fundamental purposes of the statute.

In this regard, despite an interesting discussion I heard last summer at St. Louis at the meetings of the labor law section of the ABA, it is highly significant that labor relations laws were left in the hands of the NLRB and not the judiciary. No less an authority on the administrative process than James Landis traced this result to a combination of two major factors. Courts could not devote sufficient time to enable them to develop the necessary expertise in and to keep abreast of a field which, notwithstanding all its complexities, intrigues, and dynamic qualities, provided only a small proportion of a Court's total case load. And secondly, since practical judgments rather than bare legal principles are the keynote to lawmaking in an industrial complex, commonsense dictated delegating authority to an administrative agency whose processes involve policy review, reevaluation, and revision in light of the cumulative experience acquired.

The unique fact that day-to-day relationships among employers, employees, and unions persist even after the litigation and that the Board's resolution of a given dispute will do much to shape these future relations should not be disregarded. Board decisions should therefore be directed at providing pragmatic solutions.

In the past many Board members, when requested to assess this agency's role, have indicated that we are not a policymaking body—modestly declaring that we do nothing more than interpret and execute the will of Congress as expressed in terms of the Federal labor statutes. A former Chairman of the NLRB, in discussing policy changes made by the Board in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, is quoted as saying:

"This has provoked some criticism and given rise to charges that the Board is legislating * * * something we have no right to do. * * * But if it be true that we have legislated, we have done nothing more than repeal an improper legislation act of the prior Board."

I, however, cannot endorse what I consider to be an unrealistic appraisal of the Board's function.

While I agree wholeheartedly that we must interpret and execute the words and will of Congress, the simple yet frustrating truth is that all too often neither the words nor the intent are sufficiently clear to provide satisfactory answers to the issues presented. An entire series of vital 8(b)(7)(C) recognition picketing problems presently be-

fore the Board illustrates our dilemma. Somehow we must give effect both to that section's general prohibitions and to the protection afforded publicity picketing, the extent of which Congress neglected to clarify. We wish to hold expedited elections when warranted and also to prevent unfair labor practices from affecting elections.

Even where the statutory language is free from ambiguity, the Board is sometimes required to weigh the relative merits of and then determine which of two conflicting policies to apply.

Perhaps the Board's true role can be most dramatically demonstrated by reference to the voluminous pages of Board decisions involving aspects of labor law for which the Congress furnished only the barest guidelines. Thumbing through the maze of complex and technical rules concerning bargaining units, for example, one cannot avoid being overwhelmed at the realization that all these rules involving single versus multi-employer units, the placement of technical employees, plant and office clerical employees, managerial employees, confidential, seasonal, casual, and part-time employees, and employees performing dual functions—have been whittled out of one declaration in section 9 that the Board determine the unit appropriate for collective bargaining.

Likewise, with regard to complaint cases, while fashioning remedies for unfair labor practices, the Board's discretion in ordering affirmative relief is limited only by the legislative requirement that it must "effectuate the policies of the act" and by the Supreme Court's requirement that it be remedial, not punitive. Within these broad boundaries the Board has devised a substantial body of law governing such matters as remedying illegal hiring hall arrangements, "runaway shops," the unlawful subcontracting of work, whether an offer of reinstatement will toll backpay liability and determining whether an unfair labor practice striker should be reinstated despite his having engaged in violent activities on the picket line.

Undoubtedly the Board will be called upon to continue exercising ingenuity with respect to other remedy problems. It is anticipated, for example, that the Board will review the General Counsel's recently announced intention to request the addition of interest to backpay awarded to discriminatorily discharged employees.

Thus in my view the Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal. Given an awareness of this fundamental truth and in the absence of any ill-conceived attempt to disavow authority, we will be one step closer to responsible decisionmaking. Under this system changes are inevitable. Changes should come when a prior good policy becomes outmoded or upon recognition that a prior rule was not sound to begin with or has not worked out as expected, or when experience indicates better approaches. While denying politics an improper place in the decisionmaking process, I do not deny that a member's viewpoint may be influenced by his background or philosophy, nor do I suggest that Board membership would be identical under different administrations. For this I am personally grateful.

Clyde W. Summers, presently professor of law at Yale University, posed this interesting question several years ago:

"This agency reaction to changes in the political climate is not necessarily bad. Ought not Government, in the making of policies, reflect majority will? Should not administrative agencies, within the area of discretion granted them, chose the policy which most accurately expresses the desires of the majority? To do so is to make democracy more responsive, an especially significant contribution when Government tends to become remote. It is true that our principal instrument for expressing majority will is Congress speaking through legislation.

However, there is serious doubt whether Congress is capable of expressing small shifts or gradual changes. Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act make long jumps, tending to go beyond the existing balance point of public opinion. The Board, by bending to the wind can enable the same statutory words to serve a range of shifts, thus avoiding the necessity of frequent changes. When the amendments come, it can soften the shock and ease the adjustment, thereby preserving a measure of continuity and stability.

"Just as an agency can be valuable because it may be responsive, it can be dangerous because it is not responsible. Members, once appointed and vested with power may become self-certain in their own judgments as to what is wise policy and become insensitive to majority will. They stand outside the mainstream of political pressures and may fail to sense accurately changes in public opinion. If they make policy case by case they may obscure the developing pattern and thus avoid the crystallizing of opinion. By asserting their independence and denying that they are legislating, they may deflect justified criticism. This irresponsibility need not be intentional, but may be mere misjudgment or failure to understand the place of such an agency within a democratic structure. In any case, there is an ever present threat that irresponsible agencies may impede or frustrate the processes of self-government.

"What we seek, then, is a working compromise which will permit a degree of responsiveness but which will prevent an excess of irresponsibility. This is essentially the problem of obtaining flexibility without losing control. For this we need guideposts which will help mark the boundaries of discretion and procedures which are appropriate for the making of policy choices."

This perhaps is why as many changes in Board policies could be seen from 1935 to 1952 under Democratic administrations as since.

But this is not to say that our policy-making authority is unlimited. To see how judicial review effectively operates as a check upon the Board's authority, we have only to turn our attention to April 17, 1961, when the Supreme Court set aside the Board's Mountain Pacific and Brown-Olds doctrines. Under these Supreme Court interpretations, hiring hall arrangements were no longer illegal per se. Evidence of discrimination rather than an automatic presumption was necessary to find an unfair labor practice. Furthermore, even assuming the existence of an unlawful closed shop arrangement, employee-union members were no longer automatically entitled to reimbursement of union dues and initiation fees. Evidence that union membership was influenced in violation of the act was now an indispensable element. In a word, the bubble had finally burst and with it these so-called per se rules floated to their timely demise.

I attach particular significance to the Supreme Court's aforementioned tacit indictments of these per se rules, perhaps as much because they coincided with my appointment to the NLRB as because they echo my emphatic belief that independent analysis on a case-by-case basis must be substituted for mechanical rules.

Other Federal courts have likewise had occasion to criticize the creation and application of rigid rules.

The fourth circuit in *N.L.R.B. v. Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.* stressed the need for modifying the per se approach to unit problems and then went on to say that section 9(b) (2) "frees the Board from the domination of its past decisions and directs it to reexamine each case on its merits and leaves it free to select that unit which it deems best suited to accomplish the statutory purpose."

Fixed rules are easy to apply and provide the parties with knowledge upon which to predicate their actions. These are desirable results and must, of course, be accorded some weight. Certainty necessarily follows from the implementation of mechanistic rules, but it is a superficial certainty destined for disrepute. In the words once more of Willard Wirtz, "The price of a precise rule today is anomaly in the results of its application."

Judge Leedom, a colleague of mine for whom I have a great deal of respect, recently in objecting to some current changes in decisional policy, explicated three major justifications for stare decisis, humility, predictability, and continuing stability.

Judge Jerome Frank, among many others, had a different view—that the doctrine of stare decisis seems to mean that certainty outweighs justice. Frank also suggested, however, that a rule should not be changed retroactively if a person who has relied upon it would be harmed substantially.

We followed this equitable consideration in the Ideal Electric case, when the Woolworth rule on the time period for objections to an election was changed, although made applicable only for future cases.

But Judge Frank agrees with Holmes, who labeled as "one of the misfortunes of the law" that "ideas become encysted in phrases and thereafter for a long time cease to provoke further analysis." "The constant effort," Frank adds, "to achieve a stable equilibrium, resembling sleep, is immature. The welcome of new doubts, the keen interest in probing into the usual, the zest of adventure in investigating the conventional—these are life-cherishing attitudes."

One does not lightly or capriciously alter rules that seem to be effective or widely accepted, but too many legal scholars have concluded that even stare decisis yields more uncertainty than certainty.

And as Justice Jackson has so aptly commented, "If the law were static and changeless, it could offer little more than an exercise of memory. The real romance of the law is the combination of continuity and change, the reconciliation of stability with progress."

The normal demands of any transitory age, moreover, cry out for an attitude of flexibility. My initial actions as a Board member have been directed at the attainment of this goal. A great lesson is to be learned from the Supreme Court's April 17 opinions, the breadth of which exceeds the specific substantive issues presented therein. I am pleased to report tonight that this fact has not gone unheeded. Indeed, when viewed as a whole, in my opinion, the Board's most recent decisions depict a definite movement away from the rubberstamp approval of per se rules. This trend has manifested itself in an impressive variety of representation and unfair labor practice cases. Among the most significant contributions to modification of the per se approach in representation cases is the Sheffield Corp. case. There the Board indicated its disapproval of the former practice of automatically excluding all technical employees from production and maintenance units whenever the parties disagreed as to their unit placement. A Board panel, comprised incidentally of Chairman McCulloch and Members Rodgers and Brown, explicitly discarded the automatic placement formula, substituting in its stead the case-by-case analysis based upon such factors as the desires of the parties, bargaining history, similarity of skills, job functions and working conditions, common supervision and/or interchange of employees, type of industry, organization of the plant, and whether any union seeks to represent the technical employees separately. A similar approach has been indicated with respect to driver salesmen, and may be followed in other types of units.

The case-by-case approach also was adopted in the recent American Cyanamid decision. After reconsidering the question of whether a separate unit of maintenance department employees was appropriate in situations where another union sought an overall industrial unit of the production and maintenance employees, the Board demonstrated once again its determination to avoid per se rules by specifically concluding that the mere absence of a bargaining history in a production and maintenance unit would not, ipso facto, establish the appropriateness of a maintenance unit.

Many fixed rules with respect to allegedly objectionable preemption conduct have fared no better. Their disappearance marks another step forward in the Board's assault on per se thinking. Thus, for example, employer statements that union victories may result in plant shutdowns and/or transfer of operations to other geographical locations are no longer automatically equated to predictions nor are they automatically considered protected campaign oratory. Resort to the prediction label, while obviously offering us certainty of result, begs the real issue. For, as the present Board well recognizes, the question upon which each case should turn is whether when viewed in proper context, the employer's words, even if couched in terms of a prediction, or statement of legal position, render employee free choice impossible.

The complaint case field is receiving similar treatment. At one time in the not-too-distant past, union picketing to protest either an employer's substandard wages or an employee's discharge was automatically regarded as a demand for recognition.

Today, however, as illustrated in the Calumet contractors and Fanelli Ford sales cases, the Board subscribes to a more realistic and less mechanistic approach. Before passing judgment on the object of any picketing activities, we analyze the union's conduct in the context of the particular facts of each case.

Likewise, in passing upon the many difficult problems which lie in the so-called gray area between lawful primary and unlawful secondary activity, the Board has reversed two other rigid rules formerly applied. Thus, in *Plauche Electric*, we reversed the Washington Coca Cola rule and refused to prohibit automatically "all picketing at the site where the employees of the primary employer spend practically their entire working day simply because they may report for a few minutes at the beginning and end of each day to the regular place of business of the primary employer." In *Minneapolis House Furnishing* we discarded the former rule that union activity at a secondary employer's premises necessarily invited employees to make common cause with the picketing union and to refrain from working behind the picket line. Facts may differentiate appeals to consumers from appeals to employees.

Much of this commentary is applicable to the Board's review of contract clauses for possible unfair labor practice implications. Thus, in *Minnesota Milk* the Board refused to find that section 8(e)'s ban on hot cargo clauses automatically barred all agreements prohibiting the subcontracting of work. Our exploration of this new statutory frontier continues in a similar manner.

Summing up this trend in general terms, I would say that the present Board has freed itself from the self-inflicted dedication to per se rules which had effectively, though perhaps unwittingly tied the hands of the predecessor Board. It is hoped that this resurrected freedom to act on the merits of individual cases will enhance responsible decisionmaking and better enable the Board to serve the public interest which the act was intended to promote.

This is my opinion even though recognizing that some per se rules have existed since the early days of the statute, and others may be justified.

The difference, however, is not only one of degree. The significance is primarily one of approach.

Mr. Justice Holmes stated long ago, "But inasmuch as the real justification of a rule of law, if there be one, is that it helps to bring about a social end which we desire, it is no less necessary that those who make and develop the law should have those ends articulately in their mind."

The broad statutory objectives of the Federal labor acts have an essential role in the Board's decisionmaking process. The philosophy underlying the original statute was simple yet profound. Succinctly expressed in the words of its creator, Senator Wagner, "Industrial peace rests upon freedom, not restraint; upon equality, not subservience; upon cooperation, not domination."

Significantly, this formula has survived the passage of both the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts. And today the very same general principles remain the declared policy of the Federal Government for eliminating industrial strife.

To be sure, further declarations of legislative policy may be found with respect to individual sections of the act, but they are directed at problem areas more restricted in scope. The basic purpose of the statute indicates that the Government is not neutral as to the desirability of free collective bargaining. With few exceptions, it should be neutral as to the results in any given economic contest. The Government helps provide the channels, but under our system it is properly left to the parties themselves to achieve the solution to their problems. It is short sighted and destructive to label the collective bargaining process as class conflict.

Today, moreover, our problems have taken on a new dimension. For we now find our system subjected to its most rigorous challenge. With both the United States and Russia aware that each possesses unprecedented capacity for mass destruction, the cold facts of life point away from a military and toward an economic struggle. Thus, one burning issue of the day is whether production goals are attainable under our system of industrial democracy. The stakes are high as numerous uncommitted nations throughout the world sit this very day in judgment on the relative performances of the two competing systems.

I came to Washington with some recognition of the enormity of the task at hand. My experience in the San Francisco regional office indicated clearly that Board decisions have a great practical impact on employer, employee, and union relationships. I also came mindful that the Board's activities cut across issues of economic, technological, political, psychological, and sociological import. And if that were not a sufficiently awesome thought, I was mindful further that our degree of success would be a matter of consequence far beyond the continental limits of these United States. As the Solicitor General of the United States said at that meeting in St. Louis:

"The future of collective bargaining—indeed of what we call civilization—depends more than anything else upon renewing a quality which in recent years has sometimes seemed almost to disappear—tolerance, faith in the powers of reason, recognition of the fallibility but belief in the essential rationality and perfectibility of man."

I would like to close on a heartening note by quoting from a New York Times' editorial of January 7:

"PROGRESS TOWARD LABOR PEACE

"Anxiety over strikes and strike threats in key industries tends to make us forget the extent to which peace prevails in the negotiation of most of the country's 150,000

collective bargaining agreements. A report just issued by the Labor Department shows that the number of strikes last year dropped to the lowest level since World War II and that the time lost matched the low record set in 1957.

"The 16,500,000 man-days of strike idleness in 1961 sounds like a mountainous total; yet it represented only 1 lost hour in every 700 when measured against all the available work time. This is far below the losses through coffee breaks, industrial accidents, absenteeism or the inability of unemployed workers to find jobs they are able and eager to fill."

I would hope that during my next 4 years with the NLRB we will witness even greater progress toward industrial peace and harmonious labor-management relations, and that the analysts will find that the coffee break and not the strike poses the greatest challenge to maximum productivity.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I should like to quote some other parts from this speech to indicate that a contrary interpretation might be gathered than that offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]:

In view of the volume of cases which we have decided, it really is a distortion to concentrate on a few areas where changes in policy have occurred. Moreover, I find it strange that so many people should be amazed that changes in Board membership should result in some changed interpretations of a changed and complex law.

Another quote:

We are an administrative agency entrusted with translating a general public policy formulated by Congress into varied and changing factual situations.

Another quote:

This does not mean that we are despots making up our own rules to promote ends to our liking.

These are just typical examples of the language of this speech. I might give one further quotation:

While I agree wholeheartedly that we must interpret and execute the words and will of Congress, the simple yet frustrating truth is that all too often neither the words nor the intent are sufficiently clear to provide satisfactory answers to the issues presented.

This goes to the heart of the matter. I should like to address myself to this issue for a few minutes. The facts are that Board personnel have spent countless time in pouring over the debate on Landrum-Griffin to elicit congressional intent. In case after case the debate is absolutely silent on the issue before the Board. It is not the Board which is derelict, it is not Congress. It is the contrary, ordinary traffic in human events.

My colleague tells us that in the Wagner Act and in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin amendments, and I read:

The law spells out in definite terms the conduct which constitutes these unfair labor practices. These unfair labor practices are clearly defined. They are carefully enumerated in the law. This point—

Continues my colleague—

is most important. It underscores the fact that the Labor Board has no policymaking authority in these cases.

What are the facts? Is the language of the unfair labor practice sections of the act so definite, so clearly defined, so

carefully enumerated, that it can be administered by button-pushing clerks? If so, why are the members of the Labor Board required to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate?

Let us turn briefly to the act.

The unfair labor practices portion of the act begins with a section 8(a)(1), making it unfair for an employer to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their right under section 7 to self-organization and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. The language was written into the act over 25 years ago, but despite literally hundreds of court decisions construing its intent and purpose—often by closely divided vote—reasonable men still differ as to when a given practice runs afoul of the law.

Obviously, there is no litmus-paper test; obviously, the members of the Labor Board must apply a reasoned judgment when asked to decide whether an employer has violated this provision of the law. Before this section comes into play, there is a jurisdictional hurdle: the neutral employer must be engaged in commerce or in an industry affecting commerce. I note briefly that the question of when interstate commerce begins and intrastate commerce ends is a question which has engaged the attention of Congress and the courts since the days of Chief Justice Marshall. Moreover, we provided in the act that the Board in its discretion may decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute where in the opinion of the Board, the effect of such labor dispute on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction. Can the Labor Board surmount the threshold question of commerce without exercising an informed discretion? Obviously not, as we commanded them to exercise discretion, and thereby I might add, to make policy.

On many occasions I have spent weeks investigating the interstate commerce aspects of a case. Is the shipment in interstate direct, or indirect, how much, by whom? There is no need to belabor the issue or make more of it than any other human endeavor. I merely point it out to indicate that what we here on the floor of the House can dispose of so readily with a few cavalier words has generally been the subject of long and searching scrutiny from bottom to top.

Surmounting the jurisdictional problem of commerce in the secondary boycott subsection, we enter into a maze of statutory language. It is an unfair labor practice for a union first, to induce or encourage an employed individual; or second, to threaten, coerce, or restrain any person—except, presumably, an employed individual—where an object thereof—we here have subjective problems of intent and motivation—is forcing or requiring—presumably this is something different from inducing or encouraging and from threatening, coercing, or restraining—any person from dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer. We then added several qualifications: First,

that nothing was intended to make unlawful any primary strike; second, that nothing was intended to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer during a strike situation; and third, that nothing in the listed prohibitions should be construed to prohibit publicity, other than picketing—when do handbillers become picketers—for the purpose of truthfully advising the public, including consumers and members of a labor organization, that a product or products—presumably, the same kind of product or products mentioned before the qualifications begin—are produced by an employer with whom the labor organization has a primary dispute. Then we added an exception to the publicity proviso: that it will not be operative if it has an effect of inducing—degree unspecified—any individual—but presumably not a person—employed by any person other than the primary employer to refuse to pick up, deliver, or transport any goods, and so forth, at the establishment of the employer engaged in such distribution.

Compare the above secondary-boycott provision with the relatively uncomplicated statutory prohibition against refusal to bargain collectively with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of labor. This latter provision on its face, to paraphrase my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] spells out in definite terms the conduct which constitutes these unfair labor practices; but we all know that the interpretation of this mandate has been a matter of serious dispute for a period exceeding 25 years; and today, in individual cases, remains unsettled. How then, can we expect the Labor Board to apply the secondary-boycott provisions without exercising discretion and discernment in the hundreds of individual cases which come to them for review.

When you add to these awesome problems those related to the actual physical events at the scene of action, the decision problems compound. Who was driving the truck? Did he really say that at the loading platform, and how far, by the way, was this loading platform from the main gate, and which employer's employee was manning the gate? And exactly what was in the truck? Was there anything else in it besides? The simple, unadorned facts in secondary-boycott cases are like a Chinese puzzle. And this is before the lawyers have even entered the scene. There are just people. And then there are field examiners. It is only at this point, must later, that we are ready for boards and Congressmen.

The members of the Labor Board are not ciphers. They were not appointed to punch IBM machines. The dynamic nature of our unfolding industrial development requires that the members of the Labor Board exercise an informed judgment in rounding out the contours of our act. The fact is each case before the Board is unique—its facts, physical surroundings. There is no way for congressional intent, however well intentioned or complete, to deal with every situation.

There is nothing unique about vesting this kind of policy-making power in the members of the Labor Board. Since the earliest days of our Republic the customs officials and tax collectors have had to make policy decisions in the application of our laws. Try as we might, and detail as we will, we have to date been unable to write a tax bill without ambiguity. When we began the regulation of rates and fares, our statutory standard was one of reason; a standard applied by the Supreme Court to the antitrust laws administered by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. Today, the Federal Communications Commission awards broadcast permits worth millions of dollars under a statutory directive couched in terms of the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

We acknowledge that those who head our administrative agencies make policy when we appoint them for short terms, at stated intervals, and with the advice and consent of the Senate. An ostrich-like denial of this self-evident fact serves only to balk intelligent discussion at the threshold. This is in no way to deny the constitutional authority of Congress to formulate and establish policy; it is but to acknowledge that the success of our Government rests on the coordinated cooperation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, each with its checks, each with its balances.

I have known Board Member Brown for many years and consider him a warm, personal friend. I have worked with Mr. Brown and know him to be an honest, conscientious, and able public servant. I have shared with him the frustrating experience of attempting to apply the will of Congress in situations both unforeseen and unforeseeable when the labor law provisions were spelled out in Congress. I believe the speech in which he outlines some of these frustrations is therapeutic to those of us who lack firsthand experience in the day-to-day field application of the laws we write.

When I worked at the Board, little did I realize that I would be on the floor of the House of Representatives in defense of his good name.

I remember well one of the last cases that I investigated before leaving it. The case was what we call a simple 8(a)(3). A sawmill worker had been discharged by his employer at an isolated little mill quite distant from any town, with the worst roads imaginable. The employer said this man, this sawyer had been discharged because he was not a good sawyer. He showed me the warped lumber in the yard. The sawyer said he had been discharged because he belonged to the International Woodworkers, and was seeking to organize the mill. In 10 days of investigation, and during two different trips I sought to probe the facts and weigh the two accounts. I believed there was a case. At least a complaint should issue. I will not forget my discussion of the facts of the case with my regional director, Gerald A. Brown. We talked about the saw, the cant of the mill, the habits of the sawyer. Mr. Brown refused to issue a complaint. There was insufficient evi-

dence. I know I am safe in returning the same verdict here on the criticism of the Board—insufficient evidence.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks, and that the synopsis referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE POLICY AND ITS EFFECT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES AND WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, today's news dispatches report that the European Common Market has decided to take reprisals against the United States because of the President's recent action restoring the duty on U.S. imports of carpets and glass. An article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

COMMON MARKET AGREES ON REPRISALS AGAINST UNITED STATES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—The six ministers of the European Economic Community, or Common Market, agreed on reprisals against the United States because of a Washington decision to double tariffs on carpets and sheet glass.

A spokesman for the council of ministers said the six ministers had agreed to raise duties on certain American industrial products. The decision followed a Belgian complaint that the United States violated rules of the general agreement on tariffs and trade by doubling tariffs for Belgian carpets and sheet glass without prior consultations. Higher duties on carpets and sheet glass are due to go into effect June 17.

Common Market member nations are Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany.

The Common Market reprisals affect U.S. polyethylene textiles, polyester textiles and other manmade textiles. For these products the six nations agreed to double the tariffs, roughly to 40 percent from 20 percent.

Another category of products—varnishes and water colors—has been raised to 19 percent after a reduction to 16 percent, the spokesman said.

American exports of these types of products to the Common Market nations total \$27 million annually. The difference in duty will total \$5 million.

Since advance notice of 30 days is needed for reprisal measures under rules of the General Agreement, they will take effect

July 17, according to a spokesman for the ministerial council.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this action because I think it illustrates an important difference in approach by European countries, in comparison with what has become the policy of the United States in foreign trade matters affecting home industries.

To put this matter in some perspective we have to go back a few years. When the Congress extended the Trade Agreements Act in 1951, it directed the President to make no reductions in duty in trade agreements which would cause or threaten serious injury to American industries and workers. It also directed that this policy be set forth in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. At that time the Congress provided definite procedures, so that this policy could be carried out. These consisted of the peril-point investigation of the Tariff Commission, which was made a mandatory requirement before the President entered into any new trade agreements. And it included the escape clause procedure.

The purpose of the peril-point procedure was to advise the President in a factual manner of those proposed trade agreement concessions which would violate the policy referred to above. The Tariff Commission's findings were supposed to enable the President to avoid making reductions in duty which would cause trouble for our domestic industries and workers.

The point of the escape-clause procedure was to provide a means for the correction of mistakes in the making of tariff reductions by the United States.

The peril-point and escape-clause procedures were carried forward by subsequent extensions of the Trade Agreements Act, and the Congress tried to emphasize that policy and to improve those procedures by amendments in the 1955 and 1958 Extension Acts.

Nevertheless, mistakes have been made both in the reduction of duties which have harmed domestic industries and workers; and in the failure of the executive branch to restore duty cuts when the Tariff Commission found that increased imports caused serious injury.

It must be said, to the credit of the Kennedy administration, that he has acted favorably on a higher proportion of Tariff Commission findings of injury than his predecessor. While Members may not all agree with the exact steps which the President is following, it is evident that he is endeavoring to adjust a bad import situation on cotton textiles and that he is giving or has promised to give attention to the import problems of other sections of the textile industry. It is known that administration officials have been holding discussions with other industries with similar problems.

In these matters the President has proceeded with great deliberation, but to his credit he has proceeded. A program of action has been developed, and he has overcome the rather considerable opposition of the State Department to taking any action that would benefit domestic industries affected by imports.

In the carpet and glass cases, the President has received not one, but two

thorough, factual reports from the Tariff Commission finding that serious injury from imports exists, and recommending an adjustment of duties. After causing the Tariff Commission to restudy these cases, the President on March 19 proclaimed an adjustment in the duty to correct the mistake which had been made in unwisely reducing the duty on these products in the past in violation of the policy expressed by the Congress in the 1951 Extension Act to wit, that no reductions should be made that would cause serious injury.

It needs to be said that out of consideration for the commercial interests involved, the President subsequently deferred the effective date of the carpet and glass tariff adjustments to June 17.

During the period which has intervened this administration has been in consultation with Belgium and the Common Market countries to discuss the matter of these tariff adjustments, as it is obligated to do under the provisions of GATT.

The United States has offered compensatory reductions in duties on other products to Belgium and the Common Market countries, but they have curtly refused to consider any course of action by the United States except a rescission by the President of the steps which he has taken in the carpet and glass cases in obedience to U.S. domestic law.

Today's news that the Common Market has put in motion retaliatory measures increasing duties on U.S. products in order to protect the pace of economic activity claimed to exist in the Belgian carpet and glass factories, shows that the European countries have no hesitation in handling their trade relations in a manner which is protective of their home industries. They feel no hesitancy to take such action and to justify it on the ground that in their judgment it is necessary to protect jobs in the industries affected.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Common Market countries, including Belgium, have little or no unemployment in manufacturing industries. The countries of the Common Market are, in fact, experiencing a rather serious labor shortage. Workers who may be affected by a cut in carpet and glass production in Belgium and the other Common Market countries can obviously be quickly absorbed in other industrial occupations in the booming economy of the Common Market.

The lesson for us is plain. Under the domination of the State Department the United States has been unwilling to take actions designed to protect the jobs of workers in industries adversely affected by excessive import competition. Until President Kennedy's action in behalf of carpets and glass, we had seen virtually no affirmative action by the United States to protect its own industries and workers, at least in recent years. The testimony developed before the Committee on Ways and Means in its hearings on the trade bill dwelt very often on the nontariff import restrictions maintained by Common Market countries against U.S. exports.

Yesterday the Governors of Georgia, Delaware, Maryland, and Mississippi met

with the President to bring personally to his attention the problems which will be caused the poultry industries of those States and of the United States when the Common Market raises its duty on frozen poultry next month as part of the restrictive measures on agricultural imports which are being imposed under the Treaty of Rome. If the Common Market retaliates against the United States for the tariff adjustments on carpets and glass, will the United States retaliate against the Common Market for the tariff increases which the Common Market is imposing on imports of poultry products from the United States?

The actions of the Common Market in refusing to discuss compensatory concessions, in refusing to abide by the spirit of the escape clause in GATT which gives the United States a right to withdraw concessions causing serious injury, bode no good for the United States if the authority contained in the new trade bill is enacted into law.

H.R. 11970, the so-called clean bill ordered reported by the Ways and Means Committee yesterday, would give the President the power to eliminate duties entirely on industrial and agricultural products in negotiations with the Common Market. If an adjustment in duties on products like carpets and glass is greeted by such determined opposition from the Common Market what hope is there under the new trade bill that the adjustments in duty provided for can ever be exercised without precipitating an international crisis?

The Common Market has made it plain that they are unwilling to deal with the United States on any basis other than the elimination of our duties—they will not countenance any adjustment in actions taken, however insignificant those particular adjustments are in the light of the total liberalization of import duties granted to the Common Market.

Mr. Speaker, in the past decade the United States, in trade agreement negotiations, has reduced duties on literally thousands of categories—not once, but over and over. The Common Market has received the full benefit of these reductions in duty under our most-favored-nation principle. In only a few instances has the United States sought to adjust reductions in duty unwisely made. If the United States is to be faced with the consummate ingratitude represented by the Common Market's intransigence as exemplified in the carpet and glass cases, it is a clear warning that no negotiations for reductions or eliminations of duty should be entered into with the Common Market under the authority of any new trade bill.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of this body to the behavior of the Common Market in the carpet and glass cases and the threat which American industry and American workers will face if we approve H.R. 11970.

Since the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 was enacted, our imports from Common Market countries have increased from \$970.5 million to \$2,263 million, an increase of 133 percent. During that same period our exports to the Common Market increased only 64 percent.

There is no question but that the Common Market is benefiting more from a more rapid expansion of trade with the United States than the United States is with the Common Market.

If the total extent of the trade benefits conferred on the Common Market will not be considered by them in evaluating individual tariff adjustments made necessary by our domestic law, we, the Congress, the lawmakers, should be most careful in the consideration we give to granting further benefits or authorizing the same for the Common Market. Indeed, should we not insist that the President invoke the authority contained in our own legislation to act unilaterally against the trade of the Common Market until such time as discrimination and restrictions imposed against U.S. exports are removed?

MR. STRACKBEIN WRITES THE PRESIDENT ON THE TRADE BILL

Mr. Speaker, the trade bill, H.R. 9900, will soon come before the House for consideration. It poses a difficult problem for many of us because of the complicated questions involved.

The principal purpose of the bill is to increase trade by a drastic reduction of what remains of our tariff. This action is supposed to boost our exports, and increased exports in turn are supposed to increase employment in this country.

I wish it were as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the problem of unemployment, and therefore of expanding job opportunities in this country, is one of the most important of our problems in the economic field.

I have here a copy of a letter written to the President on the subject of trade and employment. The author is Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the National-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Mr. Strackbein's analysis has a special bearing on the objectives of H.R. 9900 and what it seeks to accomplish. I believe it to be worthy of the attention of every Member of this body particularly since we will soon be faced with tariff legislation.

As a part of my remarks I desire to read Mr. Strackbein's letter to the President:

THE NATION-WIDE COMMITTEE
ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1962.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In full awareness of your strong support of the trade bill, H.R. 9900, I feel compelled to set before you considerations that must weigh heavily against the desirability of enacting the bill in its present form.

Among other questionable aspects of the bill I shall limit myself to the probable effect of the bill's passage on employment and growth in this country. It is my view that the problem of national employment would be aggravated materially by the further tariff reductions that would be authorized.

Should it have this effect I feel sure that you would be the first to question the wisdom of the bill's enactment. Undoubtedly you are convinced that adoption of the bill would have the opposite effect, i.e., that it would lead to growth and greater employment.

For these reasons it is most desirable to analyze the most probable consequences of the bill in this direction.

The bill itself recognizes the job-displacing effect of further tariff reduction. Otherwise there would be no rational basis for the inclusion of adjustment assistance provisions.

The principal burden of my counsel of caution consists not of the distress that would be caused by the expected direct worker displacement resulting from increased imports but rather is concerned with the volume of jobs that would remain unborn because of import competition. I believe that this negative effect would be much greater than that of direct displacement of workers already employed. This counsel of prudence is therefore not answered by saying that passage of H.R. 9900 would throw only 90,000 workers out of their jobs.

While this reasoning may seem abstract I believe that it can be buttressed by analyses that will be recognized not only as concrete but compelling.

The need for extensive job-creating economic activity in this country is widely recognized. As President you have given it a high rank in your economic program. The problem has both negative and positive features, as I hope to show.

If job creation has been lagging behind the twin effects of population growth and job displacement caused by improved technology, we should examine the reasons for the lag. Much thought is, of course, being given to this. Admittedly there may be a number of reasons. Many of them are frequently mentioned, such as taxation, depreciation allowances, etc. These are among the negative factors, i.e., factors of retardation.

Yet, one of the most pregnant of them all is passed over almost unanimously, in a manner reminiscent of the "Purloined Letter." This factor is that of import competition. I do not believe that this is a simple oversight, but rather the result of a negative mental attitude. It may be a case of mental processes being strangled by hardened doctrinal ligatures.

Unquestionably the source of all jobs is production. This is the basic soil. The mere fact that production workers, including farm and mine operatives, represent only about 30 percent of total employment, does not detract from the fundamental character of physical production as the original generator of jobs. If 20-odd million workers in industry, agriculture, mining, lumbering, fishing, and so forth, produce some 40-odd million other jobs, that is, a ratio of about 2 to 1, the loss of production jobs under certain circumstances will as quickly unravel the trade, service, and professional jobs dependent on them as they were effective in creating them.

Over the long run, it is true, the ratio of nonproduction workers will grow as the productive processes improve. This is one of the fruits of technology. However, in ameliorating the lot of those who toil by substituting machines for muscles and human motion, we also reduce the number of production workers employed and there is always the possibility that the new jobs that will sooner or later arise, will come to life not where the workers have been displaced by machines but elsewhere; and not at the moment of displacement but some time later—sometimes, indeed, faraway and much later.

Therefore at best technological advancement will be accompanied by economic disruption and considerable unemployment. This is well understood and is recognized as a problem of itself. Unquestionably a considerable part of present unemployment is attributable to just this source. Thirty-one industries, including many of the heavy ones, such as iron and steel, automobile pro-

duction, etc., dispensed with 1,100,000 workers between 1950 and 1960. Agriculture and mining suffered an even sharper employment decline.

Our industry, agriculture and mining can therefore not fairly be accused of inefficiency. It seems clear enough that if yet greater efficiency had been achieved, the unemployment figures would have been higher even than they were.

Yet, we hear a constant refrain to the effect that what we need is higher efficiency. This is given as the answer to foreign competition. Yet foreign competition may be the cause of much of the employment shrinkage by producing conditions that prevent the fruits of the greater efficiency from being realized.

Mixed with this refrain runs a confusion that shuffles between efficiency, growth, and productivity without touching the question of employment. Productivity is equated with growth. Efficiency is not defined and no bill of particulars is presented. Nor is growth properly defined.

Yet it seems clear enough that increased productivity, which is very often but not necessarily accompanied by efficiency, may or may not spell growth. Growth, purely in terms of output, on the other hand, may indeed go hand in hand with rising unemployment. This is not a phenomenon that is uncommon. In fact, it is quite common, as our agriculture has amply demonstrated. In 10 years of time (1950-60) we created stubborn surpluses while farm employment shrank 28 percent, or by 2.8 million workers. We enjoyed a great leap in productivity and experienced growth, but employment shrank.

What type of growth then do we seek? Growth that thrives on displacement of workers? That would not help us.

Evidently then we should not necessarily consider an increasing volume of production as healthy growth unless it should lead to more rather than less employment. Otherwise we will find ourselves applauding a fattening frankenstein while our unemployment rolls also swell.

The question is: What prevents the fruits of higher productivity from being realized in terms of greater employment?

We have been growing all right, considering our size; but the effects promised by the economists who say that lower costs will lead to increasing employment have hardly appeared at a breakneck speed. What then prevents the fulfillment of the theory?

Several difficulties may stand in the way. One of these resides in the very nature of demand itself. It may be quite inelastic or, on the other hand, quite expandable. Another difficulty may lie, as just indicated, in obstructions or interferences with the natural play of the economic forces. Let us probe a little.

In the first place, lower costs usually attributable to a gain in productivity do not necessarily expand consumption beyond that provided by population growth. This is to say, the demand for the product may be limited per capita by its possible uses or function; or the demand may already be saturated. A considerable part of our production of goods would answer to this description. We should know more definitely about this than we do. The products for which the demand is inelastic and the amount of employment attributable to them should be more closely examined.

Under conditions of inelastic or saturated demand, increased output per man-hour will simply cause a net loss in employment in comparison with population increase. Many agricultural products fall into this category. In a number of cases, indeed, we have experienced an actual decline in per capita consumption over the years, as in the case of wheat flour, potatoes, etc., thus aggravating the employment lag. This decline was not

the result of either rising costs or static productivity. Again, we should know more than we do about these cases.

In the second place, a reduction in the man-hours required to produce a unit of output, while reducing the cost of productions, may not result in lower prices to the consumers, actual or relative. Other factors may and often do stand in the way, such as a sellers' market or inflation. Consumption per capita will therefore not increase unless it is artificially stimulated. In the absence of that, the result of productivity increase then will again be a net reduction in employment in relation to population expansion.

Third, consumer preferences may undergo a change. A phenomenon such as hatlessness may strike the consuming public and greater efficiency in hat production, even if passed on in the form of actual or relatively lower prices to the consumer, will do little or nothing to stem the recession. Shrinkage of employment will once more supervene.

In the fourth place, gains in productivity might not in any case lead to lower costs or lower prices because of inflationary forces caused by high war costs and later defense outlays, high taxes, etc.

In the fifth place, a dark or threatening cloud over the market as a whole, inducing fear and caution, may discourage the expansion that normally would take place. Such a cloud could come from one of several sources. One source of prolific generative power in this respect is import competition.

It is my purpose to examine this factor in some detail.

IMPORT COMPETITION AS A DRAG ON EMPLOYMENT

The effect of import competition varies greatly, depending upon the nature of the demand for the product, as can readily be appreciated; and only competitive imports concern us here. These represent over two-thirds of the total.

1. If the market is already saturated as is most likely in the case of staple products, of which there are many, rising imports of such a product will progressively nibble or bite away at the share left to domestic producers. This fact will in turn produce at least two effects.

(a) It will induce growing fear among the domestic producers and lead them away from any contemplated plant expansion they may have had as a means of keeping up with population growth. Instead they will look to their present facilities to fill the demand in face of the rising imports.

(b) They will thus strive to become more efficient in order to hold their own. This means reducing costs; and reducing costs, to have much meaning, will mean reduction of the work force, principally through installation of more productive machinery, if this is available. Since wages cannot be reduced, a smaller payroll can be achieved only by reducing the number of workers on it. The result will then be to add to unemployment rather than to help absorb the new work force coming on the scene each year. This deficiency will shift the burden to the rest of the economy. If unemployment is not to grow the remaining segments of the economy must bear more than their proportionate share of new employment and absorption of those already unemployed.

2. If the demand for the product is inelastic, i.e., if it will not respond to lower prices by opening wider the consumer pocketbook or vice versa when prices are lowered, the same difficulty will be encountered. Rising imports will simply mean a subtraction from the sales of domestic producers and therefore will reduce employment. Expansion will be discouraged and labor-saving arrangements as a means of meeting competition will be made instead.

3. If the demand for the product is inelastic but if the product is a new one or one

the potential demand for which has been only partially met, so that an unfilled market still remains before the saturation point is reached, rising imports, while discouraging the average manufacturers or promoter, might act as a spur to the energetic one and act as a challenge. He might indeed exert himself all the more. The outcome would then depend, in turn, on the strength and vigor of the import forces and on the margin of their advantage.

This advantage would lie predominantly in the cost field, and would usually come to rest on lower wages. Relative productivity of the domestic and foreign producers would become crucial. So long as the domestic producer enjoyed a margin of productive advantage over his competitor sufficient to offset the higher wages paid in this country, he could hope to hold his own and even to gain a part of the growth of the market resulting from increase in population. Many of our industries have been saved financially by the population-growth factor in their contest with imports; but in being thus saved did not contribute to employment absorption in step with the population growth.

Should, however, the foreign producer suddenly lift his productivity by installing modern machinery and adopting more efficient methods of production, his competitive margin would be widened unless his wages took a similar leap. Whether the latter would occur would depend on the strength of organized labor in the particular country. If this were of a relatively low order, the wider competitive margin would take effect. Foreign labor is not usually as effective as is our organized labor in gaining wage increases.

The only recourse of the domestic producer would then again be to reduce his own costs, or to accept a lower rate of profit. In either event the effect would be deflationary rather than expansive and would not provide employment.

4. Should the demand for the product be reasonably elastic so that reduced prices, made possible by reduced cost of production, would result in greater consumer purchasing, the outlook would be different.

If the product were already well established in the market there would still remain hopes of improving the production and technological processes, looking to lower costs. While inventions and discoveries cannot be scheduled, vigorous pursuit of new ideas does often lead to gratifying results.

Assuming nonmonopoly conditions in the domestic market, any lower costs resulting from new developments would be passed to the consumers, at least in part, and sales volume would go up. A thriving business might develop, offering not only more jobs in the production field but in advertising, selling, distribution and servicing. If all should go well, under the tutelage of sound, imaginative and vigorous management, the industry in question would do more than maintain pace with the population growth in terms of employment. It would outpace population expansion and help absorb the existing body of unemployed.

From 1950 to 1960 we had five such industries and they contributed jobs over and beyond population expansion by 699,000.

It goes without saying that we need more industries of this type; but saying this does not provide them; nor does it overcome the fact that the net gain of 699,000 workers was insufficient to overcome the lags elsewhere.

Today even such industries are faced with a situation that was either not present before or not in a form as pressing as today. This consists of the great technological development overseas, especially since 1955. The productivity leap abroad was much greater than here because of the lower base from which it started. Specifically, it gave greater competitive effect to the lower wages prevailing there.

This fact has shown itself in the mix of our imports. The proportion of finished manufactures of the total imports doubled from 1950 to 1960.

It meant simply that we no longer had a technological monopoly and that our manufacturers or producers have become faced with a condition that brings the possibilities of competition right down to the relative standing of the factors of production. In the U.S. compensation to employees in 1960 was 65 percent of the total national income which includes rent, proprietors' income, and corporate profits before taxes.

It follows then that wages and salaries represent some two-thirds of the cost of production. A distinct competitive advantage in wages therefore represents an advantage in the heaviest of the factors of production costs.

To overcome this foreign advantage the American producer must outstrip the productivity gains made abroad.

Can he do this? Is his technological skill so much more acute or his inventiveness so much keener than that of his foreign competitors that he can outrun them, as he must if he will remain competitive?

He has certain advantages but these are being dissolved. He has a mass market, for example; but other countries are moving in that direction.

However, he also faces a stumbling block.

Assuming, as we have in this example, that the demand for the product is elastic, it will respond to lower prices on imported goods as well as on domestic goods. In fact, price will be a strong factor in selling. Price, indeed, is the key to mass consumption.

In this field then price will be the principal arbiter. Quality for quality, price will win. In many cases indeed low prices hand in hand with low quality taps a market that is not otherwise reachable. Some imports cater to that segment of the market because the low foreign wages make it possible. Sometimes this preempts such a market for imports by discouraging the kind of technological development in this country that would open the market to domestic producers.

If imports have a price advantage in products that have an elastic demand, the effect on domestic producers will again be at least twofold. Since this is the field in which real growth is possible, i.e., in terms of per capita consumption where demand will respond to lower prices to the point of increasing production so that employment will outpace population growth, it represents one of those upon which we must rely to lead us away from the degree of stagnation that now besets us. If we lose this field we will be hard put indeed in our quest for job-producing industrial growth.

One effect of the foreign competitive margin over us that has already shown itself unmistakably is the emigration of our capital. This tendency and trend is so clear and the reason for it is so self-evident that it needs only to be mentioned to be understood. It is necessary only to distinguish between the type of foreign investment that, on the one hand, is generated by a healthy base at home, i.e., one that has been cultivated, soundly supplied and saturated, so that new outlets can only be found overseas; and on the other, the type that is driven overseas because the home pasture suffers from unfavorable competitive or other conditions. In the one case the home pasture is simply fully stocked; all is well, but there is no more room. To find more pastures, overseas acreage, so to speak, must be sought. In the other case the home pasture is no longer attractive in view of alternatives, but it might be made attractive and as green as any overseas. It still has potentials but the condition to exploit them must be provided. Were this done there would be no

need and no pressure to go abroad, the home market not yet being saturated.

That this home market could be made attractive rests, let me repeat, on the assumption of an elastic demand such as exists for many products.

The other effect of a competitive import advantage will be a battle in which the domestic producer will fight lower import prices with lower domestic prices or abandon the field. Efforts to meet the lower import prices will have a better possibility of success than in the cases previously noted in which demand for the product is inelastic or saturated. The principal factor of success will lie with greater inventiveness, operational efficiency, vigorous selling and advertising. If inventiveness fails or is matched by the foreign producers, nothing will, of course, be gained in that sector; and let us not forget that foreign inventiveness is no longer backward.

PRESSURE ON WAGES

The contest will, inevitably, under any circumstances, press heavily on wage advances here as compared with those abroad. The competitive exigencies will counsel a standstill or near standstill here as a condition of self-preservation. Such a standstill, however, has neither been achieved nor is its achievement either likely or desirable.

If wage increases are indeed held within the confines of rising productivity the competitive standing might be improved; but this would not follow as a matter of course because foreign productivity might rise as much as here. It might continue to rise faster abroad because much of it is in the nature of a catch-up operation; and the other countries now have the means of closing the productivity gap. Then, unless foreign wages rose more rapidly than the gain in productivity there, the foreign competitive margin would actually widen.

Should the domestic producer abandon the field out of desperation or out of unwillingness to contest under conditions of insuperable handicap, involving a risk of heavy losses if he persists, he might turn in one or two of other possible directions. He might begin to import either a whole line of the competitive product or, if the domestic product is an assembled one, he might import some or all of the parts, as many companies are now doing; or he might invest overseas; or seek new products to manufacture.

These courses, with one exception, would all represent regressive action so far as employment in this country is concerned. The one exception would lie in turning to a new product; and here there would be no guarantee; but at least it would offer possibilities.

NEED FOR NEW PRODUCT AND NEW INDUSTRIES

The product might be new only to the particular manufacturer. It would indeed be difficult to find a wholly new product. If the product were one that is already on the market and well tested, good headway might be made, but much of this might be at the expense of existing manufacturers. The net gain might then be very small if any, in terms of increased employment.

To find a wholly new product would entail considerable search, and market tests must be first made to determine consumer acceptance. This would mean a considerable delay in manufacturing. If consumer acceptance were found to be satisfactory or even promising of great volume, production arrangements must be made, including the equipment of a plant with special machinery. Some of this machinery would first have to be designed and then manufactured.

In the ordinary operation of our economy new products are, of course, constantly developed and tested for consumer acceptance but, while this is under the pressure of healthy domestic competition, it does not represent an act of desperation, under the hammer of an unrelenting competition that

hits economically below the belt. Under this latter circumstance the elements of fair competition, so jealously guarded by law in this country, are largely absent and the competitive atmosphere produces distraction and despair rather than confidence and boldness.

THE NUMBING STING CONCEALED IN COMPETITIVE IMPORTS

There is therefore an important difference between meeting certain types of foreign competition on the one hand and domestic competition on the other.

It is this difference that goes far to rob this country of the kind of growth that it must have in order to achieve and maintain employment at desirable levels. It is this overgenerously sharing of the domestic market with competitive imports that helps prevent the fruits of higher productivity from being realized.

In order to pull out of our employment lag, so far as this task devolves upon our industry (since we need not look to agriculture because of its great efficiency in dispensing with workers), we must have not only some new products to manufacture; we need whole new industries.

What is the outlook?

In the past, as even today, we granted patents to inventors with the idea of giving them both time and a monopoly to launch a new product. This recognized the time factor as described above. Today patent owners often license foreign producers; or new inventions abroad soon challenge our lead and the bright outlook of the past is gone.

It is a fact, I believe, that foreign trade has not been responsible for the birth of any of our major job-generating industries, such as the automobile, the motion picture, the phonograph, the refrigerator, the airplane, the TV, etc.

Today import competition, because it has come into the same technological dimension with us while foreign wages still lie at the lower levels, is in a position, on the other hand, to dampen down our job-creating excursions into new products and new industries.

It hits us in the very solar plexus of our former industrial predominance: the development of products that had a potentially elastic demand and then mass producing them so that the resulting low price would tap the potentially large demand and turn it into a reality.

Mr. President, on the positive side we still need industries of that kind in order to create new employment; and on the negative side we need a rear-guard defense to prevent the staple industries and the saturated industries from disgorging more workers under desperation from import competition than can be absorbed by the others.

CONCLUSION

The present trade bill would not meet these needs. It casts its lot with exports and with retraining of workers displaced by imports and "adjustment assistance" after the damage has been done. This represents a retreat from the dynamic America that will still do wonders industrially if it is given its head under appropriate but non-deadening regulations.

The bill would do nothing to remove the impediment that prevents our system from gaining the full advantages that should flow from improved productivity. It would, in fact, entrench and enlarge it.

With all due respects to exports, we cannot hope to remove the heavy roadblock that impedes our economy by injecting a little more life into an activity that represents only about 3.8 percent of our total national product.

We need import regulation only to the extent necessary to lift the cloud of discouragement that hangs over our industrial expansion and prevents adequate job-cre-

ating growth. With more intimate knowledge of demand for consumer goods, i.e., the end product of the economy, the regulation could be shaped with a minimum of restriction.

Sincerely yours,

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SANITATION WORKERS ARE ENTITLED TO SANITARY WORKING CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1962, the Washington Afro-American reported that the business agent of Local 1, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, testified before the House Subcommittee on District of Columbia appropriations as follows:

Facilities used by the sanitation workers, of whom the majority are colored, are often poorly ventilated, shabby, unpainted, unsanitary, and furnished with old broken-down lockers and benches and odd chairs rescued from the trash heap.

According to the story, he particularly stressed "the terrible" conditions at the Southeast incinerators and in a whitewashing station behind Bell Vocational High School where there was no electricity, no running water, no ventilation, and an old potbellied stove for heat in the wintertime. I decided that I would go see for myself if this was an accurate description of conditions in the District government.

I regret to inform the House that the story was only too accurate. On Tuesday, May 29, I went with Mr. Warren Morse, the business agent of local 1, to three installations: the locker room for laborers at the garbage transfer station at New Jersey Avenue and I Street SE., a locker room at the water operations division, and the whitewashing tool shed behind Bell Vocational High School. Conditions in all three are absolutely shocking. Here in the Nation's capital I found working conditions which would not be tolerated in private industry, conditions which the District's Health Department would undoubtedly condemn if they existed in private employment. I also saw at the garbage plant an example of segregation, a locked toilet room to which only whites have keys, right next to a locker room used by 29 Negro employees who have to walk to the other end of the building to use the bathroom facilities there.

The most shocking conditions I inspected were at the whitewashing tool shed. Picture a corrugated shack about 15 feet square with a dirt floor riddled with rat holes. Inside there were oil lamps and a bucket for sanitary facilities.

In fair weather the men gather outside to eat lunch. But when it rains, or in very cold weather, about 20 men must crowd into this shack, a building hardly fit to house a mule. I am told that in the winter there is a potbellied stove for heat. It is not enough to say that these conditions would not be tolerated for

employees of private industry. I doubt that the District inflicts anything comparable on white employees. It is hard to escape the impression that such a facility reflects racial discrimination.

The impression of racial discrimination is heightened by reports of rigid barriers of job discrimination in the Department of Sanitary Engineering and elsewhere in the Government of the District of Columbia. This matter of job discrimination deserves close investigation by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have an opportunity to bring about an immediate improvement in the working conditions of laborers in the District of Columbia. The facilities I have described must be brought up to 20th-century standards. Immediate improvements in working conditions can be made in at least three ways: First, a cleanup, spruceup campaign in locker rooms and the elimination of all locked toilet facilities; second, the installation of water coolers in the summertime on all trucks of the Department of Sanitary Engineering; and third, the provision of raincoats and boots for use in bad weather.

Mr. Speaker, in a metropolitan area, such as the District of Columbia, sanitation work is essential to the health and well-being of the population. The men who do this work are entitled to enjoy decent and sanitary working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this report of my visit to these facilities will help bring about improved conditions and rectify a very intolerable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FANTASY AND FACT IN PAYING FOR HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, June 1962, my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has produced an article entitled "What Price Medical Care for the Aged."

I have great affection for my distinguished friend from Missouri, who is one of the very hard-working and capable Members of this body, and I want to express my great personal affection for him at this time and the high regard I have for him.

However, Mr. Speaker, this article is a mishmash of fact and fiction and produces an effect directed at the defeat of an important piece of social legislation. It is one which I regard as being altogether out of keeping with the character of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is the reputed author.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, let me say I am the author and I will be very interested in having the gentleman document his general conclusions. I think this is factual, and I believe I can substantiate everything I said in the article,

and I will be very happy to discuss any of the details.

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to have the gentleman here. I am rather disappointed to find he is the author of this particular article.

The article starts out:

Before we suddenly wake up to a financial nightmare of miscalculated new costs and skyrocketed taxes, we must understand the weaknesses of the proposed plan.

The title helps to lend to the whole story an aura of unrelated sense, since the King-Anderson bill has no more to do with the price of adequate medical care than it has to do with peacocks on the moon. The price of medical care is not determined by a system of financing. I would point out to my good friend that the King-Anderson bill, of which I am a cosponsor, is a method of financing medical care for the aged and has nothing to do with medical care; it only provides the method of providing adequate measures and a level of financing for that segment of the population which has the highest incidence of medical need and the lowest incidence of finances to meet it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to establish our procedure here. Would the gentleman prefer that I wait until he finishes before I request him to yield? For instance, he made a point here. How would the gentleman prefer to proceed?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield to my friend as we go along, provided it does not unduly becloud the issue.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point the gentleman makes now is the method of financing has nothing to do with cost. I think it does, although I think the point the gentleman is making is fair that it is not the basic reason for the increase in health cost but depending on how the matter is financed. You can produce overusage. That has been one of the problems involved, I may say, in our present health insurance which exists at this time. For instance, you can be paid for the same illness on three or four different policies and actually make money. There is some evidence that this in itself is creating an overusage, and also, I might say, results in increased premiums on health insurance.

The point I want to make is I do believe the method of financing does have some bearing on the actual costs involved.

Mr. DINGELL. Insofar as the gentleman has pointed out, obviously that is so. But I will point out also there is no language in the King-Anderson bill or in any bill sponsored by the present speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, which would in any way authorize or encourage this particular kind of activity. If that is the gentleman's objection to the King-Anderson bill, I would recommend that he sponsor an amendment at this time so we can eliminate that objection and go forward with a very important piece of social legislation to help a segment of our population that is in need.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe there is anything in the King-Anderson bill that does contribute more to this than any other form of health insurance. It does have one good feature, something I have recommended.

No; I would not make this as a major charge against the King-Anderson bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

The real question here is, How can the aged pay for the price of medical care?

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I think one of the serious weaknesses in the King-Anderson bill is the absence of this coinsurance clause after the first 9 days. It is possible for a social security beneficiary to collect his retirement income, which is intended to pay his cost, his room and board while he is in the hospital, and enjoy benefits under the King-Anderson bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I have to respectfully disagree with my good friend and colleague. I am aware that he has endorsed the social security principal for payment of the cost of hospitalization of the aged, and I reluctantly endorse part of the deductibility features, because I feel this particular portion of the bill creates a rather heavy burden on the aged. I have gone along with it reluctantly, and this has been put in in an attempt to eliminate the objections of the AMA. I would point out that King-Anderson eliminates practically all of the objections that the AMA has had during the last session of the Congress.

Mr. KEITH. Nevertheless there is a fundamental weakness in that the beneficiary can collect a parallel primary benefit under social security or retirement while he is collecting for the same purposes, while he is in the hospital for an extended period that may last for 180 days?

Mr. DINGELL. I appreciate my friend's interest, and I think it is a point that deserves debate. The simple fact of the matter is, at a time when an individual finds himself beset by a serious hospitalizing or debilitating illness, I think the small amount of leverage that this might yield to him in terms of economic advantage is so small as to be of little worth in considering the overall impact of hospitalization, when you consider the accompanying loss of opportunity to find jobs, to take care of his home, his or her household or house, children or grandchildren, loss of income and increased expense, deprivation of enjoyment that the aged should have when they are out of the hospital, which they are denied when they are obviously hospitalized and confined to bed.

Now, I would point out that in the gentleman's question is this, that the beneficiaries of this program are going to convert by reason of the existence of the King-Anderson bill when it becomes law, as it is going to do, whole program of hospital insurance, to be offered into a program to create rest homes or vacation spots. A hospital does not serve or offer these functions. I will say to the

gentleman for this reason this is not a real objection.

There certainly will be a small number of slackers and rascals, as there are in many other groups in society, including members of the clergy, but the simple fact of the matter is it will be no higher than the number of thieves and rogues and rascals in other population groups. And, I point out that if there are any rascals, rogues, and thieves who will profit in this matter, they will utilize this leverage with the sanction and the imprimatur of the medical practitioners and who will superintend this group.

Mr. KEITH. I think one of the most legitimate complaints that the medical profession has made concerning the King-Anderson bill is this malingering under the provisions of the legislation as it now stands.

Mr. DINGELL. I have had some experience with hospitals, and I am sure the gentleman has, and I know that I cannot get out of a hospital fast enough. It takes considerable effort to get me into a hospital.

The real question before us is: How can the aged pay the price of medical care? I will take this question up later but let us return to the gentleman from Missouri's [Mr. CURTIS] tale, to his heroes, villains, and scary passages. In so doing I will also review the facts of the case, for my good friend's superb writing ability so successfully intertwined fiction and fact that some readers may not have been successful in separating them.

In only a brief space, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has succeeded in including just about everything that any one has been able to think of to oppose the King-Anderson bill. For dramatic effect he has left unstated the fact that some of the allegations are unfounded and that some of the arguments are in direct contradiction to each other. Where he finds it necessary to make inconsistent statements he has very wisely separated them by as much prose as possible so as not to disturb the reader by their presence. In discussing the benefits that would be provided under the administration bill he refers to the bill as a "bountiful river of generosity," which would cost 2½ times as much as the administration's actuaries have estimated. Much later in the article, presumably so that the reader will not be confused, my colleague uses the administration's estimate in calculating that the bill would cover only 25 percent of the health costs of the aged. This facile use of two such different estimates without reconciling them is truly ingenious.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] also asked his readers to ponder that if the health insurance measure is enacted, a worker with three dependents and an annual income of \$4,000 will pay a social security tax of \$380 after 1968, an amount higher than his Federal income tax of \$245. My pondering showed that only one-half of this \$380 social security tax that my colleague mentioned would be paid by the worker himself. The other \$190 would be paid by his employer, and the employer contribution

has great value. My thinking also led me to ask myself how much of the \$190 would be the result of the increase on social security taxes to pay for health insurance protection under the King-Anderson bill. The answer is a mere \$10.

As one of my colleague's readers, I would like to ask him a question. If he is saying \$10 a year for the proposed health insurance protection is too much for workers to pay, perhaps he can suggest an easier way for workers to finance equivalent protection than to spread the payments over their working lifetime with their employers meeting one-half the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I point out that that is the way we are looking ahead in the private sector. Yes; I do point that out in this article because if the gentleman would observe, there is a limitation of space, and I was able to get in only as many arguments as I did set forth which I thought were most important. But prepaid health insurance is a coming thing. It does make sense for people while they are earning money during their earning years to prepay for their retired years, not just in pensions which, after all, are a form of insurance, but also in the field of health insurance. Indeed, that is coming about. That is coming about in labor-management contracts which formerly, up until just a few years ago, when a worker retired he was removed from the group health insurance which covered him as an employee. That is a form of prepayment.

Here, I would say to the gentleman, is why this can be done—I am talking about prepayment. It can be done in a better fashion, in fact, the only economical fashion I know, in the private sector as opposed to the Government sector. Prepaid insurance requires creating a fund. For that fund to be most useful it should be invested. The investment in the private sector, of course, can be in our going economy, in real estate, stocks, bonds, and so forth. The Government investment funds are in what I call sterile investments such as Government bonds.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman own any Government bonds?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, no, I do not happen to own any.

Mr. DINGELL. I was wondering.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But it is a sterile investment in the sense I am relating it to investments in such things as real estate, stocks and bonds, which constitutes the growing economy.

Mr. DINGELL. I was wondering if this was not a rather unpatriotic observation by my good friend.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; the gentleman is stretching for language to attack something that is a sound economic principle. Anyone who has an investment portfolio, when it is referred to institutions, tries to balance it off. Certainly, the basic place to put it, if one is interested in a return, which one should be, is in a mix, or have a certain

portion in Government bonds for actual liquidity purposes. But as far as growth and income is concerned he will have it in equity investments, which means real estate, stocks, and he will have some bonds.

This will give a much better return. I am talking about it purely from the economic standpoint. The private sector is the proper place to handle prepayment programs whether it is insurance, pensions, or whatever it might be.

Mr. DINGELL. I appreciate my good friend's comments.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to hear all the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], but I gather that his criticism or his comparison, in which he finds this private prepayment plan to be preferable because of the nature of the investment that would be made by the holder of the fund in private industry as opposed to the holder of the fund in the public field, would be equally applicable to the social security system as a whole, would it not?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly would.

Mr. DINGELL. As a matter of fact it would be. And it is also true that it is an objection which the gentleman could raise to the program of railroad retirement, which is even older than the social security system.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. DINGELL. The employees and persons covered by which have always favored it as being a safe and secure form of investment, not subject to periodic fluctuations.

I am glad that my friend raised this question, because it is an interesting point that even the so-called private insurance funds to which he alludes have had over the years significant amounts of their total capital structure invested in Government bonds, as have the banks, as have the various trust companies, the savings and loan companies and the credit unions. Almost every form of thrift institution has invested large amounts of money in Government obligations, and I must confess that it comes to me as a rather novel premise to call a form of investment which these institutions have so long utilized and have regarded as such a sound and sterling form of investment, as sterile and even extremely unwise, and so characterize it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman need simply refer back to my definition of sterility in this regard. The point that I am trying to make is this, that the balance of a portfolio of various institutions such as the gentleman has mentioned, will reveal that the investment in Government funds is a small percentage of that portfolio. The bulk of the portfolio, of course, is in, as I say, growth investments—real estate

in various forms, equities such as stocks, with some in bonds. The main purpose Government securities serve is, as I say, liquidity, because they are readily converted into cash.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue with my statement.

My good friend took up the Kerr-Mills program means test. He states it is more successful than some unnamed politicians who want total Federal control of medical care say it is. I do not know any of these politician villains. Certainly my good friend cannot be referring to any who support the President's program for health insurance to the aged, which was carefully drawn up to avoid Federal control. Indeed, it includes specific language which my good friend and I have debated before on this floor, denying Federal Government participation or control within the framework of this program. And I will state to my friend that neither the President nor any member of his party wants any such controls over the practice of medicine or the doctor-patient relationship.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I should be glad to yield to the gentleman, although my time is running short and I am trying to get on.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman has been very courteous in yielding. If the gentleman would like me to address my remarks on the control aspects that are in the King-Anderson bill I shall do so at this time. I can do so, I think, very briefly.

Mr. DINGELL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The control factors are that they require the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into contracts with the purveyors of these health services.

Mr. DINGELL. Which are hospitals, I remind the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was going to say, they are hospital, private nursing homes; in regard to their fees, in regard to the services they may render, which include in some instances drugs. If a hospital board of trustees disagrees with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in regard to their fee schedule or a new service which perhaps it thinks it should render or a new drug, and there is a disagreement, there will be no new contract. Then the individual person who uses that hospital or the doctor who can practice in that particular hospital in that community—maybe it is the only one—then that single person cannot use that hospital.

Let us turn it around to one other step.

Mr. DINGELL. Does this constitute Government control, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; it certainly does. I am going to turn it around by pointing out what someone commented, "Well, what hospital could afford not to enter into a contract with HEW if we included as this would contemplate eventually all people over 65 being on a compulsory basis?" That means a compulsory tax against them included in this system. Then there is the answer,

"What hospital or nursing home could afford not to enter into the contract?" There you have the heavy hand of Federal bureaucracy trying to do a great job, good people, but they are the ones who determine what drugs are permissible, what services are permissible. In effect they are setting prices, and that will mean setting wages in the health field at the Federal level.

Mr. DINGELL. I had the pleasure of letting my good friend from Missouri fall into this pit once before, because the simple fact is that the King-Anderson bill provides that the measure which the Government shall pay is the fair cost.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But who determines that?

Mr. DINGELL. In addition to this, and I pointed this out to my old friend, this is still services furnished by the hospital. There is not one nickel for the private practitioner. There is payment, certainly, for doctors and staff members who are already in the hospital. They are having services controlled already in precisely the same way by the Blue Cross or other plans which work out agreements with hospitals.

Now let me point out to the gentleman, the American Hospital Association appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and testified in opposition to this bill. They were queried on each and every one of the items included in this particular bill with regard to the compensation and control of service available. They said they had no objection to any one of the criteria which are established. They went further and they even admitted that these are significantly the same criteria and standards as are imposed by Blue Cross or other private plans which offer the same measure and kind of benefits.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The difference is a very obvious one. There are hundreds of Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans throughout the country. There are hundreds of private insurance companies. This is a private enterprise system working. I am very pleased, of course, that these people who are the heads of the various health insurance programs are arguing with the doctors and the hospitals in regard to their fees. That is what tends to keep the price down. But it is an entirely different thing to have private organizations arguing and disputing with each other just as labor and management work out their problems with regard to salaries, wages, working conditions, and so forth. That is an entirely different thing from having the Federal bureaucracy making this decision for everybody in all sections of the country. I really am a little surprised that the gentleman does not see the basic difference between the two.

Mr. DINGELL. I point out to my old friend that the simple fact of the matter is that what the gentleman is concerned with has long been in existence, because we have had the same program for dependents of the military, we have had Blue Cross plans offered to civil service retirees, which is required by the Civil Service Commission, as I am sure the gentleman is aware. We have a Kerr-Mills program, which requires much

more strict control by what may well be less competent administrators on the State level. And, also, by the same people who are going to have to enter into contracts between the Federal Government and the private purveyors of services under King-Anderson and under the Kerr-Mills program which the gentleman endorsed, which the gentleman says is working. So if that is an objection, this objection has been here for years in the Veterans' Administration and here in almost every public and private program. If this constitutes the gentleman's objection, I say he should have raised his objection when the Kerr-Mills program came out of the Committee on Ways and Means with his support.

Now let me go on. My good friend states that the Kerr-Mills program has been successful. He states that 28 States have Kerr-Mills legislation. It took ingenuity to find statistics of success in this simple fact because 92 percent of the payments being made under the Kerr-Mills medical assistance aid programs are being made to just four States, the high income States of California, Massachusetts, New York, and my own State of Michigan. Indeed, a significant further fact is that in only six of our States is there a payment being made for the care of more than 1 percent of persons 65 years of age and over under Kerr-Mills. Indeed, it is significant that even in the State of Michigan only a shade over 2 percent of persons 65 years and over are recipients of the Kerr-Mills bill.

On no less than two occasions the Governor of the State of Michigan pointed out, he feels the Kerr-Mills program is a distinct failure in the State of Michigan because of inherent difficulties in assessment and because of the inability of the States to finance this particular program.

At this point in the tale, the reader is treated to a short story complete with a hero, a villain, and an innocent bystander. And it is a tribute to our storyteller's skill that he is able to use the actuarial basis for the King-Anderson bill as the plot. The three characters are: the man who drew up the proposal, the bad guy; the health-insurance industry spokesman, the good guy; and the Government actuary, who plays a supporting role but gets several good lines.

To begin with, the story suggests that the estimated cost of the King-Anderson bill originated with some unnamed party and that only after the bill was introduced was the Government actuary permitted to examine the financing. In real life, of course, this Government actuary was responsible for the cost estimates for the King-Anderson bill from the beginning to the present, just as he has been responsible for calculating the cost of every other social-security improvement for many years. My colleague must be given some liberties, however, to make his story better reading.

My good friend took up the Kerr-Mills program of means test medicine. He states that it is more successful than some unnamed politicians who want total Federal control over medical care say it is. I don't know any of these politician

villains. He can't be referring to those who support the President's proposal for health insurance for the aged, which was carefully drawn up to avoid Federal control. Neither the President nor his party wants such controls.

My skilled colleague also found a statistic which he suggests marks the Kerr-Mills program as being successful. He says 28 States have Kerr-Mills legislation. It took ingenuity to find such a statistic of success because almost 90 percent of the payments being made under Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged program are being made in just four States. These are the high-income States of California, Massachusetts, New York, and my own State of Michigan. It is nothing less than picturesque to count as successful a program providing practically no benefits except in a handful of States.

Now, I am happy to yield to my good friend.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, I will say in regard to the Kerr-Mills Act, Secretary Ribicoff denies that he is opposed to it. In fact, he says the need is great and that this is a necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with the gentleman. It is needed.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Well, the gentleman's argument is that it has not been successful in Michigan because of basic inherent weaknesses, but I did want to point that out. This business of the cost estimates, the basis of the debate should rest on the premises upon which the costs are made and it is these premises that involve this great discrepancy which I also point out in the article between the cost of the \$1 billion estimate. Then the private insurance companies testified.

Mr. DINGELL. I am going to get to that point, may I remind my friend, and I will be happy to discuss these points with the gentleman as I come to them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The only other point I want to make is this. The King-Anderson bill, of course, calls for a tax on a basis of only \$5,000 of wages.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, it is \$5,200.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I disagree; the gentleman has not read the act.

Mr. DINGELL. The proposal is that it shall be raised by amendment to \$5,200. I do not want to quibble on this particular point and I intend to treat with this point too, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Please, will my colleague not let me finish the point I am making because it is not a quibble. The point I am making is on these estimates of cost, the King-Anderson bill had it estimated on a \$5,000 base wage. That is the bill we studied and then when the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified in late July 1961, he said:

We have reestimated the cost and a \$5,000 base is insufficient and, therefore, our amendment—we will propose an amendment to make it \$5,200.

The point I am making is that the reason for the change is that the estimates

of the administration itself proved to be inaccurate at that early stage of the game, and even now the estimates are admitted to be less accurate; that is my point.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not agree with the gentleman. Since he raised the point in regard to the actuarial accuracy of the figures let me point out that the error which the gentleman points out in raising it from one-quarter of 1 percent on \$5,000 to one-quarter of 1 percent on \$5,200 is \$1 per year per covered employee in this country. This is the magnitude of the error and ultimately figured on the gentleman's figure of \$380 per year is one part in 380 or an actuarial error of one-quarter of 1 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. DINGELL. I say that the gentleman's interpretation of weakness here is really a recognition of strength on the part of the administration in that it would recognize this and make a correction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I think he has made a very grave error because assuming this cost, the part of the increase from \$4,800 to \$5,200 as the gentleman's amendment would include, requires the entire social security tax, not just this additional one-quarter of 1 percent, and therein lies a great deal of misconception on the part of the public as to what this will cost, because the entire ultimate 9 percent of the social security tax is against this \$400, so this \$36 per year because of the increase in the base wage is not accurate, because the entire social security tax applies to the entire base. Will the gentleman not agree to that?

Mr. DINGELL. No; I will not agree to that. As I calculate it it figures out to be \$1 per year per employee. Now I must ask the gentleman to let me proceed with my prepared statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The whole point I am making, and this is not just to quibble with the gentleman, is that the full tax applies against the entire base.

Mr. DINGELL. I must proceed, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will read this over and then correct his remarks in the light of it I will be happy.

Mr. DINGELL. I assure the gentleman I will come back to this point.

While it may be less interesting, just for the record let us see what really happened. The Government actuary was given his usual full leeway—properly accorded a responsible professional—to use all the available facts to make his estimates and to reestimate the cost estimates as new facts came to his disposal, even though any increase in the original cost figures was politically disadvantageous. Who could ask for a more responsible Government position? The net effect of the Government actuary's reevaluation of his original estimates for the bill was that to fully finance the program into the indefinite future—the early years were well covered—the social security tax base should be raised another \$200—to \$5,200—and that the

increase of one-half of 1 percent of the contribution rate was enough. Secretary Ribicoff of course agreed that the safest course was best, and immediately recommended that the financing provisions of the bill be changed as the actuary recommended. He seems just as conservative as the actuary.

I believe the administration should be congratulated for its honesty and courage in coming forth with its recommendation to change the cost estimates for the bill even though the change would be expected to be capitalized on by those who oppose the bill.

But let us return to my colleague's story, for it is at this point that his hero enters—the health insurance industry. The story goes on to say that the new cost figures were way too low and that the insurance industry had the very information that was needed to correct the administration's cost estimates—a study conducted by the New York State Insurance Department for the full year 1958 that is supposed to have been based on the claims experience of over 200 insurance organizations yet was completely overlooked by the administration and the Government actuary.

The truth is that the data used by the health insurance industry—from a report the New York Insurance Commission published in 1957—was not any good insofar as the aged are concerned. It included only a few fragments of insurance claims data on older people's use of hospitals from six companies. One company reported its experience with the aged during a 2-week period in 1950 and others of the so-called claims data were just as poor. But more important is the fact that even the use of these limited data do not produce figures that are much different from those of the administration.

While the Government actuary has never been asked to place a treatise on his calculations in the Reader's Digest, he did present his cost estimates before the 1961 meeting of the Society of Actuaries. He said of data from the old 1957 New York report on which the insurance industry based its estimates:

I can find no information in the New York report presenting this study as to the exposure at ages 65 and over, and only fragmentary information as to the exposure at all ages.

No rebuttal of this statement was presented by the actuaries in that expert audience.

Recognizing the inadequacy of their figures, New York conducted a study of health costs of the aged in 1960, which produced much more reliable data. The Government actuary has studied and used the 1957 report, the 1960 data, and all other sources of pertinent information that is available. I wonder whether the health insurance industry lobby has found out about the 1960 study?

The last episode in my colleague's little tale tells us that while the insurance industry has struggled to estimate the costs of the King-Anderson bill in as responsible a way as their biased opinion can allow, the Government actuary is still, according to Congressman CURTIS, making bewildered but sincere efforts.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] cites two horrible examples of what my colleague characterizes as self-delusion and blundering. According to the story, the Government actuary believes that hospital costs are going to stop rising. If we can return to the real world for a moment, I will point out that the cost estimates for the King-Anderson bill are based on the assumption that hospital costs will rise faster than other prices into the indefinite future. More precisely, it is estimated that hospital costs will increase faster than earnings for a number of years and then will taper off until the rate of increase for hospital costs is about the same as for earnings levels. Of course, since labor becomes increasingly more productive, earnings levels—and estimated hospital costs—rise faster than price levels. This explanation is technical, tricky, and hard to follow. It does not make good reading, and my colleague may think he can be forgiven his artifice for the sake of greater reader appeal.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] cites a second horrible example. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] alleges that the Government actuary largely ignores the fact that old people will use hospitals more after the bill is passed than they now do. Hospital use among social security beneficiaries will increase, of course, since older people who now avoid going to the hospital to get needed care could afford to do so if the King-Anderson bill is enacted.

I will say this is perhaps the most persuasive argument we have for the enactment of the King-Anderson proposal. It covers these people who desperately need hospital care.

I can assure those readers who have not read the reports of the actuary that this has not been overlooked in the official estimates; an increase in hospital use by older people has been assumed in calculating the cost of the King-Anderson bill.

While it is always nice to see one's name in the Reader's Digest, I should think the Government actuary would be a little unhappy about the assertions that were made about his competence. In addition to being Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, the gentleman involved has served on the board of governors of the Society of Actuaries since 1951 and is first vice president of the Population Association of America. He has served as an actuarial consultant for congressional committees and various parts of the executive branch. He has given actuarial assistance to the Governments of Greece, Japan, Israel, and Germany and has served on a number of international advisory groups. He has served in an advisory capacity for the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Population Association of America, the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, and other nongovernmental organizations.

In fact, he has also given considerable actuarial advice to many of the insurance companies which are complaining about his efforts with regard to the

King-Anderson bill, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There has been no criticism of Mr. Meyers. I pointed out to the gentleman it is the premises upon which the actuarial conclusions are based and the arithmetic used, and so forth. I know Mr. Meyers himself would be the first to say that these premises upon which he has been told to make these studies are controversial.

Mr. DINGELL. I recognize they are controversial, but I think the gentleman from Missouri will have to recognize in terms of experience that we have heard this same old record with regard to actuarial happenings; that is, from this same group that opposes the King-Anderson bill, and we go back to the first days of the Social Security law, back in the days of 1935, when I was a boy around here. We heard the same group stating it would bankrupt the country, it was actuarially unsound. The simple truth of the matter is he has been proven to be right and this group is wrong. The Social Security system is based on a solid rock of actuarial soundness.

I say to my old friend that I would rather take a man whose past record is as good as the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, who studied this thing very carefully, than I would to take the word of a group of partisan members, if you wish to use the term, who work within the private insurance industry, whose sole purpose is not to achieve social advance but whose primary purpose is to scuttle it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my old friend.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman misses the point. The point is not over Mr. Meyers' ability as an actuary at all. It comes back to the premise. All I can suggest to the gentleman is to refer again to him and others the speech I put in the RECORD several months ago entitled "Politics Can Destroy the Social Security System," in which I tried to point out this premise upon which the social security system is based, assuming this actuarial soundness is within the area of the premise. Likewise, in this problem for the health care for the aged, the problem involved is that of the premise.

Mr. DINGELL. I certainly admire my good friend, and I want none of my remarks to be construed as showing any lack of affection or regard for him. But, the simple fact of the matter is that my old friend from Missouri has a consistent record of opposition to this particular measure and has also throughout the years opposed a significant number of liberalizing amendments to the social security system.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be happy to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman certainly has not looked at the record accurately. There are certainly

measures that I have opposed because I felt they did affect the social security system, but if the gentleman will look at the record, he will find that many of the measures in social security today I not only helped put them there, but I spent considerable time in doing the research necessary, including, I might say, the present provision in regard to disability. I was the one who pointed out in the hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means that until we tied disability and rehabilitation in, which we failed to do in the House but, thank goodness, we did in the Senate—until we did that, we could not move forward soundly but that when we did do that, we could. And, I submit that the record is there on that subject, as well as the additional coverage under social security. And, I repeat, unless we start debating with clarity and objectively these premises upon which the soundness of the social security system is based, until we start debating them objectively, we are endangering the future stability of the social security system upon which all of us depend.

Mr. DINGELL. Now, I am delighted to hear my good friend say this, and I am also delighted to hear him say that he swallowed a small dose of socialized medicine, because, as the gentleman knows, the disability provision to which he alludes was opposed by the American Medical Association time after time as constituting socialized medicine, in the most perverted and devilish form, and having swallowed this much, I am sure the gentleman can go on and swallow a bit of sound liberalization of the social security system, which will protect and defend the private insurance system, by offering a device to fend off the medical costs for the aged, who have the highest incidence of medical need, and who have the lowest incidence of means to pay for that need, and the lowest incidence of means with which to pay for private health insurance.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be happy to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I hope I did not swallow anything, although I was opposed to the AMA position on this. My attention was directed really toward the rehabilitation feature in our society and my desire to move that forward and the fact that I saw that in this area there was a possibility to further develop rehabilitation, and I make no apologies for my efforts in behalf of putting them into the social security law.

Why, I am simply pointing it out. I do not agree with the gentleman, of course, and am not suggesting that I should go along and support a program which I feel is so fundamentally unsound as the King-Anderson bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out to my old friend that the time has come now, with the common recognition that exists with regard to the aged and also with regard to the high incidence of hospitalization, and the very limited means that the whole group of persons 65 years and over have with which to meet that need, that unless my good friend comes around to a program of

contributory health insurance of the kind provided for in the King-Anderson bill he is going to find he is going to have a great deal more and greater socialized medicine in the form of Kerr-Mills operation which is going to continuously be expanded until in this country we have a national program of hospitalization and medical care for every person over 65 paid for from the general revenues in the Treasury. I say to the gentleman from Missouri that that is coming as sure as the sun rises tomorrow and the moon rises tonight, unless we make some adequate provision for meeting this desperate need.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say to the gentleman that the Kerr-Mills Act has a very definite limitation because it follows the theory which caused us to switch from old age assistance to the basic program of OASDI, the social insurance, the theory being—and it has proven to be accurate—that as we developed a social security insurance covering more and more of our society the OAA—the old age assistance—rolls would decline and, indeed, that is coming about. So the gentleman's bugaboo as to what will happen to Kerr-Mills I regret to say is not well founded. It will phase out, I might say, just as OAA will phase out, as OASDI moves forward with Government coverage.

Mr. DINGELL. I wish my friend were right, but the simple fact of the matter is this was the expectation at the time the original social security law was enacted, and we still have the welfare provisions of the Old Age Social Security Act, and we still have a substantial number of persons receiving benefits under it. I would point out to my old friend that it takes a matter of striking less than one dozen words from Kerr-Mills—and I think that others interested in this subject ought to study this—to change the Kerr-Mills proposal into a complete federalized program of socialized medicine for everyone from the cradle to the grave.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. The gentleman made a remark to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a few moments ago which concerns me a little bit. I think the gentleman said that the sole purpose of the private insurance industry is to scuttle social progress in this country.

Mr. DINGELL. I made no such allegation. I said it scuttles that particular aspect of social progress. I will concede, since the gentleman raises the question, that over the years the private insurance industry has done its level best to sink social security, going back to the early days, with as many amendments as they possibly could. I shall be glad to make that statement for the benefit of my old friend.

Mr. KEITH. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman will find that the private insurance industry recognizes the need for a platform of

security on which the individual can build for himself.

Mr. DINGELL. This is true. But this is 30 years after their original opposition to the program, and a period of years after they have originally opposed other liberalization of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman is very knowledgeable in the insurance field, and I am sure has gained quite a good deal more knowledge in this field than I, but I would say this to my old friend: The insurance industry of this country and the AMA have a remarkable facility for justifying its opposition in years past, and by a weird process of intellectual endeavor convert their position into support of these programs at time of enactment. This is the same thing which we see in the operations of the AMA when they opposed the original Social Security Act, the disability provisions, and grants to the States for medical care programs. They opposed the Blue Cross and Blue Shield programs, and only relinquished their opposition to those programs when they were stricken under the bane of an injunction in an antitrust decision here in Washington, D.C., because of their opposition to the then Group Health of Washington, now known as Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

Mr. KEITH. If the gentleman will yield further, I am very glad the gentleman corrected the impression he gave me. I hope the gentleman will correct the record and make it read as he has reiterated his position. I am sure the gentleman would not want it to stand, because the attitude that I heard in the gentleman's presentation sort of frightens people. I think they have a great confidence in the private sector of our economy, and it is only when we in the Congress get hypercritical of that private sector that we find people leaning more heavily than they should on the public sector of our economy.

Mr. DINGELL. I assure my good friend that I buy private insurance to the limit of my means. I have great confidence in the private insurance companies, and I try to express my confidence in the private sector wherever possible. I intend to continue to do so, and I am going to try to give them King-Anderson so we can protect them still further.

My good friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] tells another story about a top researcher in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare whose speech was canceled out when it was learned that he was on the verge of telling the world that he had estimated the cost of the King-Anderson bill to be some frightening figure; so I want to discuss this. I had not heard this rumor before, but what I heard concerned a man who was a staff member of the Public Health Service, who is not an actuary, who is not in the Social Security Administration, and who based his study solely on newspaper reports. The memorandum was an attempt to review the cost estimates for King-Anderson in the light of the Colorado public assistance experience. This experience, I am sure my good friend from Missouri, and my

knowledgeable colleague from Massachusetts, will agree on an insurance basis, was based upon an older and upon a sicker population. Moreover, from an actuarial point of view the experience was not used even correctly. The writer of the memorandum was not even knowledgeable about the provisions of the King-Anderson bill. For example, he assumed incorrectly that the Colorado coverage of nursing home care, which is coverage that is purely custodial care, without limit or duration, had a counterpart in the King-Anderson bill.

I am sure that my good friend from Missouri, who is knowledgeable on this subject, will recognize that the King-Anderson proposal has no such provision for nursing home care.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very happy to identify this. This was a paper apparently prepared for the American Public Health Association meeting in Detroit in late 1961, and what occurred was this, that an abstract of this paper, apparently a press release, had been prepared and was on the table for people to pick up. I have a photostat of this: "How To Assess Services and Costs for the Proposed Program for the Aged."

This is from a gentleman who was research consultant, Division of Community Health Practice, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Let me read this document.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe that I have successfully slain this particular document as far as its having any value on this subject is concerned.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me read the document. Let us evaluate this together; because I do not know, either.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it would be a waste of time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us put it on the record, anyway. Here is the last paragraph:

An attempt is made to show the volume of utilization by the aged under similar provisions in this country and in Canada. On the basis of these exploratory inquiries the estimated costs obtained are about four times the costs given in official statements. When the dynamic factors are taken into consideration, it would appear that after a few years the disparity between probable costs and official estimates would become even wider than four to one.

So I certainly do not think it refers to the paper that the gentleman was talking about, and it does indicate that the estimates of HEW in this area are off more than 4 to 1, as a matter of fact.

Mr. DINGELL. I have discussed the paper with my old friend. I have pointed out that the author of this document is not an actuary. He based his own study on newspaper reports. So I think we may successfully dispense with this so far as its being a knowledgeable treatise on the subject.

In my colleague's article he refers to a series of proposals which he feels deserves serious consideration. One of

these, oddly enough, is a bill introduced by a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator JAVITS, which, like the administration proposal, would be financed through the social security system. Its cost was estimated by the same actuary who estimated the cost of the administration proposal.

I wonder why my good friend objects so strenuously to the financing of the administration's proposal but thinks that the Javits proposal, which has substantially the same financing procedure, merits some consideration, and when it was estimated by exactly the same actuary who did the actuarial studies for King-Anderson.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not in favor of the Javits bill, but here is one thing the Javits bill does do that makes it at least acceptable as far as not damaging the health-care system is concerned. It eliminates the compulsory aspect that is contained in the King-Anderson bill of having HEW enter into these contracts for all services to be rendered all people over 65. It permits people to select their own health insurance program on a voluntary basis if they desire. It has a voluntary aspect. So does the Lindsay bill. Apparently the one thing the administration is determined not to compromise on is the compulsory feature of King-Anderson.

Mr. DINGELL. Is that the gentleman's objection to King-Anderson?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman withdraw his objection to King-Anderson if that particular feature were eliminated?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I could consider it.

Mr. DINGELL. Then the gentleman raises no question as to the actuarial soundness of the King-Anderson proposal?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I do. But as soon as you put that on a competitive basis with the private sectors you will not find many people take the Government program. Once you put the Government program in competition with the private sectors then my worries are relieved.

Mr. DINGELL. May I say to my friend here there is a peril in having the private sector in this, and I think the gentleman ought to be concerned about it, because the peril of having the private insurance plans in competition with the King-Anderson proposal is precisely the same objection which Blue Cross finds in its coverage of the aged today. The simple fact is that Blue Cross is having a difficult time in competing for persons of 65 and over and also in competing for younger persons. What happens is that private insurance companies, because they are not compelled to have as broad coverage as Blue Cross already has and as King-Anderson would have, will cut in and will skim off the actuarial cream and take away the good risks and leave the taxpayers at large and leave the rate payers of Blue Cross at large and leave the payers of social security taxes in this country with the high-cost, poor-

risk, low-income groups. If the gentleman will recognize this soundly based fact, I am sure he will recognize there is a real need to adhere to the administration's proposal and reject the grossly crippling amendment he suggests.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In the private sector as well as in Blue Cross or Blue Shield they take the group insurance approach, at least to a degree. For instance, in Connecticut, anybody in Connecticut over 65 can enroll on a non-physical examination, noncancelable basis. So they do have a group approach and they do not skim off the cream. These programs are in existence now.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman does not deny that plans of this coverage very often in this country, and I include the Blue Cross, are in trouble.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, indeed. In many instances because it so happens that Blue Cross in many States of the Union has recently had to go to the State insurance regulatory agencies to secure a raise in rates. In large measure this request for a raise in rates stems from precisely the fact to which I have alluded, that the communitywide rating principle to which Blue Cross is compelled to adhere is very frequently damaged by competition. I say there is nothing illegal or wrong or immoral about it, because under the competitive influences in the market today a private insurance company is indeed wise to go in and skim the cream and make a profit, because that is the basis of the capitalist system. But the fact of the matter is that this is the reason there is a great deal of trouble for these plans in covering these people.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All I say is that the hearings demonstrate that the gentleman's thesis just is not sound in actual fact. Let me say this: Blue Cross has increased the rates, but it has also increased the benefits, and if costs keep going on up they are going to have to continue that. So are the private plans. But there is some competition, and that is the one thing I would interject into this situation: If the Government has such a good program, why should it be worried about this competition from group policies?

Mr. DINGELL. The fact of the matter is the Government does not propose to eject anybody from the insurance field, nor do we intend to take over by enactment of the King-Anderson bill the administration of health insurance to the aged in this country.

What is proposed by King-Anderson is to have coverage for high costs, low-income groups in this country over 65 and others made available on a basis which will permit private plans to offer other and better insurance just as private retirement plans have been enabled by the reason of the enactment of social security to offer better retirement plans and better retirement insurance plans to general insurance buyers in this country. That is what I say to my good friend.

Now, if I may continue, earlier in the article my good friend tells us that the

King-Anderson bill had been inspired by what he refers to as vested pressure groups and newly formed lobbying organizations. I would like to take care of this by mentioning those who do support the administration proposal. I think my good friend will recognize there are a substantial number of worthy citizens, honorable people, and outstanding groups in the American community which do support this.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I just want to point out, because I refer to groups as pressure groups, it does not mean that they are not fine citizens. In fact, I have encouraged people to get active, but I do think it is pertinent to call attention to the fact that this is where this stems from.

Mr. DINGELL. Now let us have a look at these pressure groups. I suggest to my good friend, the AFL-CIO and affiliated unions and State, local, and central bodies endorse this. The American Nurses Association endorses it. My good friend recalls in their function in Detroit just recently, they reendorsed it in spite of the statement that they were in so doing resisting substantial pressure from the AMA. I would point out to my good friend, if there is pressure here, it has been exerted by the AMA against the poor little nurses who seek in their own wisdom to serve the needs of the aged in this country. I would say they are knowledgeable, and by reason of their record in curing and treating and aiding and extending sympathy and gentle treatment to our sick and aged, perhaps they are better qualified to speak as true humanitarians than are the professionals of the American Medical Association.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield at this point, please.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to yield and to be gentle with my friend, but surely the gentleman understands that my time is short.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do understand, but the gentleman made a charge that undue pressure was exerted against the nurses by the AMA.

Mr. DINGELL. I did not say undue pressure. I said despite considerable pressure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know, I said undue pressure.

Mr. DINGELL. This report appeared in the daily newspapers.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand it did. Will my colleague let me point this out because this came up in the hearings. I read it in the newspapers. I asked the nurses if they could document it. Walter Reuther used it and I said, "Can you document the undue pressure?"—and the record is there for anyone to read that no one documented this. I think it is about time that this kind of smear tactics—and the gentleman has not used it and the gentleman did not use the word "undue" but the newspaper articles have—

unless there is evidence of improper, undue pressures, let us leave that out and direct our attention to their arguments. I would respect the Nurses Association. The gentleman is correct in saying that they did support this approach.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, and I would point out to the gentleman that this has repeatedly appeared in the press. I would point out that the present speaker in the well of the House is quoting people within the American Nurses Association on this point, who have been quoted in the daily press repeatedly. It was reported rather extensively in the city of Detroit just recently that they were endorsing this despite considerable pressure from the AMA.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be happy to yield after I have proceeded a while.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But the gentleman is now mentioning names and calling the roll. Will he not yield for just one observation?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield when I am through.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. At the time of the hearing I said if anybody in the Nurses Association would call my attention to any incident where they were misrepresented or what was said was untrue I would examine into it. But no such documentary evidence has been submitted. That is why I say to the gentleman that we must refrain from bandying about these sensational and perhaps sometimes irresponsible reports on such matters.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. HALL. I would like to meet some of the gentleman's objections and refute some of his statements by calling attention to a few things the American Nurses Association has done. I can say categorically that American nursing has done more for the extension of life and the support of organizations around the world for the eradication of disease, has done more for the comfort of the American people to give them a higher standard of living than is enjoyed by any other nation in the world, has done more to advance and raise up the standard of medicine—and the speaker himself being another gentleman from Missouri, having worked in nurse recruiting all during the World War, and in a not inconsiderable capacity, has rated them to their true rank and relative rank, and for the same pay scale as other officers of the grade, knows the great record of these nurses in the various fields of medicine and in their humanitarian care of people. I think the gentleman should reconsider the statement that he has made, and I say that as a qualified member of the AMA.

Mr. DINGELL. I will not withdraw my statement at all.

Mr. HALL. I say to the gentleman categorically as a member of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, categorically, no pressure regardless of the issue has ever been

expressed by the American Medical Association on its membership.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to hear the gentleman come out and say that as a member of the house of delegates of the AMA, because I am going to proceed to make some of the positions of the AMA known, and I yield to no man in my devotion to the honest practitioners of the country, but in the matter of social reform I call the gentleman's attention to these positions of the American Medical Association.

This is some of the record I am going to give my good friend of the AMA. The AMA opposed the National Tuberculosis Act, and I refer to the official proceedings of the house of delegates of June 1944. The AMA fought the American Red Cross plan to set up a nationwide reserve of civilian blood banks. The AMA fought compulsory vaccination for smallpox. The AMA opposed voluntary health insurance plans as "socialism" and "communism" and "inciting to rebellion." It dismissed the Blue Cross as a cracked-brain scheme.

That is the record of the AMA. It is a shameful record. I say it is a disgrace. I say the gentleman should not get up on the floor to speak with pride for an organization with such a record as this.

The AMA opposed the Social Security Act passed in 1935, and I refer the gentleman to the Journal of the American Medical Association and the proceedings of its house of delegates. I think in fairness when he stands up and opposes this and speaks as a mouthpiece for the AMA and as a mouthpiece for the house of delegates of the AMA he should be shown as speaking for the kind of organization that has opposed all of these things.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say that the gentleman's words need to be taken down.

This is a point of order. To clarify, it was the reference to the gentleman from Missouri as a member of the house of delegates of the AMA and the reference to that organization and the relationship of the gentleman from Missouri to that organization.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL. I think in fairness, when he stands up and opposes this and speaks as a mouthpiece for the AMA and as a mouthpiece for the house of delegates of the AMA, he should be shown as speaking for that kind of organization that has opposed all of these things.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the words complained of to "self-appointed spokesman" instead of "mouthpiece."

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri withdraw his point of order?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. Now, then, to continue with the record of the AMA.

The AMA opposed the creation of public venereal disease clinics. The AMA fought Federal aid to the States to reduce infant and maternal deaths. The AMA opposed enactment of the original Social Security Act as a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism.

AMA opposed Medicare for dependents of military personnel as impractical and harmful to national defense. AMA opposed the National Tuberculosis Act 1 week before its enactment.

AMA opposed compulsory smallpox vaccination. AMA opposed creation of public venereal disease clinics. AMA opposed creation of free diagnostic centers for cancer and tuberculosis.

AMA opposed requirement that all tuberculosis cases be reported to a public authority.

AMA attacked provisions for immunization and preventive measures against diphtheria and other contagious diseases by public health agencies.

This is the record of the AMA, perhaps the largest number of opponents and perhaps the largest and best financed group in opposition to the King-Anderson proposal.

Now let me give my good friend some information as to who supports it.

American Nurses' Association.
American Public Health Association, medical care section.
American Public Welfare Association.
American Veterans Committee.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Council of Golden Ring Clubs of Senior Citizens.
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
Family Service Association, public issues committee.
Fifty-second annual meeting of the Governors conference, held in 1960.
Group Health Association of America.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Churches. And, I say this to my good friend from Missouri, this is not a pressure group.
National Farmers Union.
National Council of Jewish Women, again obviously not a pressure group.
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.
National League of Senior Citizens.
Nationwide Insurance Companies.
Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Synagogue Council of America, and I am sure they are not a dangerous socialistic group or pressure group whose sole purpose is to destroy the welfare and the health services and the social security system of the United States.

White House Conference on Aging, Section on Income Maintenance, the section that is specifically charged with

consideration of this particular program, and I say this particular convention was called by the previous administration.

Women's Division of Christian Service of Methodist Church's Board of Missions.

YWCA National Board.

These are the pressure groups to which he has referred, and I say to my good friend from Missouri, he should be more careful with his language.

Earlier in his article Mr. CURTIS told us that the King-Anderson bill has been inspired by what he refers to as "vested pressure groups and newly formed lobbying organizations." Now with the Javits bill deserving consideration we see what he means; those who support the administration proposal have vested interests even though they happen to be, among others, the American Public Welfare Association—whose members run public assistance programs around the country and who would have their jobs cut back by the bill, the YWCA, the American Nurses Association, the aged, and organized labor—whose members would be required to pay additional social security taxes to help support the measure. My colleague, of course, looks to the health insurance industry for the nonvested-interest point of view.

Other bills, in addition to the Javits proposal, which Mr. CURTIS believes should be considered are the Lindsay bill and the Bow bill. Each of these three proposals would cost more than the King-Anderson bill, and the cost estimates are made on the same basis as those for the bill he opposes. Certainly, then, my colleague's real concern is not costs, or the method of estimating them. The three bills he prefers do not use a means test—so that cannot be his real concern. Two of the three bills would be financed through social security. Obviously, the use of social security and compulsory financing is not his real concern. But there is one point of difference, a point which many of us would not consider crucial—namely that, unlike the administration proposal, the three bills my colleague likes were introduced by Republicans. Can this be the guiding principle that enables him to see so clearly what is the right way and what is the wrong way to finance the health care costs of our aged people?

But overshadowing my colleague's laudable partisan loyalties is his willingness to consider proposals to aid the aged. Now that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is on the right track perhaps he is ready to take a fresh and objective look at some of the facts that show that the aged cannot now pay the price of adequate health care.

One in six aged persons is hospitalized each year. Nine out of ten will be hospitalized at least once after reaching age 65. An elderly couple, in a year during which one or both members receive hospital care, can expect their combined medical bills to total about \$1,200. The average aged couple can expect about five hospital stays after age 65.

Half of all aged couples have less than \$2,500 annual income, half of the aged persons living alone have less than

\$1,000; while many of the aged have equity in a home, about half have less than \$500 in liquid assets.

Only about half of the aged have any hospitalization insurance; in many cases the coverage is so restricted as to be no defense against bankruptcy if serious illness strikes—bankruptcy from which the aged person cannot recover.

Further, private health insurance protection for the aged must surmount the barrier not only of the generally low-income, high-cost problem of the aged but of the complication that those not now covered include the worst risks and lowest income groups even among the aged.

Blue Cross, which has long tried to extend protection to the aged by shifting part of their cost to younger groups through "community rating" finds it more and more difficult to compete with the commercial insurers. The latter have increasingly been able to attract the low-cost groups, leaving the higher cost groups to Blue Cross. To remain competitive, Blue Cross has been forced to compromise its community rating principle. The latest step has been the proposed national Blue Cross plan, under which the aged would be expected to pay their own way without subsidy from younger workers.

Today few people reaching retirement age are free of the fear that an expensive hospital stay will wipe out their savings and after a lifetime of independence, force them to public assistance, private charity, or dependence on children.

With health care costs continuing to rise, and income of the aging rising much more slowly, the problem of the aged in meeting these costs can only become more difficult. It is clear that the aged cannot pay the price.

It is equally clear that the Federal-State, Kerr-Mills programs made possible by the 1960 social security amendments are not doing the job. As I said before, in April only about 24 States—and 3 possessions—had put any kind of Kerr-Mills program into effect and most of these States have very limited programs. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, four high-income States, New York, Massachusetts, California, and my own State of Michigan—account for about 90 percent of the Kerr-Mills payments that are being made. The problem is, of course, that the States simply do not have the money to make it a success. If all 54 jurisdictions were to establish full-fledged Kerr-Mills programs, the total annual cost would run about \$1.5 billion, of which the Federal Government would pay approximately one-half. This would mean that the States would be required to spend about three times as much as they are spending on medical vendor payments under existing public assistance programs.

Thus we find that the legislatures of 23 jurisdictions—including Mr. CURTIS' State of Missouri—met and adjourned in 1961, without providing authority or funds for a Kerr-Mills program. Fourteen of these legislatures are not due to meet again before 1963.

We also find that in the 24 States that have Kerr-Mills programs, eligibility requirements are strict. Nearly all these States have an upper yearly income limit of \$1,200 or \$1,500 for an individual; about one-half the States have annual income limits of \$2,000 or less for a couple. More than half the States deny eligibility for Kerr-Mills payments if an individual has over \$1,000 in liquid assets; and in half the States couples with liquid assets of more than \$1,300 are ineligible.

Once the applicant becomes eligible he may not get all the medical care he needs. Sometimes fewer than 10 days of hospital care per admission are covered—Kentucky, 6 days; New Hampshire, 7 days. Three State programs—Kentucky, Tennessee, and Washington—provide for acute or emergency care only. Sometimes coverage is limited to life or sight-endangering conditions—Oklahoma, South Carolina.

Unfortunately, there is little reason to expect any substantial improvement in the States' financial situation and any resulting improvement in their Kerr-Mills programs. But even if the health needs of our older people could be met in this way, the means-test medicine approach would be unsatisfactory. The problem must be approached fundamentally on a self-help basis—not through the demoralizing means test involved in public assistance. The approach should be one that is consistent with the American concept of earning security through work.

The established and successfully operating social security system fully meets the specifications for a sound and practical fundamental approach. Financing health insurance for the aged through the contributory social security system would be the key to a threefold solution: First, basic health insurance protection afforded almost all older people through social security; second, supplementary protection through private insurance, just as the present old-age and survivors insurance benefits have had wide-scale supplementation through private insurance and supplementary pension plans; third, good medical assistance—becoming financially practicable—to help the relatively small group not eligible for the basic protection under social security and to aid those with special needs. This is the approach contemplated in President Kennedy's proposal to finance basic health insurance protection for people age 65 and over through the social security system.

The administration's proposal would cover 9 out of 10 people reaching age 65 next year. It would cover every aged person who is entitled to monthly benefits under the social security and railroad retirement systems. Over the long run, 95 percent of our older people would be protected. The proposed program would, for any period of illness, pay the entire cost of up to 90 days of inpatient hospital care less a deductible amount of \$10 a day for the first 9 days—with a \$20 minimum. Payment would also be made for up to 180 days of skilled nursing fa-

cility care after discharge from a hospital and all the costs of outpatient hospital diagnostic studies in excess of the \$20 deductible amount. Up to 240 home health visits would be paid for in a calendar year; these payments would cover the costs of such services as intermittent nursing care and physical therapy.

The administration's program would be financed by an increase in social security tax contributions of one-fourth of 1 percent each on employers and employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed plus an increase in the social security tax base from \$4,800 to \$5,200.

IN DEFENSE OF THE AMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has seen fit to launch a violent attack upon the American Medical Association and accuse it of virtually every crime known, and unknown, to man. I regret that the gentleman would make such unfounded charges, and that he would do so without yielding the floor so that these irresponsible statements could be "slain" then and there.

Apparently the gentleman is following the same guidelines set down by the administration in its letter to AMA president, Dr. Leonard Larsen, the use of invectives, half-truths, untruths, innuendoes, and inferences, none of which are hardly commensurate with the responsible behavior expected of this body. They are also a repeat of the charges made by the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, that great reservoir of knowledge on health matters which professes to know so much more about TB, cancer, blood banks, et cetera, than do the doctors of America.

The facts are that the positions attributed to the AMA by the executive branch and its spokesman are identical, word for word, to a similar diatribe made on October 27, 1950, 12 years ago, by former Representative Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Nebraska, during a campaign speech. Mr. O'Sullivan, who was defeated for reelection, subsequently had his speech printed as an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, 1950, as a lameduck Congressman.

It is even more interesting to note that ex-Representative O'Sullivan's remarks were borrowed from a speech made by former Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin, on August 30, 1950. Mr. Biemiller is now director of the American Federation of Labor's Legislative Department.

So, in the final analysis, the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, are a carbon copy of the words of a defeated Congressman from Wisconsin, which, in turn, are a repeat of a defeated Congressman from Nebraska. I trust the

same fate will not befall the gentleman from Michigan, who referred to me as a "mouthpiece of the AMA" and later reduced this allegation to a "self-appointed spokesman of the AMA."

It would seem that if there is any "self-appointed spokesman" that label could be applied to the gentleman from Michigan acting in that capacity for COPE and the New Frontier. He may even have been officially deputized.

Misrepresentation of fact on the floor of the House is not altogether uncommon, but these charges against the AMA must certainly establish a new record for effrontery. The allegations are false and I shall proceed to offer documentation for each one.

First. Allegation: "The AMA opposed the requirement that all cases of tuberculosis be reported to a public authority."

The facts: The AMA has fought for tuberculosis control since 1899 when a committee was appointed to report on the nature of the disease, means for controlling it, public education, and so forth. In 1944 a resolution was passed by the association's house of delegates which said in part "that it is necessary to extend procedures for careful, continuous supervision of the tuberculous by practicing physicians, who in cooperation with duly constituted health authorities, Federal, State, and local, are in a position to deal with these problems by modern methods to prevent the spread of this communicable disease." The AMA has never opposed the reporting of all cases of tuberculosis to a public authority. The allegation is false.

Second. Allegation: "The AMA opposed the National Tuberculosis Act."

Facts: The AMA was in sympathy with the purposes of the National Tuberculosis Act and said so. Its objection to the specific bill was twofold: First, money could not be appropriated or expended without the approval of the Federal Security Agency; second, the AMA believed the objectives of the legislation could be achieved in other ways—as for example, direct aid to needy communities under the Lanham Act. Each year, thousands of bills are introduced in the Congress and few are so flawless as to pass in their original form. That is why Congress holds hearings and seeks guidance. To state that the AMA opposed the National Tuberculosis Act is to suggest that the AMA opposed its purpose, which is totally untrue.

Third. Allegation: "The AMA fought compulsory vaccination for smallpox."

Facts: The AMA has fought for compulsory vaccination since 1863. In that year it appointed a committee on compulsory vaccination "to educate the public on the value and necessity of universal vaccination." This committee did report that general compulsory vaccination was impracticable in 1863. No doubt it thought so because a Civil War was raging, thus making general compulsory vaccination difficult—particularly in the Confederate States.

In 1899, the AMA's house of delegates resolved that it was the physicians' duty

to "institute measures looking to the vaccination, ultimately, of every person living within the limits of the country," and urging local boards of health to adopt laws requiring compulsory vaccination for smallpox. This was after the famous research of Lord Lister and Dr. Jenner on cow pox.

The allegation is an out-and-out falsehood.

Fourth. Allegation: "AMA attacked provisions for immunization and preventive measures against diphtheria and other contagious diseases by public health agencies."

Facts: The AMA has cooperated with public health agencies in the prevention of contagious diseases for more than 80 years. From 1875 to 1879, the AMA was urging that "State boards of health be established in those States where such boards do not exist." In 1884, the AMA recommended that Congress appropriate money "for the prosecution of scientific research relating to the cause and prevention of the infectious diseases of the human race, to be expended under the direction of the National Board of Health." And in 1950, the house of delegates said:

The basic services of the departments of health should be . . . the fields of vital statistics, public health education, environmental sanitation, laboratory services, prevention of disease and control of communicable diseases, such as the diseases of childhood, venereal diseases, and tuberculosis.

The allegation is an out-and-out falsehood.

Fifth. Allegation: "The AMA fought Federal aid to the States to reduce infant and maternal deaths."

Facts: The AMA has long favored maternal and infant welfare programs, but felt they would be most effective if each State were free to set up its own plan in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service. It has recommended that any legislation involving cooperation between the Federal Government and the separate States should be jointly administered by the U.S. Public Health Service and State health authorities.

Sixth. Allegation: "The AMA opposed the original Social Security Act as a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism."

Facts: As originally drafted, this measure also made mention of national health insurance, though this section was deleted when the bill was redrafted. The AMA testified only on the section of the Social Security Act dealing with the extension of public health services. The following is taken from that testimony:

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Doughton). Doctor, are you supporting that section of this bill as it is, without the suggestion of amendments or modifications?

Dr. BIERRING. From my knowledge of the needs of the country, I would say that it should be supported.

CHAIRMAN. We understand that it is one of the paramount needs, but do you have any changes or anything like that in mind that would help to better the bill?

Dr. BIERRING. No, sir, I believe it is under good supervision if it is under the expert

guidance of the U.S. Public Health Services.

An editorial written by Dr. Morris Fishbein in opposition to any form of compulsory old-age and unemployment insurance, represented his opinion as an editor and did not constitute the official viewpoint of the AMA, which did not oppose old-age and unemployment security provisions of the Social Security Act. Furthermore, Dr. Fishbein has not been with the AMA in any capacity—other than a member—for many years.

The allegation is totally false.

Seventh. Allegation: "The AMA opposed the creation of public venereal disease clinics."

Facts: Since its inception the AMA has fought to eradicate venereal disease. In 1907 the association declared it the duty of "State boards of health to disseminate literature to educate the people on the subject of venereal disease as they do tuberculosis and other infectious diseases."

The AMA has called upon its doctor members to cooperate with the U.S. Public Health Service for better control of venereal disease. It has declared that members of the medical profession should cooperate with the official health agencies charged with the responsibility for an expanded program to control venereal disease made possible by Federal grants-in-aid. The association has also approved the treatment of nonindigents for venereal disease in public health units in those instances where such treatment is not available through private sources.

This particular allegation is not only totally unfounded, it is also thoroughly disgusting.

Eighth. Allegation: "AMA opposed creation of free diagnostic centers for cancer and tuberculosis."

Facts: In 1948 the house of delegates approved a resolution which authorized the association to cooperate with the American Cancer Society and other agencies engaged in cancer detection "for the purpose of formulating standards of procedure and conduct in the operation of cancer detection and diagnostic centers and that the results of these studies be adequately publicized to those concerned, including the medical profession and the public."

As part of its program for improved medical care, the AMA has also approved the diagnosis of tuberculosis by public health centers, and treatment of the disease by those centers, for indigent patients. In those instances where treatment is not otherwise available, the AMA has approved treatment of non-indigent patients.

AMA has been cooperating with cancer fighting groups since 1913, when an AMA resolution, noting the recent founding of the American Society for the Control of Cancer, stated that "this movement deserves the cooperation of the medical profession of America, and this association heartily commends its worthy purpose."

The allegation is without foundation.

Ninth. Allegation: "The AMA fought the American Red Cross plan to set up a

nationwide reserve of civilian blood banks."

Facts: The house of delegates approved the Red Cross plan in principle shortly after it was announced, but with the understanding that the program should be maintained on the community level. In 1949, the house of delegates accepted a report from its committee on blood banks, which stated that there was an urgent need for a national blood program capable of continued expansion, and that the Red Cross was the logical agency to assume the responsibility for such a program.

In 1953, the house of delegates urged the establishment of a coordinated national blood program to be jointly organized by the American Red Cross, the AMA, and other qualified organizations interested in blood banking. The plan was subsequently approved. To sum up, the AMA has continually and consistently supported the Red Cross plan. I, myself, helped found the 11th U.S. Regional Blood Center in 1948 in Springfield, Mo., which serves parts of three States.

The allegation is false.

There are other allegations made by the gentleman from Michigan which can be refuted, just as they were when first uttered over 12 years ago by Mr. Biemiller. But by now it should not be necessary to proceed further. It is already quite clear that no single solitary word of truth prevails in the spurious remarks aimed at the professional organization of American doctors. Let us hope that these facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will effectively serve to discourage future Congressmen from speaking out on a subject on which they have so little knowledge and so little inclination to seek the truth.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the reason I took the time is first, to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for taking the floor and the time on an important measure of this nature, and for his courtesy throughout most of the debate in yielding on various points. I thought this was quite constructive. I think the evidence will show when we read the RECORD tomorrow that the adjectives he used to describe the article that I wrote for Reader's Digest were hardly substantiated, that the article is essentially correct.

The one point to which I must register disagreement—and the reason I took this time—is that I do believe it is unfortunate to attack the American Medical Association in the fashion it was done here without yielding to permit those who disagree to have their say. I have no special brief for the American Medical Association as my record reveals. I have opposed many things that they have suggested. On the other hand, I hap-

pen to think that they are a group of very honorable people, as I happen to think are the other pressure groups on the other side and on many sides on this issue.

Regrettably, throughout this entire public controversy, including the hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means, certain of the pressure groups sought to make the American Medical Association the butt of the debate and issue. I am not concerned with who is for a bill, I am concerned with what they say, what the facts are, and what the arguments are, and I am sure most of the Representatives here in the Congress look at it that way.

Let us not resort to this ad hominem argument of attacking the integrity or the actions of people involved unless indeed they have been indulging in improper action. If they have, then let us pinpoint that action and bring it out. If there were undue pressure on the nurses, for example, let us substantiate it so that there is no question about what we are talking about. But if it is not to be substantiated, let us not make these charges.

I regret the attack on the AMA. I doubt if the record presented here can be substantiated. I think in the next day or so someone should take the floor and point out the other side of the case so far as the American Medical Association is concerned. They have helped me on a number of affirmative bills that are now law. I refer to one in particular, the labeling act for hazardous substances left around the home. Without the AMA's help that would not have become law. Then the bill extending FHA guarantees in the construction of private nursing homes with high standards was supported by the AMA. I am sure the AMA has affirmatively supported much good legislation over a period of years. I daresay on what legislation they have opposed they have tried to point out their reasons and their views upon which their opposition was founded. They, too, are deeply concerned about the progress of our society and the welfare of all our citizens.

SOUTHEAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, with remarkable foresight the American Legion at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., in September of last year passed the following resolution:

Whereas recent events in Laos and southeast Asia are alarming and cause great concern to the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas it is most important that this deteriorating situation be corrected by affirmative action at once; and

Whereas our Government has not taken positive and corrective action to save Laos

from Communist domination and control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention, assembled in Denver, Colo., September 11-14, 1961, demands immediate and positive action, if possible, through the facilities of the SEATO organization, to save all free nations of southeast Asia from further domination and infiltration by Communist Russia and Red China.

Mr. Speaker, about 2½ weeks ago, motivated partly by the excellent American Legion resolution, I introduced House Joint Resolution 718, reading in part as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, requested to call an emergency conference of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and is hereby authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States, in concert with the armed forces of other Southeast Asia Treaty Organization members, as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of restoring the integrity of the 1961 cease-fire line in Laos and securing and protecting Laos and other southeast Asian nations against armed attack, his authority to include the taking of such measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the freedom of Laos or any other southeast Asian nation.

Starting on the 8th day of May in a letter which I wrote to the President of the United States, I have had correspondence with Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State. I should like to include a full text of that correspondence at this time and to include also at this point an excellent question and answer interview in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report with Father Menger, a Catholic missionary stationed at Laos and currently visiting this country, who gives his own eyewitness account of one who has lived with the Lao people and he gives such constructive steps as he feels might be taken to preserve the cause of freedom in that part of the world.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your news conference tomorrow, May 9, provides you an excellent opportunity to clarify U.S. policy with regard to the swiftly deteriorating situation in southeast Asia.

Mr. Walt W. Rostow, State Department Policy Planning Council Chairman, is quoted as having said in my State of Minnesota on May 3: "We stand ready to fight to the limit to defend the vital interests of the free world. But we are not looking for a military climax to this historic struggle between the West and the Communist bloc."

But the Associated Press on May 7 indicates that your administration reaction to the military loss of Nam Tha in Laos is that the affair is "simply an incident which should not be allowed to wreck the efforts for a peaceful settlement in Laos."

On March 23, 1961, you said at another news conference, in reference to conditions in Laos at that time: "I know that every American will want his country to honor its obligations to the point that freedom and security of the free world and ourselves may be achieved."

Two months later, on May 27, 1961, the Associated Press reported from the Geneva Conference on Laos that the U.S. delegation had accused the Pathet Lao of repeatedly and willfully violating the cease-fire in Laos.

The same report said, "The U.S. delegation is not prepared to sit in Geneva indefinitely while Pathet Lao artillery and rebel infantry units whittle away at territory held by the pro-Western Royal Lao Government."

The pro-Communist rebels have whittled away for a full year since those fine statements. In the past few days they have taken the town of Nam Tha, a key point in the defense of the country. On the evening of May 2, 1962, I was present at a gathering of some 30 men to hear your Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. In response to a question, Mr. Averell Harriman said, "It doesn't matter much to us, one way or the other, what happens in Laos."

Was Mr. Harriman expressing his own ideas, or stating administration policy? The American people need now to have a clear statement of your views, and answers to the following vital questions:

1. Are we going to defend the cause of freedom in Laos?

2. Do you think that Laos can be considered apart from the neighboring countries of South Vietnam and Thailand?

3. Is our policy in Laos still based on the idea that a coalition government with Communists and "neutralists" must be achieved, and that the hope of this achievement carries the best chance for advancement of peace with honor in southeast Asia?

Sincerely yours,

Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1962.

HON. CLARK MACGREGOR,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACGREGOR: Your letter of May 8 to the President concerning U.S. policy in southeast Asia has been referred to me. In view of the fact that Governor Harriman and the Secretary, and of course the President, have so frequently spoken to the American people on this subject, I shall not undertake a lengthy exposition here.

The decision to work for a neutral, independent, peaceful Laos was taken by the administration early in 1961. You have referred to the March 23, 1961, statement by the President explaining the decision to support the goal of a neutral and independent Laos. At his news conference on May 9, 1962, the President said that political negotiations are "a very hazardous course, but introducing American troops, which is the other one—let's not think there is some third course—that also is a hazardous course, and we want to see if we can work out a peaceful solution, which has been our object for many months."

The situations in Laos and Vietnam are quite different. In Laos there is a civil war. The only way in which this civil war can be ended is through international agreement for noninterference and through the formation of a government of national union, which requires agreement between the three princes representing the three principal political forces. The Republic of Vietnam, on the other hand, is subject to direct Communist aggression through subversion and guerrilla warfare. These guerrillas are organized, directed, and supported from North Vietnam, in direct violation of the 1954 Geneva Accords. The people of South Vietnam are fighting for their freedom and independence with great force and energy.

Because Laos cannot be considered apart from the rest of southeast Asia, we worked for 7½ months in 1961 at the 14-Nation Conference on Laos at Geneva to reach agreement on guarantees for the neutrality, independence, and peace of Laos as the best means of assuring peace and freedom in the area. As to Thailand, the President stated on May 15 that additional U.S. forces were being ordered there "to help insure the ter-

ritorial integrity of Thailand." His statement included the following:

"The dispatch of U.S. forces to Thailand was considered desirable because of recent attacks in Laos by Communist forces, and the subsequent movement of Communist military units toward the border of Thailand.

"A threat to Thailand is of grave concern to the United States.

"There is no change in our policy toward Laos, which continues to be the reestablishment of an effective cease-fire and prompt negotiations for a government of national union."

After long and painstaking appraisals of the Laos problem over the years, it has been determined that the best hope for Laos lies in neutrality under a government of national union, with international guarantees that Laos will not be used as a base for aggression against neighboring countries. We believe a neutral and independent Laos will best support the cause of freedom in that country and in southeast Asia.

Regarding the statement you attributed to Governor Harriman when he talked with a private group on May 2, the Governor pointed out at the time, in response to press inquiries, that the statement you attributed to him was completely distorted and that he could not have made such a statement, since he had worked at Geneva and Washington for a year to achieve an independent and neutral Laos.

I hope the above comments will be helpful in connection with the questions raised in your letter. As of possible interest, I am enclosed a publication, "A Threat to the Peace: North Vietnam's Effort To Conquer South Vietnam."

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosures: As stated.)

JUNE 2, 1962.

HON. FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUTTON: Thank you for your reply of May 25 to my letter of May 8 to the President.

I was delighted to read that you feel Laos cannot be considered apart from the rest of southeast Asia. It seems to me that the deteriorating situation in Laos makes the position of American forces in neighboring South Vietnam and Thailand increasingly more precarious.

You may be assured that I quoted the remarks made by Averell Harriman on May 2 with absolute accuracy. While it is true that Mr. Harriman, in behalf of the State Department and the administration, has been working for over a year to establish a coalition government in a neutral Laos, it seems obvious that indigenous Communist forces are busily creating, through aggression, a military situation which makes Mr. Harriman's efforts fruitless. You quote President Kennedy as stating on May 15 that "there is no change in our policy toward Laos." While our policy has remained unchanged for over a year, Communist forces have made striking military gains. These forces appear headed toward occupying virtually all of the land area of Laos lying east of the Mekong. Are we to continue with no change in our policy while the Communists realize their objective? Will our present policies make any sense if Communist forces control 90 to 95 percent of the land area of Laos? How can we conceivably then have any leverage to accomplish the political and diplomatic goals of the present administration policy?

Would you agree that the position of American forces in neighboring South Vietnam and Thailand grows more difficult with each Communist success in Laos?

Sincerely yours,

Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR.

CC: The President, the White House.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 11, 1962]

RED WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: AN EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT

(Interview with Father Matt Menger, Catholic Missionary stationed in Laos)

(War is flaring up again in Laos, where Communist forces are back on the offensive. Can that primitive but strategic land be held? What happens if it falls to the Reds? And what of the U.S. role in Laos?)

(Father Matt Menger, an American, is one of 60 Catholic priests of the Oblate of Mary Immaculate order who are on missionary duty in Laos. He has lived there since 1956, and is presently on a trip to the United States.)

(U.S. News & World Report invited Father Menger to its conference room, where members of the news staff interviewed him about the events in Laos and what they foretell.)

Question. Father Menger, do you think the Communists are going to get all of Laos?

Answer. Unless we do something about it, they certainly will.

Question. What can we do—the United States?

Answer. Keep our promise. We promised to defend Laos. We promised in 1954 when we set up SEATO—the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Laos was not a member nation. But, nevertheless, we said that we would put Laos under the protective umbrella of SEATO.

The Communists came in, and, of course, we did not keep our promise. Laos was under the umbrella of SEATO, but we forgot to open the umbrella. And, therefore, the answer to your question—"What can we do?"—is very simple: Let's keep our promise.

Question. Well, is it militarily possible to win back the area that the Communists have taken?

Answer. It surely is.

Question. What do the Communists hold?

Answer. They occupy about three-quarters of the country already.

Question. How could so much territory be taken back?

Answer. By using SEATO troops.

Question. Could it be done with the Lao Army?

Answer. I don't think so, because it would be Lao Communists fighting against Lao anti-Communists. You could—but there are too many North Vietnamese troops in Laos.

If you would put in the same number of SEATO or American troops as you have North Vietnamese troops, you could certainly stop them.

Question. How many Communist Vietnamese troops are in there?

Answer. No one knows exactly. No one can give you an exact figure. I personally believe there are about 10,000.

Question. Would SEATO troops be effective?

Answer. In the spring of last year, all of the Asian members of SEATO begged the United States to let them fight the Communists in Laos. They said: "Let us Asians fight the Asians." They said: "We will furnish all the ground troops. All we need are a few American military leaders." And the United States said "No." We were afraid of foreign intervention. But if the Communists are using foreign intervention—

Question. Are there any Chinese Communists in there, do you think?

Answer. Definitely. I couldn't give you their number. Definitely there are Chinese Communists.

Question. Father Menger, how long have you been in Laos?

Answer. Since 1956.

Question. Why are you in the United States just now?

Answer. I am on a nationwide lecture tour to raise funds to build the first orphanage in Laos.

Question. Are you going back?

Answer. Certainly. I'm there for life. All the Catholic missionaries are there for life. I'll be going back in early fall.

Question. Is your mission out in the wilderness, or are you in a metropolitan area?

Answer. I have been all through the country. Actually, where I was the first 3 years—all the places I was stationed the first 3 years—have all been captured by the Communists.

Question. How do you get around out there?

Answer. By walking, mostly.

Question. Are there no roads?

Answer. No roads—a few dirt roads.

Question. From your knowledge of the villagers, is it your impression that the people of Laos will stand and fight?

Answer. They will if they have to.

Question: Have they in the past?

Answer. Not too often, because they do not have a strong dedication. The Lao is a wonderful person. He is a hospitable, a gentle person. He loves to live and let others live. He does not like to fight. He's not like a German—a German has a strong will. The Lao does not like to fight, but he will fight. He needs someone to go in and give him courage and to strengthen his dedication.

Question. Can you give us an idea of the war in Laos—what the actual fighting is like?

Answer. It's small skirmishes. I can't say big fighting every day, but it's very, very frequent. I would say there are many small skirmishes every day.

The Communists come in, they kill their man, they capture their man, and they take off in the jungle.

Question. Do they come in force: 20 or 50 or 100?

Answer. It depends on the area. Sometimes they're very small groups—four and five. Sometimes they're more numerous.

Question. Do they just come in and shoot somebody?

Answer. That's right.

Question. They have arms and the villagers don't, is that it?

Answer. Some of the villagers do. They have their autodefense.

Question. What are these people—home guards?

Answer. Yes, there are about 13,000 of them—home guards, or you can call them guerrillas, if you want. Better to call them the home guard—the autodefense.

Question. Do they have American instructors?

Answer. In some groups, yes.

Question. And American equipment?

Answer. It's all American equipment.

Question. How long do you think Laos can last, the way it is now?

Answer. The Communists could take the country today if they wanted. It all depends on the United States.

Question. Why have the Communists taken so long?

Answer. They have time. Time is with them. They're not in a rush. For example, the Communists came into the city of Houei Sai. The Americans brought their troops into Thailand. The Communists were afraid then that the American troops were coming across, so they retreated a few miles from Houei Sai. They then waited, and when they saw that it was an American bluff, they came back and took Houei Sai.

Question. What proportion of people of Laos, do you suppose, are really politically conscious of what's going on?

Answer. They do know that the Communists are fighting, and they are beginning to realize what communism is.

Most of them know very little about politics. I could give you one example: One evening in 1958 there were 42 people in my hut—my bamboo hut. And I decided to find out how much they knew about the politics of their country. I asked these 42 people how many of them knew the name of the Prime Minister. Only two out of 42 even understood the word na yok, which means Prime Minister, and one of the two knew his name.

In 1958 and 1959 I walked all through whole areas of Laos and I visited 40 villages in which I was the first white man ever to go in. Laos is by far the most primitive nation in the world.

Question. That being the case, why are the Communists so anxious to get it?

Answer. Because they realize that it's the geographic heart of all of southeast Asia. It's a corridor. There's little in it economically. It's like a corridor in this building. There might not be any typewriters or tables or chairs, economically, there's nothing in the corridor, but to get to the other rooms where you do have typewriters and chairs, and a safe or people, you have to go through the corridor—you have to take the corridor.

The Communists do not want this for itself, but they do want it for the countries whose doors open onto Laos.

And, of course, if you take a map of the whole Far East you can see how the Communists will take Cambodia and Burma and they'll squeeze Thailand. I don't care how many divisions of American troops you put in South Vietnam, all I can say is, God help the American troops that try to defend South Vietnam if Laos is Communist.

Question. Is the whole thing strategic?

Answer. A lot of people have pointed out that its geographic location makes it very important strategically, but we often forget that the lives and freedom of 3 million human beings who live there are at stake. Like us, they have a right to live outside the system of slavery the Communists are trying to force upon them.

Question. Has the Lao Army been able to disrupt the Communist supply lines at all?

Answer. Very little, because, until the United States has a firm, unified, constant policy in Laos or in any other country, the Lao themselves do not want to fight, do not want to commit themselves, because they feel—they say: "Why should we fight with the Americans against the Communists, against the neutralists?"—because the Americans are vacillating.

IF UNITED STATES MUST FIGHT

Question. Do you feel, then, that it's going to require American combat troops in there?

Answer. A small number at the beginning. No one can tell you what the North Vietnamese will do. We said we would defend Laos; well, let's defend it.

What happens if North Vietnam comes in? In that case the 7th Fleet could handle Hanoi very easily.

What happens if the Red Chinese come in? Our Air Force could take care of Peiping and Shanghai.

What happens if Russia comes in? Well, the U.S. Army will take care of Russia.

The point is that, until we stop the Communists somewhere, we're always afraid of what's going to happen. Some place, we have to decide to call a halt.

The American people must realize that we are at war, and that we must take the means to stop it—to restore peace.

Question. Do you get the impression that communism is popular with the people of Laos?

Answer. No, very few of the natives in Laos are Communist.

Question. How do people out there feel about U.S. insistence that they set up a coalition government of neutrals, Communists and anti-Communists?

Answer. They are very opposed to it—a great opposition. The strongest opposition of all is coming from the South Vietnamese and the Thai Ambassadors in Laos.

Question. Why?

Answer. Well, they know that a coalition government in Laos will work the same as it has in Rumania, in Yugoslavia, in China.

Question. You mean it will be a Communist government?

Answer. Certainly. History has proven this.

Question. How about dividing the country? Could that be done?

Answer. Instead of a coalition government, it would be much better to divide it.

Question. Where would you partition?

Answer. The only way you can would be at the 17th parallel and come up through the mountains. You'd have to keep the valley bordering on Thailand; otherwise, you are going to have a lot of friction.

Question. Is there a feeling that, if Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, the leader of the loyal Government, is forced into a coalition government, the effect will be to give the country to the Communists?

Answer. Right. Well, let's face it, let's put it this way: History itself has proven that in many countries.

Question. What about the Americans who are out there—both military and civilian? Are they popular and respected?

Answer. The people of Laos know them very little.

Question. Whose fault is that?

Answer. The Americans. Suppose a Japanese would come to the States to try to sell your wife a Japanese radio, and he would talk to your wife in Japanese. Do you think that such radios would be very popular in the States? Do you think your wife would buy a Japanese radio?

Question. Do many Americans speak the Lao language?

Answer. There has never been an American in the U.S. Embassy that I know of—and I've known them all since I arrived there in 1956, and the Embassy wasn't set up until 1955—that has learned the Lao language.

Question. What about the American military?

Answer. They have learned a few words. I know of one major in particular who could sit down and carry on a fair conversation in Lao. But you can say, in general, that the Americans in Laos do not learn the Lao language, do not learn the customs, and are not winning the minds and hearts of the people.

A very important thing that we do not realize is that dollars are not enough. The Lao people say that. They say the Americans are the most generous people in the whole world. And it's true, really. You can't find a nation as generous as the Americans with their dollars, but not with their hearts.

As far as I'm concerned, the most dedicated man I ever met during my 5 years in Laos was a Russian Communist. I met him at the airport one day and asked him how long he was going to stay in the country. He was very surprised. He said: "Father, why do you ask that?" I said: "Well, the ordinary foreigners, the diplomats, come for 6 months, 12 months, or 24 months—that's it."

He answered: "Well, we are not here to put in time. We're here to do a job, and until that job is done—"

Question. Was he a Russian official of some kind?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What is the theory of the people in the American Embassy in Laos? What is their opinion of the future?

Answer. They don't know, because they don't have the facts. How can you expect an American who does not know the people, cannot speak the language, to know anything about the country? People in Vientiane cannot travel into the countryside any more at all. They are obliged to remain in Vientiane, a city of 100,000 people.

Question. What are health conditions outside the cities, or towns?

Answer. The first 23 weeks I was in Laos I lost 35 pounds.

Question. Did you use the local food?

Answer. Sure, we eat the Lao food and drink their water.

Question. Any ill effects?

Answer. I had malaria, hookworm, dysentery, ringworm; I had all the other parasites, too.

Question. These American military instructors who get down to the village level—do they eat with the local people?

Answer. In general, no. They have their rations.

NEEDED: A STRONG POLICY

Question. To sum up, Father Menger, are the vast majority of people in Laos now under Communist control?

Answer. I'd say at least 75 percent of the country of Laos is held—geographically and also populationwise—by the Communists.

What can be done about it? We need more dedicated Americans, men who are willing to make the sacrifices required in order to learn the language and customs of the people. Also, we need a strong, unified foreign policy. We need a foreign policy whose sole criterion is "right."

In other words, we should not worry what others might say, what the United Nations might say. But if communism is wrong—which it is, for it is atheistic materialism, and thus directly opposed to our Christian democracy—let's stop it. Why worry what others are going to say?

MICHIGAN TOURIST BUSINESSES LEARN FEDERAL AID INCLUDES FEDERAL DICTATION

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, what happens when the camel of Federal aid gets his nose under the tent of State and local government is clearly demonstrated in Michigan, where Federal Bureau of Public Roads, with the silent consent of the Michigan State Highway Department, is requiring all tourist business establishments to remove their signs which overhang or encroach upon the highway right-of-way. This edict applies to all roads to which the Federal Government has contributed a dollar.

Tourism is big business in Michigan. Motels, restaurants, gasoline stations, and other accommodations for tourists have erected attractive signs at their places of business. Some of these have cost \$4,000 and \$5,000 each and are of

such a nature that the owners will experience a great loss because of the damage done in an attempt to meet the mandate of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Our Michigan scenic highways are lined with evergreen trees for long stretches and the tourists would be unaware of these accommodations in many instances if the signs were located back of the property line. Consequently, and sometimes with State consent, signs were erected on the right-of-way line or overhanging State highway rights-of-way. The signs to which I refer are not the gaudy type, but modest signs advertising the tourist business establishment at that particular point. They create no hazard to traffic.

While the Senate and House of Representatives of the Michigan Legislature, separately by resolution, have asked the Michigan Highway Department to reexamine its policy with respect to the sign removal directive, the Michigan State Highway Department remains aloof to these pleas and even concurs in the mandate of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads—calmly accepting the dictations that go with accepting gifts from the Federal Government.

The following are Senate Resolution 55 and House Resolution 104 of the Michigan Legislature, expressing concern over the ruling:

SENATE RESOLUTION 55

Resolution requesting the highway department to reexamine its sign removal policies

Whereas the recent ruling of the Michigan State Highway Department concerning the removal of commercial highway signs has created grave concern among legitimate businesses catering to the tourist trade; and

Whereas the Michigan State Highway Department, acting pursuant to the authority of act No. 108 of the Public Acts of 1925, as amended, has been informing all businesses having frontage on State trunkline highways and advertising signs placed on State highway rights-of-way to remove the same; and

Whereas the State highway department, in its directive, has stated that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has issued a directive to all States, requiring all signs to be removed from any highway right-of-way wherever any Federal funds have been used in the building or maintaining of such State highways; and

Whereas there is a sound recognition for the need of curbing the flagrant violations of State rights-of-way, but we are concerned not with nondescript advertising signs, but signs at the place of business of hotels, motels, restaurants, supper clubs, fishing resorts, and service stations whose chief livelihood depends upon tourist travel; and

Whereas many of these signs, some of which only projected over the highway's right-of-way, were erected with the knowledge and approval of the State highway department; and

Whereas some of these signs valued at hundreds of dollars cannot be moved without total destruction and removal of many signs directing the traveler to State, city, county, township parks, public fishing sites, and historical sites would decrease the attendance; and

Whereas the permission to have such signs was verbally implied by the Michigan State highway right-of-way purchasing agents, and these verbal concessions were a major factor in obtaining additional private property for highway purposes without resorting

to condemnation proceedings, thereby saving the Michigan State Highway Department thousands of dollars in legal and purchasing expenses for additional land obtained from private property owners; and

Whereas one of our largest businesses in Michigan is the tourist business and to a great extent it is founded upon the principle of taking care of the motoring public who need and use such advertising signs as a guide to places to sleep, eat and to visit; and

Whereas the removal of such signs will deal the tourist industry of Michigan a staggering blow, which will cause an untold amount of confusion, as well as requiring the expenditure of a great deal of money in removing the signs, which, in many instances, because of the peculiar location of the businesses involved, cannot relocate their signs to an advantage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the senate request that a revision or an amendment be made in the Federal law upon recommendation of the Michigan Highway Department to eliminate the need for removal of such signs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Michigan State Highway Commission, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the senate, May 22, 1962.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 104

Resolution requesting the State Highway Department to reexamine its sign removal policies

Whereas the Michigan State Highway Department, acting pursuant to the authority of Act No. 108 of the Public Acts of 1955, as amended, has been informing all businesses having frontage on State trunkline highways and advertising signs placed on State highway rights-of-way to remove the same; and

Whereas the State highway department, in its directive, has stated that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has issued a directive to all States, requiring all signs to be removed from any highway right-of-way wherever any Federal funds have been used in the building or maintaining of such State highways; and

Whereas in innumerable cases, businesses along the Michigan highways have been built on the principle of advertising and in many cases have secured previous permission from the State highway department to erect such advertising signs on the State highway rights-of-way at a considerable expense to the said business owners; and

Whereas one of the largest businesses of the State—the tourist business—is to a great extent founded upon the principle of catering to the motoring public whose use such advertising signs as guides to places to visit, to eat and to sleep; and

Whereas the removal of such signs will deal the tourist industry of Michigan a staggering blow, which will cause an untold amount of confusion, as well as requiring the expenditure of a great deal of money in removing the signs, which, in many instances, because of the peculiar location of the businesses involved, cannot relocate their signs to an advantage; and

Whereas while it seems to be true that the Federal directives appear to indicate that failure to follow the Federal directive on sign removal might result in a curtailment of Federal aid to State highway programs, nevertheless this policy has not definitely been decided, and, further, it should be pointed out that the moneys being spent on the Federal highway programs are moneys collected from the motoring public itself, and that if they find roadside

signs of convenience, then, perhaps, the entire Federal and State policy regarding their removal should be reexamined: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the legislature request the Michigan State Highway Department to reexamine its directives concerning the removal of signs from the State highway rights-of-way; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Michigan State Highway Commission, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the house May 15, 1962.

NORMAN E. PHILLO,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

POLITICS FIRST IN FHA

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a highly political move by the present "politics first" administration has backfired and the people of Minnesota are the losers. The resignation of Wallace E. Berg of St. Louis Park, Minn., an extremely competent and dedicated Federal Housing Administrator, has been forced by Washington Democrats in announcing Berg's impending transfer out of Minnesota. His resignation yesterday to become an officer of Farmers and Mechanics Bank in Minneapolis resulted directly from the effort to "kick him upstairs."

Since May 12, I have received many letters from leading Minneapolis area professional people urging Berg's retention in the Minnesota job. These letters have come from suburban Hennepin municipal officials, producers of FHA loans, the Minneapolis Board of Realtors, and the Minnesota Association of Realtors. It is reported that Berg was forced out of Minnesota to create a political opening for a recently defeated DFL candidate. It is bad enough to add to the Washington bureaucracy by creating new jobs for most defeated Democrats, but it is certainly worse to provide slots for those Democrats rejected by the voters. On May 16, I protested to the head of the FHA in Washington about Berg's transfer and was told "staffing requirements necessitate the utilization of Berg's talents at the national level." This is pure politico-bureaucratic toe dancing designed to cover up the real purposes for easing Berg out of Federal service. Democratic officials in Washington are well aware that he had had earlier offers to go to Washington under far better terms than those handed him last month.

HELP WANTED: BUSINESS RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the plight of small businessmen in the path of public projects is a matter of national concern.

Many small businessmen suffer great personal hardships and severe financial losses, and receive little or no compensation.

While limited Federal financial assistance is given to businesses forced to relocate by urban renewal programs, it is not sufficient to cover actual costs.

No relocation payments are given to businesses evicted by highway clearance programs and many other public projects.

In my own State, Hartford and New Haven firms displaced by urban renewal projects had average actual expenses of close to \$9,000, a large portion of which are not covered by present relocation payments.

Twenty-five percent of these firms received no relocation payments at all although they were eligible.

A nationwide study conducted by William N. Kinnard and Zenon S. Malinowski and published by the University of Connecticut showed 1 out of every 4 businesses displaced by urban renewal projects go out of business for good.

The study also showed only one firm in a hundred succeeds in relocating in the project area when it is completed.

I propose a minimum three-point program to relieve businessmen of the burden of forced relocation.

First, the Federal Government should pay relocation costs to all businesses evicted by federally assisted public projects, not just those forced out by urban renewal.

Second, relocation payments should cover all actual costs, including moving expenses, property losses, losses resulting from delay in property acquisition, and loss of business good will.

Third, the Federal Government should provide lease guarantees in redevelopment areas and shopping centers which are now almost completely beyond the means of small independent merchants who have been forced to relocate.

This three-point program could do a great deal to enable the small business man to survive and share in the renewed prosperity of his community.

I intend to discuss this in greater detail in the days ahead.

THE SCHOOL LUNCH: FOOD FOR THOUGHT AND FOOD FOR HEALTH

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I rise to support H.R. 11665, a bill to revise the formula for appropriating cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of Agriculture, I have been deeply concerned with the operation and the financing of the school lunch program throughout the United States. I think one of my most important contributions to the work of the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee has been my deep interest in and strong support for the school lunch program and the special milk program.

The national school lunch program represents legislation which I believe by its nature and intent demands flexibility in order to meet changing school needs. You may remember that initial Federal assistance for school lunch programs which began in 1933, was started for three major reasons: First, to supplement relief feeding programs of the States and localities; second, to provide relief employment for the unemployed; and third, to assist in removing surplus agricultural commodities from the market. By 1946, when the school lunch program became permanent, the relief aspects had disappeared, and the objectives were broadened. At that time school lunch became an accepted program which, even in times of prosperity, had two very important objectives. One objective was to extend the market for agricultural food commodities by first, providing an expanded market for agricultural commodities through local purchases of food by school lunch programs in commercial channels of trade; second, serving as a valuable outlet for agricultural commodities purchased by the Department of Agriculture to alleviate local and seasonal surpluses; third, expanding the outlet for highly nutritious foods, particularly in areas of nutritional deficiencies; and fourth, introducing a wider variety of foods, thus creating a demand for commodities that many housewives would not otherwise buy.

The second and perhaps more important objective is to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing them a well-balanced lunch at school to help fill their daily nutritional requirements, and by developing proper and nutritionally beneficial food habits which will continue in later life.

Today, the national school lunch program furnishes food items to schools by distributing commodities acquired under the stipulations of the National School Lunch Act through State distributing agencies. Under section 6, National School Lunch Act, commodities are purchased on the basis of their nutritional value and acceptability. Under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, those commodities declared as surplus foods by the Department of Agriculture are purchased for donation to author-

ized outlets including all eligible school lunch programs.

Under present school lunch programs, the average cost of a lunch is 50 cents; 11 cents is contributed by the Federal Government, 12 cents by the State and local subdivisions, and 27 cents by the parents. The formula for apportionment by the Federal Government to the States is based on school population without regard to the number of students participating in school lunches. Consequently, some States where student participation is higher than average participation, reimbursement to those schools is lower than average reimbursement; whereas, in some States where student participation in type A lunches is lower than average participation, reimbursement to schools in those States is higher than average reimbursement. This is so because the sum allotted to a State is a fixed sum based on total school population. The result of more children participating in the program is that reimbursement for each child is less. This legislation proposes to eliminate that inequity. It revises the formula and provides that the apportionment of funds among the States be on the basis of the number of students participating in type A lunches in the preceding year multiplied by the need rate of a State.

A type A lunch is lunch without milk. A type B lunch is lunch with milk. A type C program is the consumption of milk alone without food. The provisions of this bill will eliminate the unfairness in those States where participation in type A lunch is higher than the average participation by increasing the reimbursement. In no event shall the State reimbursement to a participating school be less than 5 cents per meal regardless of the wealth of a particular State or its need rate, and in no event shall the reimbursement exceed 9 cents per meal.

This bill proposes to distribute one-half of the funds under the existing law and one-half of the funds under the new formula. In addition, where State statutes prevent the State agency from disbursing funds to private schools, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to disburse to such nonprofit private school that portion of Federal funds for the State attributable to the number of children participating in the school lunch program in the private schools. It is noteworthy that no question of constitutionality is raised against the practice of the Federal Government through the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct payment of Federal funds to nonprofit private schools whether they be parochial, Hebrew, protestant or otherwise. Contrast this attitude with the attitude as to the use of Federal funds to private schools in connection with aid to education. No difference in principle exists. Each of the two programs, Federal contributions to school lunch or Federal aid to education, has an observable objective or an observable end other than the establishment of religion. In one instance, the objective is the mental health of the children and

the other instance, it is the physical health of our children.

The improvement in physical health is brought about by the use of better foods while at the same time distributing agricultural surpluses. This lack of objection to the use of Federal funds directly to the nonprofit private schools is proof positive that no valid constitutional objection exists in providing Federal aid to nonprofit private schools where all schools and schoolchildren are treated equally.

Since 1958, when I became a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee, the number of school enrollments in school lunch programs, the number of schools and children participating, and the number of meals served has increased greatly. As a result of my efforts on the Appropriations Agricultural Subcommittee, the amount of Federal contributions to the school lunch program has increased greatly despite the reluctance of the prior administration to provide additional funds to take care of the increasing school population and school participation in school lunch.

The national school lunch program has contributed immeasurably to the health and welfare of the Nation. It has had a most beneficial influence on the eating habits of our young people. It has also helped to encourage the finest use of various food surpluses. The special milk program has encouraged the consumption of fluid milk by our schoolchildren.

The national school lunch program and the special milk program represent a sizable market for the food produced on our farms. Total Federal, State, and local funds expended under these programs represent a significant part of our annual food bill. In fiscal year 1958, a total of \$874.5 million was spent for these purposes. In fiscal year 1962, the expenditures for food in these programs are expected to increase to \$1,300 million.

Since 1958, school enrollment has increased from 38.4 million to 43.8 million, the number of children participating in school lunch programs has increased from 11.5 million to 14.4 million, and the number of meals served has increased from 1.9 billion to 2.4 billion. Federal contributions for school lunch since 1958 in the form of direct appropriations in cash and purchases under section 6 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act rose from \$100 million to \$170 million. In addition, commodities donated by the Federal Government from purchases with section 32 funds, that is, from a portion of our customs receipts and under section 416, rose from approximately \$75 million to \$111 million. The Federal expenditures under the special milk program rose from approximately \$65 million to \$101 million.

But the real importance of this program is not in the statistics, but in what they have meant to the schoolchildren. The almost \$380 million Federal expenditures for school lunches and milk represent a relatively small item in the total Federal budget in return for the

real value of the program. The school lunch and special milk programs will reduce the number of physically unfit young men. During World War II, the number of rejections for the military services was over 150,000 because of bad teeth, vitamin deficiency, and other health defects. Such a large number of 4-F's was ominous and a warning. Good nutrition will correct those deficiencies to a large extent. The Federal expenditures represent a figure of vital importance to the millions of schoolchildren who for no charge or for a minimum charge may receive a noonday meal, which is not only appetizing but nourishing. Truly our school lunches are providing food for thought and food for health.

In 1958 during the national convention in Philadelphia of the American Food Service Association where I was a speaker, I heard the executive secretary, Mr. Perryman, deliver a memorable address. He entitled his speech "The ALSO of School Lunch." Implicit in that speech is the list of benefits which are obtained. In speaking of the contributions of those who prepare the food, the panelist called the administrators, and the workers in the school lunch program, the ALSO of school lunch.

The initials meant:

A—Architects of anatomy.

L—Leaders of learning.

S—Sources of survival.

O—Operators of opinion.

Thus, we see that school lunches develop the anatomy, teach children what to eat by providing examples of nutritional food, prepare for survival by building stronger bodies and provide the food requirements, a necessity of life, so that our youth need not be diverted from the task of developing their minds and opinions in order to search for food.

The revised formula of this legislation improves the school lunch program, obtains maximum utility from appropriated funds by dividing funds on the basis of students participating rather than on the basis of school population. In our desire to help the impoverished people of the world, we must not forget that charity begins at home with our children. Let us provide in our schools not only food for thought but also food for health. I trust that this measure will pass.

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. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 90 minutes, today.

Mr. SCRANTON (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 15 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 30 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 3 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 1 hour, tomorrow, June 6, 1962.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 1 hour, tomorrow, June 6, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT and to include an address by the Vice President of the United States given today at the commencement exercises of the National Cathedral School for Girls.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. BAKER and include a speech.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BECKER.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. GUBSER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 6, 1962, 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:

2143. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the military assistance program (MAP) for Turkey, as administered by the Joint U.S. Military Mission for Aid to Turkey (JUSMMAT); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2144. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of supply management of selected weapon system components and spare parts in the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2145. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, trans-

mitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to an overobligation of an allotment in connection with project IND-17-6, Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2146. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 59th quarterly report covering the first quarter 1962, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2147. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the sixth annual report of operations conducted by or under contract with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to 70 Stat. 1119; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2148. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2149. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2150. 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 Carmela Caraccia, A8789066, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2151. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relating to the review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 19, 1962 the following minority views were filed on June 5, 1962:

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. Part 2, minority views on H.R. 8846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws (Rept. No. 1605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 5, 1962]

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. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11017. A bill to amend section 4281, title 18, of the United States Code to increase from \$30 to \$100 the amount of gratuity which may be furnished by the Attorney General to prisoners discharged from imprisonment or released on parole; without amendment (Rept. No. 1757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11793. A bill to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 675. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11879. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1759). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11990. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 11992. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to publication or distribution of printed political material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 11993. A bill to provide full indemnities for sheep slaughtered in connection with the scrapie slaughter program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 11994. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by creating a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11995. A bill to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11996. A bill to amend the act of January 30, 1913, to provide that the American Hospital of Paris shall have perpetual succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 11997. A bill to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11998. A bill to provide for the transportation of mail by aircraft upon star routes within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11999. A bill to repeal section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of supervisors, enumerators, and other employees of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12000. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 12001. A bill to permit the retirement of employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act with full annuities on completion of 30 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12002. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection of certain information with respect to the medical profession; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 12003. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 12004. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12005. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States, counties, cities, and political subdivisions of States, and public and private corporations established under State law, in providing improved mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 12006. A bill to amend the Library Service Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 12007. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 12008. A bill to incorporate the Navy Mothers' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 12009. A bill to permit the filing, before the use of a trademark in commerce, of an application for the registration of such trademark, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 12010. A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12011. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 12012. A bill to grant the American Hospital of Paris perpetual succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12013. A bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain aliens residing in Hong Kong who are relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 725. Joint resolution to request the President to proclaim June 1 to June 14 each year as "New Glory for Old Glory Time"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 726. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.J. Res. 727. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 728. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 729. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the Offices of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Res. 673. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 674. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12014. A bill for the relief of Corsignana Dalbis and Marissa Dalbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12015. A bill for the relief of Ora Drelewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12016. A bill for the relief of Beverly Helen (Smith) Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12017. A bill for the relief of Joyce E. Millette Clements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 12018. A bill for the relief of Capt. Henry F. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H.R. 12019. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia Silvani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of John Rocca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12023. A bill to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552-C, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of Librande P. Caltagirone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12025. A bill for the relief of George A. Simmons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. Res. 676. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 12019) for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia Silvani, together with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 fourth calendar quarter of 1961 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) \$233.50. E. (9) \$291.90.

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) \$180. E. (9) \$1.20.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$7,929.94.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,017. E. (9) \$2,017.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$15,967.76. E. (9) \$15,967.76.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$20,821.64. E. (9) \$20,821.64.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$145.74. E. (9) \$11.55.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$501.31.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$103. E. (9) \$7,579.34.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$661.76.

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.

D. (6) \$25,000. E. (9) \$318.66.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$10,600. E. (9) \$538.84.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,292.39.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$2,984.80.

A. Atlantic, Gulf and Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,872.67. E. (9) \$4,872.67.

A. Fred A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif.

B. The Federated Indians of California.

A. J. D. Bearden, 401 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,093.74.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine Street, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,124.26.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$2,687.04.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$610.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,408.24. E. (9) \$1,722.74.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$709.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$245. E. (9) \$245.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$937.50. E. (9) \$951.93.

A. Mrs. Fred L. Bull, 8124 Oakleigh Road, Baltimore, Md.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doyles-town, Pa.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$47.50.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

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) \$3,769.26. E. (9) \$376.93.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

E. (9) \$1350.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) \$1,462.55. E. (9) \$273.85.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Greg-Gary Corp., 7 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$7,500.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$218.32.

- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Camara Nacional de la Industria Pesquera, Manuel Maria Contreras No. 133, Mexico 5, D.F., Mexico.
 D. (6) \$861.31. E. (9) \$150.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., 343 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$27.65.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
 D. (6) \$8,750. E. (9) \$485.28.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. West Marin (Calif.) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.
 D. (6) \$1,160.13. E. (9) \$25.55.
- A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,250.
- A. Citizens Committee for International Development, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Charles Patrick Clark, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.
- A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
- A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$110. E. (9) \$10.72.
- A. Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.
- A. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
- A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$4,250.
- A. Edward Cooper, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Edward Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,600.
- A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$473.74.
- A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$521.85. E. (9) \$521.85.
- A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
 E. (9) \$12.23.
- A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
 B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
 B. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$12.03.
- A. Credit Union National Association, 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
 D. (6) \$506. E. (9) \$506.
- A. Currey Air Transport, Ltd., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
 E. (9) \$331.49.
- A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$150.
- A. Abraham A. Dash, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
 D. (6) \$506. E. (9) \$29.
- A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$712.50. E. (9) \$14.48.
- A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
 E. (9) \$38.39.
- 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) \$1,413.50. E. (9) \$50.50.
- A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$9,701.03.
- 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. Anthony P. Donadio, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
 B. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co., 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
- A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ernest J. Eaton, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Water Conversion Institute, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. John W. Edelman, 704 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,464.19. E. (9) 464.14.
- A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$3,304.85. E. (9) 300.
- A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,404. E. (9) \$602.27.
- A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$55.25. E. (9) \$1.81.
- A. Clyde A. Erwin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,327. E. (9) \$560.18.
- A. Joseph C. Fagan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
- A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
- A. Edward O'Brien Fennell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 8800, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,100. E. (9) \$21.50.
- A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
 B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$187.83.
- A. Forest Farmers Association, P.O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
- A. Aubrey Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. William C. Greer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association.
 D. (6) \$300.
- A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Virgin Islands Gift and Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, V.I.
 D. (6) \$750.
- A. John A. Gosnell, National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,650.01.
- A. Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
 E. (9) \$331.49.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
 E. (9) \$30.80.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
 B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilton Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
 D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$27.75.

- A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,249.96. E. (9) \$78.75.
- A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,275. E. (9) \$65.77.
- A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
 B. National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
 D. (6) \$571.56. E. (9) \$523.34.
- A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,649.99.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Joe L. Howell, 5845 Kinder Drive, Jackson, Miss.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
- A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
 B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
- A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
- A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.
- A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$13,905.66.
- A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
 D. (6) \$2,150. E. (9) \$175.
- A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, Peter Marianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.
 E. (9) \$259.36.
- A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$119.68.
- A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- 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) \$2,150.76.
- A. Keatinge & Older, 3325 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
 B. Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., et al.
 D. (6) \$637.50. E. (9) \$1,873.40.
- A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
- 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) \$143.75.
- 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. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 B. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$232.51.
- A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Atlantic, Gulf and Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,512. E. (9) \$195.67.
- A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$125.
- 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.
- A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$416. E. (9) \$52.88.
- A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,225. E. (9) \$10.98.
- A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
 B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$206.14.
- A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$1,961.14.
- A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
- A. John H. McCormick, Jr.
 B. The Council for Exceptional Children, department of the N.E.A., 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$3,304.85. E. (9) \$300.
- 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) \$2,692.30. E. (9) \$284.65.
- A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$12.15.
- A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,440. E. (9) \$470.41.
- 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) \$81.25.
- A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York 16, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$4.60.
- A. Suzanne MacLean, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$50.
- A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$9,100. E. (9) \$924.97.
- A. James D. Mann, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$280. E. (9) \$81.46.

A. William R. Merriam, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$1,215.

A. Ross A. Messer, P.O. Box 1611, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, P.O. Box 1611, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$84.87.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit 26, Mich.

E. (9) \$1,507.65.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$2,094.71.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) \$2,439.69. E. (9) \$538.37.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., P.O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P.O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$786.90. E. (9) \$1,182.37.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Office Employees.

D. (6) \$3,718.84. E. (9) \$1,680.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$13,701.62. E. (9) \$17,694.65.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$63,399.50. E. (9) \$16,038.97.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$48,267.85. E. (9) \$1,575.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$14,991.34. E. (9) \$2,385.17.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$8,109.70.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) \$3,018.78. E. (9) \$780.46.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$6,220.96.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$28.50.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$17,080. E. (9) \$17,045.63.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.

E. (9) \$3,500.

A. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$41.34. E. (9) \$732.51.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,660. E. (9) \$1,350.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$150.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,154.94. E. (9) \$1,240.70.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$19,532.20. E. (9) \$19,466.38.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$861.59.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$12,160.08.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,199.70. E. (9) \$767.50.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$2,775.01.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,361.85. E. (9) \$5,833.62.

A. National Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$749.29. E. (9) \$1,738.84.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,812.27. E. (9) \$548.46.

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) \$4,307.38. E. (9) \$2.75.

A. Paramount Airlines, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

E. (9) \$756.18.

A. Robert Pennington, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$265. E. (9) \$50.36.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$221.30.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$460.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees.

D. (6) \$2,935.10. E. (9) \$30.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$322.50.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$350.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$48.32.

A. Quaker City Airways, Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

E. (9) \$760.25.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Association, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Commission for Research in Neurological Disorders.

D. (6) \$11,750.01. E. (9) \$9,866.46.

- A. Grant S. Ray, 114 Huron Drive, Washington, D.C.
- A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. John J. Riley, 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) \$1,480.75. E. (9) \$94.15.
- 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) \$173.88.
- A. Ruder & Finn Inc., 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United World Federalists, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$8,281.82.
- A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Los Angeles; Mobil Oil Co., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
- A. Ira Saks, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Sealy, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$229.23.
- A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,353. E. (9) \$539.18.
- A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$357.14.
- A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City and County of San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,050. E. (9) \$1,231.86.
- A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$300.
- A. Henry M. Shine, Jr., 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) \$1,846.20. E. (9) \$144.10.
- A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$379.26.
- A. John A. Smith, Continental Airlines, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Airlines, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
- A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$219.71.
- A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) \$245.82. E. (9) \$426.08.
- A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$940.56.
- A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$750.
- A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,934.40. E. (9) \$31.80.
- A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$250.
- A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
- A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 4 Albany Street, New York, N.Y., et al.
- 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. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Amerop Commodities Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$958.33. E. (9) \$7.21.
- A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$3.58.
- 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. E. (9) \$1.91.
- A. Edward J. Thyne, Northfield, Minn.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$81.94.
- A. Sigmund Timberg, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sealy, Inc., 925 Halstead Street, Chicago, Ill., et al.
E. (9) \$98.98.
- A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,535.20. E. (9) \$2,006.27.
- A. Trans-Alaskan Airlines, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
E. (9) \$331.49.
- A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,712.50. E. (9) \$25.55.
- A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
- A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,435.91.
- A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$260. E. (9) \$260.
- A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,588.80. E. (9) \$1,611.82.
- A. Arvin E. Upton & Anthony W. Lederer, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$660.
- A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 1, Ill.
D. (6) \$26.06. E. (9) \$11.55.
- A. Veterans, World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$600.
- 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) \$40.
- A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$748.65.
- 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) \$92.87.
- A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$1,289.87.
- A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$49.94.
- A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,569.19. E. (9) \$3,569.19.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

E. (9) \$2.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., Neopit, Wis.

E. (9) \$8.15.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinalcitt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Laurens Williams, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,711.15. E. (9) \$1,320.56.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.

B. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,850.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1962:

(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			
	QUARTER			
P	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 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.**—(1) *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.**—(1) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (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 "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," 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 "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

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 & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at \$800.00 per month.
\$4,150.00		TOTAL

- A. Clarence G. Adam, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$25.
- A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,684. E. (9) \$486.64.
- A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,856.42.
- A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) \$100.
- A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Air Traffic Control Association, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$690.
- A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,224.53. E. (9) \$5,224.53.
- A. Mrs. D. Allen, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 189 West Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.
- A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.
- A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
E. (9) \$1.
- A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
- A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$7,795.77.
- A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$10,392.71. E. (9) \$10,392.71.
- A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill. and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$27,608. E. (9) \$27,608.
- A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
E. (9) \$33,611.80.
- A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$16,125. E. (9) \$19,329.68.
- A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$185,794. E. (9) \$6,726.06.
- 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) \$1,203.66. E. (9) \$1,190.94.
- A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
- A. American Legion.
D. (6) \$72,650.26. E. (9) \$30,703.57.
- A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$505.54. E. (9) \$60.65.
- A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$39,436.31.
- A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$38,996.49. E. (9) \$5,478.16.
- A. American Optometric Association, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) \$5,163.03. E. (9) \$5,163.03.
- A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$731.14. E. (9) \$731.14.
- A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,679.13. E. (9) \$1,239.09.
- A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$32,900. E. (9) \$10,916.
- A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$51,527.68. E. (9) \$3,634.37.
- A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,853.71. E. (9) \$5,853.71.
- A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. American Textile Machinery Association, c/o E. C. Connor, Foster Machine Co., Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) \$1.
- A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$11,060.14.
- A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$1,402.35.
- 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. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
- A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc.
- A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
- 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.
E. (9) \$24.45.
- A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) \$0.55.
- A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,268.25.
- A. Lester Asher, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Conference of labor organizations.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$15,075.39. E. (9) \$15,075.39.
- 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) \$4,521.22. E. (9) \$4,521.22.
- A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,467.61. E. (9) \$2,467.61.
- A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$165.06. E. (9) \$165.06.
- A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$200.
- A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$67.55.
- A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
D. (6) \$1,525. E. (9) \$1,516.83.

A. Fred A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif., and 1201 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Federated Indians of California.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.

B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$267.55.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$960.

A. Richard B. Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lime Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$351.37.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$441. E. (9) \$70.80.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.

B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$759.55.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,093.74.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$187.23.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126, 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$2,569. E. (9) \$877.03.

A. John H. Beidler, 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) \$3,419. E. (9) \$132.42.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$10.64.

A. Mrs. 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.

D. (6) \$222.50. E. (9) \$66.57.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$151.02. E. (9) \$55.96.

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) \$4,420. E. (9) \$352.50.

A. Hudson Biery, 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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, Association of Marine Underwriters of the U.S., American Cargo War Risk Reinsurers Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.

E. (9) \$12.22.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mollers Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., Hongkong; the Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd., Hongkong; Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd., London.

E. (9) \$85.39.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$18.50.

A. Henry J. Blson, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,471.06.

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) \$605.

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.

A. S. B. Bledsoe, 627 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Progressive Tax Committee, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,000. E. (9) \$1,018.92.

A. Samuel B. Bledsoe, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc. 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$11,936.37.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$120. E. (9) \$4.70.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$550.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$175. E. (9) \$117.24.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph I. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$115.06. E. (9) \$50.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York World's Fair 1964-65 Corp., Flushing Meadow Park, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, 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) \$241.23.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$540. E. (9) \$8.68.

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. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Brady, 45 Monadnock Road, Newton, Mass.

B. The Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) \$494.50.

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) \$444.87.

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. 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.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$600.

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) \$512.46.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$4,387.76. E. (9) \$4,387.76.

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) \$750. E. (9) \$55.71.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,502.22.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Muck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,550. E. (9) \$10.95.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,550. E. (9) \$29.04.

A. Norman D. Burch, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$55.11.

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 of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$13,926.49. E. (9) \$365.43.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$833.33. E. (9) \$5.93.

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) \$185. E. (9) \$185.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

E. (9) \$186.50.

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) \$4,000.03.

A. Hollis W. Burt, Room 1212, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$49.87.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Northwest Country Elevator Association, 920 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

E. (9) \$2,024.44.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$760.20. E. (9) \$75.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$358.67.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$113.04.

A. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

E. (9) \$1,000.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,300. E. (9) \$405.22.

Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$205.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corporation, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) \$3,433.35.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. Michael Boake Carter, 6606 Nevius Street, Falls Church, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$720. E. (9) \$115.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 520 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$25.

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) \$1,760. E. (9) \$987.87.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Asociacion Mexicana de Empacadores de Fresa, A.C., Venustiano Carranza 48, 5° Piso, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C. V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
 D. (6) \$8,750. E. (9) \$114.82.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. West Marin (California) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.
 D. (6) \$551.25. E. (9) \$50.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
 D. (6) \$2,200. E. (9) \$1,943.97.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
 E. (9) \$48.50.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
 D. (6) \$6,825. E. (8) \$16,662.92.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$4,091.37. E. (9) \$5,660.28.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$954. E. (9) \$234.89.

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. Henry J. Clay, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. Committee on Fair Federal Tax Incentives for Depreciable Personal Property, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,000.

A. Henry J. Clay, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. The Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$9,000.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del.
 D. (6) \$20,000. E. (9) \$350.23.

A. Earle C. Clements, 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) \$750. E. (9) \$286.44.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$234.18.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$109.89.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Committee of American Tankers Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$65.67.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 307 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$665. E. (9) \$608.40.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$819.96. E. (9) \$819.96.

A. Committee on Fair Federal Tax Incentives for Depreciable Personal Property, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$7,500.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$100.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$49,022.06. E. (9) \$7,952.60.

A. Committee to Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, Post Office Box 74, Old Bridge, N.J.
 D. (6) \$17. E. (9) \$16.54.

A. R. L. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,697.06. E. (9) \$38.37.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$11.30.

A. Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
 B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$1,570.14.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,457.25.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,340.09. E. (9) \$4,340.09.

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) \$1,500. E. (9) \$18.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$7.60.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Axe-Templeton Growth Fund of Canada, Ltd., et al.
 D. (6) \$3,850. E. (9) \$29.96.

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. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
 E. (9) \$1,781.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$140.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Cuban-American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$20.46.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. International Business Machines Corp., 590 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, 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. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., and The British Cycle & Motor Cycle Industries Association, Ltd., Eaton Road, Coventry, England.

- A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$14.32.
- A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
- A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,419. E. (9) \$698.60.
- A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,700.
- A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin 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. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) \$1,034. E. (9) \$1,110.
- A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Danish Shipowners' Association, 33 Amaliegade, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$737.50. E. (9) \$18.29.
- A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$26,653.92. E. (9) \$94.03.
- A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,199.38. E. (9) \$10.35.
- A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) \$87.50. E. (9) \$87.50.
- 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. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000.
- A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$18,850.
- A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Equitable Life Insurance Co., 3900 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (5) \$2,000. E. (9) \$735.10.
- A. Tony T. Dechant.
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. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, 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) \$1,102.50.
- A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
- A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,687.59. E. (9) \$381.47.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. \$2,695.35. E. (9) \$70.35.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,514.45. E. (9) \$114.45.
- A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1,750.
- 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) \$18,189.64. E. (9) \$18,252.45.
- A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Thomas Dixon, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$437.50. E. (9) \$336.63.
- A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$193.75. E. (9) \$0.50.
- A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$343.03.
- A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$46.34.
- A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$46.35.
- A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$137.50.
- A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$883.65.
- 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) \$1,737.11. E. (9) \$67.
- A. Fred H. Dressler, Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
- A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
- A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$546.49.
- A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
- A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street 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) \$675.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,230.59. E. (9) \$2,230.59.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$15.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$100.

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) \$516.25. E. (9) \$77.15.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,404. E. (9) \$80.23.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$234.50. E. (9) \$22.05.

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) \$73.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,050. E. (9) \$318.55.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 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) \$3,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,045.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,730.79. E. (9) \$209.70.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,750. E. \$39.90.

A. Joseph C. Fagan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Clinton Fair, 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) \$3,419. E. (9) \$69.40.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$3,905. E. (9) \$2,380.86.

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) \$96,405.08. E. (9) \$23,218.40.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China, Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$32.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R.E.A. Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$500.

A. Joe G. Fender, Post Office Box 66787, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) \$3,337.09.

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 Corporation, Clewiston, Fla.; Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) \$6,951.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$799.25.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German & Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 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) \$1,150. E. (9) \$19.37.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,715.44.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) \$1,967.03.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) \$1,579.84.

A. Fordyce, Mayne, Hartman, Renard and Stribling, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. National Rejectors, Inc., subsidiary of Universal Match Corp., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) \$2,809.13.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,312.50. E. (9) \$258.54.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$340.30.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$200.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$747.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,187.50. E. (9) \$38.36.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$31,133.39. E. (9) \$9,362.60.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$32.50.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Ore.

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.

D. (6) \$675.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota railroads.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$314.60.

A. A. Arthur Gardner, 1630 Jefferson Street, Hollywood, Fla.

A. Gardner, Morrison and Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones and Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$15.07.

A. Gardner, Morrison and Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Port Louis, Mauritius.

E. (9) \$1.95.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Aubrey Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$170. E. (9) \$137.68.

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, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$154.12.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, V.I.

D. (6) \$1,272.01.

A. Phillip Goldstein, 1000 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

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) \$7,811.21. E. (9) \$6,749.08.

A. James W. Grady, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers' National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$38.15.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$4,348.45. E. (9) \$4,348.45.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward E. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$42.19.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$198.75. E. (9) \$27.72.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corporation, 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. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Smelting and Refining Co., and others.

D. (6) \$5,075. E. (9) \$1,700.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250.04. E. (9) \$134.40.

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) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,398.87.

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) \$954. E. (9) \$222.58.

A. Louis P. Hafer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Haight, Gardner, Poor & Havens, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Danish Shipowners' Association, 33 Amallegade, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, 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.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, care of General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,500.

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) \$239.30.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America.

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. E. (9) \$93.36.

A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers, P.O. Box 6081, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$2,752.28.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th 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) \$1,408.33. E. (9) \$50.50.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,511.25. E. (9) \$156.97.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$22.50.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers, P.O. Box 6081, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$225.

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) \$338. E. (9) \$70.68.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) \$4,021.72. E. (9) \$996.95.

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) \$77.85.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,943.92.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$48.50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$19.93.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru, S.A.
E. (9) \$370.44.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of High Fidelity Manufacturers, Inc., 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$28.97.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,198.75. E. (9) \$38.46.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$722.83.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,300.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Ore.
D. (6) \$1,220. E. (9) \$1,132.40.

A. K. C. Hendricks, 7303 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

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) \$2,050.66. E. (9) \$925.66.

A. John K. Herbert, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,915.70. E. (9) \$266.42.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y. and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$466.26. E. (9) \$466.26.

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) \$28.82.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 336 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) \$10.88.

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. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$71.57.

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) \$481.25.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 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.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$75.

A. L. S. Hitchner, Associations Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC, retired, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,166.67. E. (9) \$45.10.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,000.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,199.38. E. (9) \$10.35.

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.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$275.

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, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building Trades Unions, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$3,192.79.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$950.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,545.59 E. (9) \$8,545.59.

A. Evan S. Ingels, Oakwood Lane, Greenwich, Conn.

B. Time Incorporated, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$935. E. (9) \$392.23.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$20,235.02.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,530.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,160. E. (9) \$6.20.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$722.25.

A. Samuel Ishikawa, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$2,150. E. (9) \$640.20.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) \$150.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,391.23. E. (9) \$54.65.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers Association, 505 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.

D. (6) \$439.06. E. (9) \$46.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,692.48. E. (9) \$291.83.

A. Ned Johnston, 4309 Saul Road, Kensington, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$35.35.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$125.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$4,365. E. (9) \$1,510.42.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Salvador Schaps, Servidora Electrica, S.A., San Salvador, El Salvador.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$37.04.

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, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$340.44. E. (9) \$38.36.

A. David K. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$10.25.

A. David Walbridge Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Zantop Air Transport, Inc., Detroit-Metropolitan Airport, Inkster, Mich.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$18.58.

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) \$250.95.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$60.25.

A. Eugene A. Kenney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$769.92. E. (9) \$1,499.06.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$4,062.50. E. (9) \$236.95.

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) \$1,480.92. E. (9) \$1,429.28.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Rossmoor Liesure World, Seal Beach, Calif.

E. (9) \$41.04.

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) \$268.75. E. (9) \$2.93.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$725.

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) \$425.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$570. E. (9) \$35.88.

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) \$3,540.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$30.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$240.77.

A. Germaine Krettek, The Coronet, Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$3,017.69.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$8,093.65. E. (9) \$8,076.34.

A. James K. Langan, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,120.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) \$999.96.

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) \$900.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$375.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,750.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$525. E. (9) \$7.90.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$35.

A. Philip P. Leahy, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$26.87. E. (9) \$118.37.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,489. E. (9) \$2,752.63.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard T. Leonard, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$405.75.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,175. E. (9) \$167.67.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

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) \$2,229.74.

A. Lawrence J. Linck, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$806.77.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$730.33. E. (9) \$71.30.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$637.50. E. (9) \$109.73.

A. Bernard Locker, 4716 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$6.

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) \$2,499.90. E. (9) \$15.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$240.93.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.

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. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Illinois Bell Telephone Co., 212 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,400.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
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.
E. (9) \$3.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$3.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corp., 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.

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) \$2,341.67. E. (9) \$27.65.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) \$2,515.80. E. (9) \$46.80.

- A. McCormick Associates, Inc., 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,946.02. E. (9) \$2,946.02.
- A. Angus H. McDonald.
 B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,584.51 E. (9) \$222.45.
- 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. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
 B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
 D. (6) \$781.26. E. (9) \$519.32.
- A. Rev. A. J. McFarland.
 B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 D. (6) \$1,150. E. (9) \$250.
- 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.
 D. (6) \$123.28. E. (9) \$535.56.
- A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$800.
- A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,166.67. E. (9) \$30.05.
- 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) \$4,250.04. E. (9) \$571.81.
- 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) \$481.25. E. (9) \$21.17.
- A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
 D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$80.21.
- A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Miss Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.
 B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$868.50. E. (9) \$278.63.
- A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Association of Mirror Manufacturers, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Confectioners Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,166.66. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Mail Advertising Service Association International, 622 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,180. E. (9) \$2,560.13.
- A. Ben J. Man, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,411.62. E. (9) \$757.85.
- A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
 B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$17.30.
- A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
 B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$170.35.
- A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$537.51.
- A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$1,180.88.
- 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) \$4,040.
- A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$176.31.
- A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$100.
- A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L 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. Paul Marshall, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$92.04. E. (9) \$249.65.
- A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$75.
- A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,188. E. (9) \$63.
- A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$150.
- A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$608.91. E. (9) \$203.51.
- A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$186.25.
- A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$38. E. (9) \$92.
- A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,430. E. (9) \$451.
- A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 D. (6) \$2,205.
- A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mehler, Goldsborough, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,000.
- A. Mehler, Goldsborough, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Ferro Corp., the O. Hommel Co., Glostex Chemicals, Inc., and Pemco Corp.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$95.88.
- A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,419. E. (9) \$126.90.
- A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$141.90.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
 E. (9) \$1,525.78.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis.

A. C. R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 930 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$50.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
 B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
 B. General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
 D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
 B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
 D. (6) \$2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 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) \$3,000.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$751.50.

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.

A. Mobilhome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$2,346.29.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Vocational Association, 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) \$825.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
 B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$30.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
 B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$24.50.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
 D. (6) \$1,410. E. (9) \$137.75.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
 D. (6) \$6,500. E. (9) \$6,926.96.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
 D. (6) \$9,500. E. (9) \$1,134.82.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
 D. (6) \$2,370.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$304.80.

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. Warren Mullin, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$37.90.

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) \$600. E. (9) \$600.

A. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$44,032. E. (9) \$13,530.94.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$2,118.37.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
 D. (6) \$13,750. E. (9) \$24.25.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$58,161.61. E. (9) \$13,513.92.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$35.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 718 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Maurice G. Herndon, Federal Liaison, 801 Warner Building, 13th and E Streets, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$8,440.06.

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.
 D. (6) \$3,297.10. E. (9) \$3,350.69.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$7,230.68.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 343 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$110,454.61. E. (9) \$1,665.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
 D. (6) \$3,567.04. E. (9) \$509.71.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$14,273.70. E. (9) \$682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,230.59. E. (9) \$2,230.59.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$6,503.92. E. (9) \$6,503.92.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$269,971.93. E. (9) \$7,005.99.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
 D. (6) \$8,625.

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 Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$5,181.03.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$3,422.58. E. (9) \$3,422.58.
- A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$230.42. E. (9) \$425.
- A. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,204.67. E. (9) \$951.49.
- 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.
- A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$27,573.15. E. (9) \$2,165.80.
- A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$12,859.91. E. (9) \$12,859.91.
- A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,376.08. E. (9) \$1,376.08.
- A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$46.12.
- A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Member associations of the league.
D. (6) \$350,197.42. E. (9) \$4,221.79.
- A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,652.50. E. (9) \$2,652.50.
- A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,673.10. E. (9) \$1,668.22.
- A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,611.94.
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,514.60. E. (9) \$4,514.60.
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$845.50.
- A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$24,297.04. E. (9) \$12,127.77.
- A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,199.70. E. (9) \$767.50.
- A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,167.50. E. (9) \$12,463.34.
- A. National Relectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) \$2,809.13.
- A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$6,199.74. E. (9) \$6,199.74.
- A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$12,625. E. (9) \$5,399.35.
- A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$32,335. E. (9) \$10,029.09.
- A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$652.85.
- A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$195,098.83. E. (9) \$3,984.30.
- A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,723.02. E. (9) \$1,990.37.
- A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$2,888.12.
- 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) \$955.
- A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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) \$4,750.02. E. (9) \$3,496.01.
- A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md., and others.
- A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$799.25. E. (9) \$799.25.
- A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,650.
- A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 Williams Street, New York City.
D. (6) \$1,956.22. E. (9) \$4,845.89.
- A. T. A. Nooner, Jr., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,600.
- A. Walter O. Noreen, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$100.
- A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$160.07.
- A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Northwest Country Elevator Association, 920 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) \$2,024.44.
- A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$675.
- A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$26,705.65.
- A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,374.96. E. (9) \$208.60.
- 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. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$600.
- A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$500.
- A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$500.
- A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1,511.71.
- 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) \$19.30. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Oliver & Donnelly, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$146. E. (9) \$246.77.
- A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$2,805. E. (9) \$105.65.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$25.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
 B. The 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) \$185.

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) \$923.10. E. (9) \$6.75.

A. Wm. Edison Owen, 215 C Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Manning Clagett, Robert Smith, and John Underwood, Accokeek, Md.
 D. (6) \$250.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Michael Padnos, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$38.30.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
 B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
 B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
 B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$127.35.

A. James G. Patton.
 B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,650. E. (9) \$1,140.63.

A. Paul, Weiss, Riffkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,275. E. (9) \$335.93.

A. Phillip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
 B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
 D. (6) \$1,900. E. (9) \$130.16.

A. Phillip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
 B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
 D. (6) \$2,300. E. (9) \$160.20.

A. Phillip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
 B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$179.70.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
 B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
 D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$210.53.

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) \$23.25.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,730.24. E. (9) \$2,031.92.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$5.05.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$186.85.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) 926.43.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
 E. (9) \$3,135.56.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
 D. (6) \$188,508.04. E. (9) \$1,350.

A. Sanford L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

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) \$1,000.

A. James K. Polk, Esq., 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$263. E. (9) \$5.50.

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. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$132.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$300.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$347.50.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 E. (9) \$1.35.

A. Purcell & Nelson, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
 D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$150.93.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
 B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., etc.
 D. (6) \$8,249.97. E. (9) \$7,516.12.

A. Cushman S. Radebaugh, Box 1928, Orlando, Fla.
 B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
 E. (9) \$44.57.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$352.95.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
 B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
 D. (6) \$167. E. (9) \$110.80.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

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. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$24.10.

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) \$514.94. E. (9) \$364.94.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$22,750. E. (9) \$14,387.94.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
 B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,300.01. E. (9) \$3,965.06.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
 B. Texas railroads.
 D. (6) \$78.50. E. (9) \$269.05.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$800.02. E. (9) \$95.48.

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) \$1,250. E. (9) \$203.14.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$6,250.

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) \$91,700.35.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,925.50. E. (9) \$5,734.16.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,060. E. (9) \$358.10.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
 B. Louisiana railroads.
 D. (6) \$37.50. E. (9) \$147.62.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue 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 & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$94.35.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$170.74.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

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) \$450. E. (9) \$96.35.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,419. E. (9) \$478.65.

A. James F. Rill, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$135. E. (9) \$15.

A. Eugene Ritzner, 2400 Benedict Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,200.

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. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$175.

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) \$375.

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) \$5,260.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. T. J. Ross & Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$4,125.50.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$235.39. E. (9) \$75.29.

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) \$367.71.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Air Traffic Control Association, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$69.10.

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) \$2,999.88. E. (9) \$60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, etc.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.

A. L. R. Sanford, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,950.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Washington D.C. Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,375. E. (9) \$77.02.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$20.66.

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) \$1,125. E. (9) \$82.90.

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) \$812.50. E. (9) \$108.28.

A. David C. Sharmar, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$203.53.

A. John H. Sharon, Esq., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$968.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. City and County of San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$4,050. E. (9) \$1,558.79.

A. David A. Shepard, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$420.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$992.50. E. (9) \$20.

A. Richard C. Shipman.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,387. E. (9) \$368.74.

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) \$700.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,166.66. E. (9) \$100.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,867. E. (9) \$1,096.63.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$120.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,312.50. E. (9) \$222.79.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,812.50. E. (9) \$9.60.

A. Carleton D. Smith, RCA Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

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) \$200.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 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) \$4,650.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 West Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

D. (6) \$971.10. E. (9) \$1,401.38.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$769. E. (9) \$176.31.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 954 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$189.38.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$90.43.

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) \$1,471.14.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$697.10. E. (9) \$3,457.87.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$10.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Sloop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,206.90.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, Esq., 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$471.29.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$45,818.20. E. (9) \$4,336.04.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

E. (9) \$514.94.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$830. E. (9) \$188.01.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$15.32.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$3,839.77.

A. Howard H. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$161.80.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tool & Fine Steel Committee, Reading, Pa.

E. (9) \$175.

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. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$750.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$220.63.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$225.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 4 Albany Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y., and Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$268.15.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.
D. (6) \$1,153.85.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy.
D. (6) \$1,562.50.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Kampelman & McLaughlin, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$1,024.25.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600.

A. Verne R. Sullivan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, 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.
E. (9) \$102.60.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

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. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$443.44.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$958.33. E. (9) \$27.65.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. B. Thayne, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,416.67. E. (9) \$31.15.

A. Cecil A. Thomas, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,346.15. E. (9) \$281.22.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,397.71.

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) \$795. E. (9) \$19.19.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 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) \$147.50. E. (9) \$151.19.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,723.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,062.50. E. (9) \$260.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of U.S.A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,831.93. E. (9) \$1,484.23.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$51.80.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue 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) \$1,762.50. E. (9) \$69.23.
- A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$19.25.
- 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) \$2.
- A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$463.48.
- A. John W. Turner, 814 Railway Labor Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilot's Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$72.55.
- A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) \$10,000. E. (9) \$85.16.
- A. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) \$903.94.
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,409.04.
- A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$322,152.11. E. (9) \$38,574.39.
- A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$32,482.01.
- A. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$24.45.
- A. Henry A. S. van Daalen, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Carrier Conference-Irregular Route, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$1.
- A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, DC.
B. National Rural Electrical Cooperation 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.
D. (6) \$66.43. E. (9) \$14.65.
- A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$90.
- A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Voice of the People in Action, the Society of the People, Inc., 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
- A. Paul F. Wagner, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$562.50. E. (9) \$410.45.
- A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$8.
- 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) \$425. E. (9) \$6.10.
- 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) \$478. E. (9) \$17.55.
- A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
- A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$13,950. E. (9) \$13,741.29.
- 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. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10. E. (9) \$3.05.
- 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) \$225. E. (9) \$50.72.
- A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,396.10. E. (9) \$301.64.
- 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) \$167.30.
- A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) \$603.33.
- A. Donald Francis White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,666.66. E. (9) \$155.90.
- A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Shippers Association.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$66.85.
- A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
- A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$878.
- A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$30.25.
- 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., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp, Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$150.
- A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$1,129.15.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$6.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barger, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) \$7.25.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barger, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) \$9.45.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barger, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., Neopit, Wis.
E. (9) \$28.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barger, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinalett Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

E. (9) \$5.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barger, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

E. (9) \$5.65.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Laurens Williams, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$82.80.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 714 Associations Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$2,769.31.

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) \$1,523.08.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$303.94.

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. Venio Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Alexander W. Wuerker, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$542. E. (9) \$99.91.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$720. E. (9) \$23.86.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,311.

A. Zantop Air Transport, Inc., Detroit-Metropolitan Airport, Inkster, Mich.

E. (9) \$318.58.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington D.C., and 11 LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1962:

(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			
	PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT			
	P			
	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]

A. Charles D. Ablard, 930 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edwin N. Altman.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Shareholders Committee, General Aniline & Film Corp., 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders International Union, 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Hod Carriers', Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Operating Engineers, 1125 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Arens, 500 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard B. Barker, and Jay W. Glasman, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.

A. Ralph O. Beck, Post Office Box 2200, Honolulu, Hawaii, and 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Telephone Co., Post Office Box 2200, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. S. B. Bledsoe, 627 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Progressive Tax Committee, Washington, D.C.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter W. Brudno, 2400 Adolphus Tower, Dallas, Tex.

B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Northwest Country Elevator Association, 920 Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold M. Campbell, 2536 Marine Drive, Bremerton, Wash.

B. Marks Mines, Inc., 685 Northwest Eighth Street, Gresham, Oreg.

A. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Michael Boake Carter, 6606 Nevius Street, Falls Church, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and Galaxy, Inc., 1218 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Casey, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. James E. Lofland, 923 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph E. Casey, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Paramount Airlines, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Armand Chankalian, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. United Builders Association of New York, Inc., 118 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Jeppesen & Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Post Office Box 1189, Houston, Tex.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Asociacion Mexicana de Empacadores de Fresa, A.C., Venustiano Carranza 48-50 Piso, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico.

A. Charles Patrick Clark & Charles Patrick Clark, Esq., 500 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, Long Beach, Calif.

A. William H. Coburn, 530 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Export Expansion Through Subsidiaries Abroad, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Cope, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don Costa, 3517 Brandon Avenue, Roanoke, Va.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Costinett, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. A. P. Moller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. I. Irving Davidson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government of Nicaragua, Managua, Nicaragua, C.A.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. J. D. Durand, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde A. Erwin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Federal Counsel Associates, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Federal Counsel Associates, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William C. Geer.

B. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.

A. Jack Golodner, 800 Fourth Street SW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
 B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. William B. Harmon, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Institute of High Fidelity Manufacturers, Inc., 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. James R. Jenks, 1024 Quebec Terrace, Silver Spring, Md.
 B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1024 Quebec Terrace, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Henry B. Jordan, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The United States Graphite Co., 1621 Holland, Saginaw, Mich.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street, Washington, D.C.
 B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ronald Korsan, 5343 Main Street, Skokie, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Tennessee Building, Houston, Tex.

A. Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
 B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Ambrose V. McCall, Jr., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Shareholders Committee, General Aniline & Film Corp., 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. McCormick Associates, Inc., 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. McCormick Associates, Inc., 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Mirror Manufacturers, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mail Advertising Service Association International, 622 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. N. Mallon, 1522 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
 B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry Irwin Marks, 67 Harvard Avenue, Allston, Mass.
 B. Marks Mines, Inc., 685 Northwest Eighth Street, Gresham, Ore.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. C. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Mayson, Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
 B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Pacific Lighting Corp., 600 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Manfred L. Minzer, Jr., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Federal Counsel Associates, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. L. Moody, Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
 B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Warren Mullin, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
 B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Inc., 755 NADA Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 401 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Northwest Country Elevator Association, 920 Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Olson, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Monroe Oppenheimer, 1026 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Signal Hill Telecasting Corp., 5915 Berthold Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Pacific Lighting Corp., 600 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stanley Peterson, 2901 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Product Development International, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard Ring, 679 Warburton Avenue, Yonkers, N.Y.

A. Kenneth M. Rofrano, 637 Warburton Avenue, Yonkers, N.Y.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1016 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Haitian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port Au Prince, Haiti.

A. Abe Rubin, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ruder & Flinn, Inc., 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. United World Federalists, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., and Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. John Seath, 320 Park Avenue NW., New York, N.Y.
 B. International Telegraph & Telephone Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Association National Des Tisseurs de Tapis, Velours et Tissus D'Ameublement 24, Rue Montoyer, Brussels, Belgium.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., World Trade Center, Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp., Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex.

A. Smith Lobbying Service, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Tool & Fine Steel Committee, care of the Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry Stewart, 321 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, Calif.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Japan Export Footwear Manufacturers' Association, No. 11, 3-Chome, Denma-Cho, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 A. Aeromarine, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cecil Thomas, 245 Second Street NE., NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Bert M. Tollefson, Jr., 14th & L Streets, Washington, D.C.
 B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carol Lee Tucker, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Federal Counsel Associates, Inc., 20 E Street, Washington, D.C.

A. United Builders Association of New York, Inc., 118 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, 528 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
 B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. W. M. Wheeler, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Air Carrier Association, Inc., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurens Williams & James V. Heffernan, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. of America, Washington, D.C., and The Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Memorial Day Exercises at Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my Memorial Day speech for Lawrence Post No. 15, the American Legion, at Lawrence, Mass., on May 30, 1962:

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT LAWRENCE, MASS., MAY 30, 1962

Greetings: The bright, young flags move in the breeze above the old—the silent graves. In closed ranks here, at the veterans' lot; but scattered like sentinels throughout these cemeteries, the proud flags honor the brave Americans who fought for freedom in every generation from the War of Revolution to the Korean war.

Each year, we come to decorate their graves. By this tender and beautiful custom, we thank them for the faith and the courage that they have bequeathed to us.

The flags above their graves remind us that we, the living, are the bridge between the past and the future.

Each one of the veterans who sleep in this final bivouac, had the courage that is immortal. And each had the confidence that succeeding generations would be true to the

heritage won by sacrifice, and go forward, unafraid, toward the realization of human dignity under God.

This is the inspiration of the dead to the living. So that we, during our years on this earth will be faithful to that trust, advancing the cause of human knowledge, understanding, and fulfillment.

The departed veterans whom we honor today have strengthened us by the example of their courage, showing us the way to face the dangers of the unknown future.

Their spirit lives on in the members of the Armed Forces who guard the frontiers of freedom from West Berlin to Southeast Asia.

The Declaration of Independence proclaims: " * * * all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights * * * "

In the struggle of our people for independence, that began in 1775, they hungered for these rights, and for the privilege of representative government.

Through the tests of time, our Nation has proved itself to be the leader of mankind's search for a better way of life in which all will share. But with this leadership of those who look to us for guidance and for help, we acquire the burdens of responsibility.

In this rapidly changing world of scientific breakthroughs, of social and economic adjustments, we must prove that the spirit of freedom moves with the times; that its fundamental truths can shape the evolving pattern of society with due regard for man's rights and his responsibilities.

The courage required is expressed in many ways.

In religious worship which opens the human heart to the redeeming grace of divine love. In the classrooms of the Nation where teachers nourish the potential in every

young mind. In the hospitals and medical laboratories where the battle against disease and pain is waged with increasing success. In commerce, industry, government, the arts, the sciences, and in the daily chores of good citizenship, democracy is at work, liberating the energies and the talents that give meaning to the life of each man, and contribute to the advance of civilization.

They have brought to us the threshold of a new and what promises to be the most brilliant age of discovery as we set our course to reach the moon, and the worlds beyond.

Since last Memorial Day, the brainpower and the productive facilities behind our space effort have twice succeeded in launching intrepid Americans into orbit around the earth.

In the beginning, there were doubts whether the man in the capsule could survive the challenges of his strange environment and doubts as to whether there was a place for his intelligence to operate in the presence of so many automatic devices.

To those of us who followed in our imagination the voyages of astronauts John Glenn and Scott Carpenter while they were in progress, we identified ourselves with the dangers they risked. As their voices were relayed to us from the lonely orbits they traveled in space, we were almost overwhelmed by the conflicting emotions of hope and fear for their safety.

There is courage supreme; daring the unknown and death in man's pioneering quest for new horizons.

Then we heard their calm voices reassuring us that all was under control and going well. And we knew that the wonders of science and the marvelous machines that it builds will never make man obsolete.