



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 139: 23: Search me, O God, and know my heart, try me, and know my thoughts.

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we earnestly beseech Thee to create within us those aspirations and desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy and may they be the progenitors of lofty achievements.

Inspire our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress to meet their arduous tasks and responsibilities with composure and confidence.

Grant that their energies and efforts to discharge their duties faithfully may never be dissipated by fears and frustrations.

Help them to see clearly the definite part that they must take in every forward- and upward-looking program of thought and action.

Give them a firm grasp on life's moral and spiritual realities and verities.

May they daily witness by character and conduct that they are always in close contact and communion with Thee. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Vir-

ginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 384. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes;

S. 449. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans;

S. 583. An act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force;

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 978. An act to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; and

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western river rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—A NEW WEAPON IN THE FIGHT FOR EQUAL CIVIL RIGHTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it was some 91 years ago that the 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted. That amendment provides in section 2 that if in any State Negroes are denied the right to vote, then the representation of this State in this body shall be reduced proportionately. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is time now for us to put that amendment into effect; and so, accordingly, within the next few days I shall introduce legislation to en-

act the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment of the Constitution by calling for a new census to be taken, without waiting until 1970, and requiring that the Census Bureau shall take into account in compiling its population figures in that new census the extent to which Negroes have in fact been denied the right to vote in Southern States, a fact that has repeatedly been reported in the reports of the Civil Rights Commission. Once these new figures are in and have been certified to the President the realignment of seats in the House as I understand it, becomes automatic, without further legislation action being required.

Here, as I see it, is one simple and effective way in which Congress can apply real pressure to those Southern States which still refuse to give the Negro the vote, or who still drag their feet in according Negroes the rights and privileges to which they are entitled under the Constitution.

Here is a bill which will provide us the easiest way I know of to break the current civil rights logjam in the South.

With recalcitrant States faced with the actual loss of seats in Congress, I am sure we could look for action that, compared with what has gone on since the historic Supreme Court decision on school integration was first handed down, would really make our heads spin.

A RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO RING BELLS AT MIDDAY ON THE 4TH DAY OF JULY EACH YEAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have on this day introduced a resolution calling on the American people to ring bells at midday on the 4th day of July each year. This thought originated with the third grade of Franklin School in Marion, Ind. These youngsters, encouraged by their teacher, Mrs. Schaffner, and their principal, Mrs. Ballard, have undertaken the task of encouraging the people of their city to ring every available bell on that day as a reminder that it is the day freedom was born here in America.

I recently participated in an inspirational program at Franklin School in Marion where I presented a bell and dedicated it to this inspirational and

patriotic purpose. What a motivation it was to hear the expression on the part of these young Americans of their love of country and dedication to the principles of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would call upon all Americans to join with these young patriots and ring the bells proclaiming, as was proclaimed with the ringing of the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, that America is a free nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GOP: PARTY WITH A POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post columnist Marquis Childs has a piece on the editorial page charging that, in the context of civil rights, the Republicans are a party without a policy. I should like to call Mr. Childs' attention to H.R. 3139, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. McCulloch], and to the 23 bills identical in content to Mr. McCulloch's introduced by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and others on this side of the aisle. This bill offers sound progress in the civil rights field. Substantive gains could be achieved by its enactment. On page 1538 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1963, will be found a statement of the Republican position. Press releases were issued and a press conference held at the same time.

Yet, Mr. Childs and the press generally has seen fit to ignore this effort on the part of the Republicans who serve on the committee which has jurisdiction over this subject. These are the men in the Republican Party who can most effectively move this matter forward. Mr. Childs, however, chooses to overlook what they have done, and what others in agreement with them among the Republicans in this body have done. Either Mr. Childs has not done his homework or he is consciously misrepresenting the facts which exist. In either case his acts are a damning indictment of his failure to do the job of reporting with which he is charged.

And compounding the situation is the fact that Mr. Childs and his fellows in the reporting profession, or the great majority of them, have not seen fit to report the Republican efforts of which I speak. I can understand the average

newspaper reader of this country accepting Mr. Childs' distortion without question, for Mr. Childs and those in his profession who share his view of the job of reporting in modern America have done their best to keep only one side of the news before the people. Here is the real threat to the continuation of our system of representative government.

A FABLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time there was a city named "Wonderland" located in the "District of Confusion" on the banks of a river called the "Puttermuck." In that city was a great representative body whose duty was to look after the interests of the people, and it was called the Congress.

One day in May—on the 28th at 3:20 p.m.—to be exact, a Member of the Congress received a telephone call from a captain in the Navy who told the Congressman that a contract for \$7,854,597 had been given to an industry which employed many of his constituents.

The Congressman had received similar calls before and suspected that he was late learning the news. He knew that there is no market for stale news, but because of the great concern of the people he represented he telephoned several hundred miles to make sure they had heard about it. That call cost the taxpayers \$1.05. He learned that the news had been announced many hours earlier by another Member of the same Congress, but of a different political party, and had been printed in the afternoon papers long before 3:20 p.m. This call from "Wonderland" was duplicated by four Senators and three Congressmen by actual count. Six out of the seven who spent \$1.05 each of the people's money to convey stale news wasted a total of \$6.30.

Mr. Speaker, these are silly games for these make-believe people to play, and this is a foolish way for them to waste their constituent's money.

THE TORTOISE IS WINNING THE RACE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am certain all of you recall the childhood story about the race between the tortoise and the hare. As the story goes, the tortoise won the race by sheer determination and persistence. My fight for the concept of true competitive bidding in military procurement reminds me of that story, for my "persistent" efforts are bearing fruit.

One giant step forward in this long "race" toward the goal to achieve more competition in the manufacture of defense equipment occurred today when the Army canceled a proposed no-competition purchase of 240 test sets used to check operation of a gyromagnetic compass. The action came after my charge in my speech on the House floor yesterday that a false certification of "no drawings available" for the production of the equipment was being used to shut out competition and channel a contract to a past producer.

These charges were substantiated in a matter of hours yesterday after I conferred with Brigadier General Stanwix-Hay, Chief of the Army's Electronics Materiel Command in Philadelphia, on the telephone. General Stanwix-Hay checked into the matter immediately, found that I was right and took direct action by ordering the procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set—for which \$220 was paid the last time a no-competition purchase was arranged—"pulled off the street" immediately and requesting a full and unbiased investigation by the Army's Inspector General of the obviously false certification. Further, he assured me that the procurement will be carried out under full competitive conditions when it is reissued soon, and he warmly thanked me for bringing the case to light.

I wish I could get the same cooperation from other officials when I pinpoint waste and worse in defense purchasing elsewhere. I congratulate General Stanwix-Hay, but at the same time, I would suggest the civil or military servant who set up the false certification should be disciplined severely. If this case had gone undetected, the contract would have gone to a favored producer at an unchallenged price. Now, I predict a bid considerably below \$220 per unit will result when the 240 test sets are bought competitively. I must take sharp issue with a system which allows such obvious flouting of purchasing regulations and the law. There is something wrong when a U.S. Congressman must investigate and turn up the facts that hide behind redtape and fine print.

To briefly relate the story as it happened, upon learning of the false certification by the Army, I scrutinized the Army's own files and private business sources to prove that the test set had been purchased twice before from Winslow Electronics, Asbury Park, N.J., as a part of a June 1961 contract, and the Government paid \$1,000 for and received a complete set of manufacturing drawings for the equipment. Further, this equipment is almost exactly the same as an earlier test set called the TS-1086. Made as a commercial "off the shelf" item as early as 1958 by Sorenson & Co., Stamford, Conn., this set, too, was accompanied by complete drawings. Hence, the Army has drawings for both sets.

I hope the Inspector General turns up some bodies in his investigation. Such people should be severely disciplined as an example to others. Once we see a few middle-grade paper shufflers pay for their mistakes and worse, we will see a real clean-up come about in procure-

ment. The comparatively few bad apples in the procurement barrel make all the rest look bad.

A week ago, I lauded two Navy officers for stopping a procurement under similar conditions. The Navy swept the case under the rug. Americans should thank General Stanwix-Hay for his action which will save tax dollars and improve procurement efficiency while exposing those who misuse their positions of trust and authority. Those who rig purchases either through inefficiency or by design should not escape punishment while those who bring the facts to light and cause corrections to be made are being praised.

FAIRY STORY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amusement to the fairy story by the gentleman from Maryland, and I want to say that I think I can remedy this situation for him—at least, I will try. They did these things much better in the Eisenhower administration. There was no money wasted, and they never bothered to notify the minority at all about any of these projects. We read about them in the newspapers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 57]

Adair	Gibbons	Ostertag
Anderson	Goodell	Passman
Andrews	Gray	Pilcher
Ashmore	Griffiths	Pillion
Auchincloss	Hanna	Powell
Battin	Healey	Purcell
Blatnik	Henderson	Rains
Bolling	Hoffman	Randall
Bow	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burton	Hutchinson	Riehlman
Celler	Ichord	Roberts, Ala.
Clancy	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Clark	Kee	Scott
Collier	King, N.Y.	Secrest
Daniels	Kluczynski	Shelley
Davis, Ga.	Knox	Shipley
Davis, Tenn.	Laird	Siler
Dawson	Landrum	Snyder
Denton	Lesinski	Stephens
Devine	McClory	Tupper
Diggs	McIntire	Van Deerlin
Dorn	McLoskey	Van Pelt
Dowdy	Martin, Mass.	Waggonner
Dwyer	Michel	Walter
Edmondson	Minshall	Weaver
Ellsworth	Montoya	Wharton
Everett	Morrison	Widnall
Finnegan	Nedzi	Wilson
Flood	Nelsen	Charles H.
Flynt	Nygaard	Winstead
Forrester	O'Konski	Wyman
Fulton, Tenn.	Osmer	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 340 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FAIRY STORY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the distinguished, lovely, lovable, even-tempered lady from New York for getting me a larger audience and to say that somehow or other I cannot help being reminded of the story of Lady Astor and Sir Winston Churchill, when they had a little argument and she said, "If you were my husband, I would give you poison," to which he is reputed to have replied, "Lady, if I were your husband, I would take it."

REPLY TO FAIRY STORY

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank that courtly, even-tempered, well-mannered gentleman from Ohio. I am also happy that I had a quorum call so that some Members of the House could take an example from his courtliness, his charm, and his Old World stories. I made the quorum call because I knew the gentleman would speak again, and sometimes he is worth listening to.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 374) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That RICHARD H. ICHORD, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ATTEND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to appoint a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the Committee on Education and Labor to attend the International Labor Organization Conference

in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 1, 1963, and June 30, 1963.

He is further authorized to appoint as alternates a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the said committee.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the aforesaid delegates and alternates from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the U.S. Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the Members of the House today a resolution which would authorize travel to the International Labor Organization at its meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, by official representatives of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the resolution is very clear. The Members remember that just a few days ago the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and myself, by direction of the Committee on Rules, brought to the floor of the House a somewhat similar resolution. However, at that time there were some special provisions contained in the resolution which caused some Members to view it with some concern.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution which would authorize the Speaker to appoint official representatives of the House of Representatives to represent us at the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Speaker would be authorized to appoint one Representative from the majority and one Representative from the minority and also to appoint alternates in both cases. They would be official representatives of our body.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this it does require full reporting procedures and requires that the Members who may be appointed or who will be doing the traveling to be bound by the requirements of the per diem and travel arrangements and to make full disclosure and full representation of such expenditures which would

not be required if these Members were traveling under the auspices of the State Department or without this official stamp of approval by this body.

It would further, of course, permit and authorize the use of counterpart funds for this travel to and from, and during the time they were in Geneva, subject to the availability of such local currencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the resolution would be approved and that the Speaker be permitted to make the appointments as official representatives.

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

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BURLERSON. The reason for this resolution is the simple fact that the Education and Labor Committee does not have authorization to travel outside the continental limits of the United States. This authority was not included in their authorizing legislation permitting money to be appropriated to the committee for the conduct of their committee business. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is exactly right and I think very clearly states the need for this resolution.

Mr. BURLERSON. There was some misunderstanding at the time this matter was on the floor a few days ago. There was obviously some confusion as to the necessity for this resolution to be brought before us. I thought it was well to develop this point. As the gentleman knows, this authority has been given by the Rules Committee which, of course, the gentleman is now representing, to some other committees as a blanket authorization because of the nature of their investigations and studies abroad.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from Texas, because it very clearly spells out the reasons why we are here today on this resolution.

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

Mr. SISK. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I should also like to ask my friends in the House to realize that this is a somewhat different resolution. In the previous resolution there was authority for this Member to make certain other trips which are not included in this resolution. I think it is also important to recognize that the House, since 1919, has always had official representation in the odd years when the Senate does not go to the International Labor Organization. The effect of the action that we took a few weeks ago was to leave the House without any official representation which I am sure, of course, was not the intent of the House.

I might also point out, and I want to speak very frankly, that the chairman of the committee is already at the ILO, not as the official representative of the House, but he is there as an invitee of the State Department. Therefore, this resolution merely brings, I think, some dignity back to the House and gives the House official representation subject to the appointments of the Speaker. Incidentally, it will require anybody appointed by the Speaker to detail the expenditures he makes, whereas if you

go as an invitee of the State Department you make no report whatsoever. The ILO is a most useful body. Members of Congress have and should represent our country. I feel deeply the House should adopt the resolution before us.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the explanation of my colleague from California because I think it very ably spells out the reason for this resolution.

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

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The statement was made, I might say, that this required correct reporting. I will ask the gentleman whether or not it is his understanding that the reports have been correct in the past so we can logically believe these reports will be correct.

Mr. SISK. Of course, I might say I would not want to speculate on the accuracy or inaccuracy of any reports that have been heretofore filed. This resolution very specifically spells out the requirements of the reporting procedure. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLERSON] and his committee are very vigorously watching this situation, I know, and I feel certain are going to see that proper and legal steps are taken to require the reports as we have provided under our rules.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Would it be a logical assumption, if I might direct the question to the gentleman from California, if the reports have not been filed correctly up to this time, that it is illogical for us to assume they will be filed correctly from now on?

Mr. SISK. As I said, I am assuming that the reports heretofore filed have been correct, because I have no knowledge that they have been otherwise, and therefore assume that those in the future would be correct.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In view of the interest which the House showed in this matter a few weeks ago, I believe we should thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for clarifying the situation and for making a very frank, correct, and to-the-point comment. I think those of us who listened carefully to his remarks appreciate his contribution in clearing the air and helping in sending this resolution to a justified true test.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree with me that when a Member of the House, denied by the House the authority to travel to a given place, then goes to the State Department and obtains financing for his trip, is defeating the will of the House of Representatives?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from Iowa, I think, shares with me the feeling that

neither of us can be the judge in this case. It was my understanding, I might say to my good friend from Iowa, that certain Members of the House said that they would not attend this meeting unless such a resolution were passed, which would make their status official and they would have the consent and approval of the House. I cannot speak for anyone else.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not agree with me that the House of Representatives should take some action legislatively to halt this business of a Member being able to nullify the will of the House of Representatives in this respect?

Mr. SISK. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman from Iowa's objective. This is what we intend to do. This is in accordance with the action we took early this year in connection with travel.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I inquire of the gentleman from California who is now offering the resolution in what position this leaves the delegate that is now attending the meeting? Is he a representative of the House of Representatives? I am speaking now of the delegate who is already attending this meeting as a delegate or a representative of the State Department. Will this resolution make him also a representative of the House of Representatives?

Mr. SISK. If I could explain to the gentleman from Florida the situation as I understand it, the meeting, of course, has not yet begun. I believe it will be starting next week, as I understand, probably during the next week. This is subject to designation by the Speaker. Then the gentleman to whom my friend from Florida refers would become an official delegate, because, as I understand, these delegates are appointed through conference with the State Department, and it is my understanding that the State Department is our official representative in matters of international affairs and actually makes the approach to the Speaker for a representative of the House, or the Senate, as the case may be, that representation be made.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In order to clear this matter up about Members going to the State Department and getting designated as representatives to the ILO Conference, I think it should be pointed out that the State Department made a request to the Speaker and the Speaker designated two Members of the House to go to this Conference. This is not a question of a Member going around the House to the State Department and getting designated.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of the majority leader. I think that is very clear.

I had promised to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. In view of the fact that the position of the Department of State

has been referred to here, after the House turned down by an overwhelming vote to designate House Members to attend the ILO then I, having been suggested as a delegate, said I would not accept unless the House approved. Insofar as the position of the State Department is concerned, they did have the authority to send delegates, and after the House turned it down, they offered to send me. I, in turn, said I would not go unless the House acted favorably and I could be there representing the House of Representatives and not the State Department.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution has been pretty well explained by Members on both sides of the aisle up to this point. In connection with the discussion that has taken place, I would just like to recall two or three things to your attention which may not have been brought up. Once again, this is an original resolution. We are not talking about something that when we are going to adopt it, we are then going to go into Committee of the Whole. As soon as we have completed the discussion of this resolution, House Resolution 368, upon voting on it, when it is passed, that will be the end of it. I do think it is a result of our action the last time the press reported in various columns that the House failed to place brakes on POWELL or that we gave carte blanche authority to spend as much as he wanted. I think the press report is correct. I do not in any way find fault with them.

However, no Member in voting against that resolution voted for the reason to give any individual carte blanche authority to just go ahead and use all the counterpart funds they wanted. I do not think anybody had that in mind when they voted against it. I think that it was the result of confusion of some wording. It is better in this one. It has been reworded and is specific as to where the individual is going to go. I believe they will get \$16 a day over there and they cannot live in Geneva on \$16 a day and they will have to spend some money out of their own pockets and if they use counterpart funds, they have to report back to the House.

As far as the gentleman over there is concerned, there is a little difference of opinion among lawyers but my personal opinion as an attorney is that if he is appointed and continues to go under the State Department and does not accept counterpart funds under House Resolution 368, I do not think he will have to make any report. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] stated he intends to make a report. On this side of the aisle, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be appointed as the principal member from the minority side and that possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will be appointed as an alternate. May I say this one thing, when we

are placing this responsibility on the distinguished Speaker to appoint these individuals, particularly in view of the action which we took the other day, I think we owe him the respect of passing this resolution and standing behind him, if we are asking him to appoint people to go to an organization of which we are a member and have already contributed almost \$5 million over the years to the operation of the International Labor Organization. I urge approval of this resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Some suggestion was made here that these appointments are dictated by the State Department. As you will see from the resolution, two of the Members who could be appointed by the Speaker are to be representatives of the minority. I want the record to show that on such occasions as this the Speaker always confers with the minority leader and accepts our recommendation as to who is to be appointed. We confer with our members of the committee involved, and then we make the suggestion which, as I say, has always been followed by the Speaker. So far as I am concerned, I have never been conscious of any State Department intervention and, certainly, I do not go to the State Department to ask for their approval or disapproval of any designations that may be made from the minority side.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to reiterate what I said when the earlier resolution was up for consideration. It is important that we do pass this resolution and have officially designated Members of the House as participants in this ILO conference. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, we contribute substantial moneys to support the ILO, and I think it is entirely proper that we authorize these delegates.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that today we are going to turn our heads the other way, look over principle and go ahead and vote for this resolution. But I want to reiterate what I said on the floor of the House on May 14. First, however, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who was so generous in taking some of the blame for the prior defeat of this resolution, I want to say that I do not feel that the majority of the Members of the House voted against the resolution because of his additional and extended travel. I believe the majority voted against it because there was a principle involved.

At that time I said, and I repeat: "The chairman of our committee has not and will not file a correct statement of

counterpart funds already expended by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1962. For us to pass this resolution, to my way of thinking, simply condones this noncompliance with the statutory law which is in title 22, section XX 1754 and makes the illogical assumption that the law will be observed in this case. You will note at the end of page 2, lines 20 to 25 and in the first four lines on page 3, that the chairman is required to make a report. I point out, however, if reports have not been filed in compliance with the law in the past, what reason is there for us to believe that suddenly we will get accurate and correct reports?

I respectfully suggest that we refuse this travel request with a positive statement that until a correct report is filed by the chairman of this committee, no travel will be authorized outside of the country. To do otherwise, would be to condone further noncompliance with the law, the very laws which, I might add, we pass and in so doing we to assume a double standard whereby we tell 188 million Americans to observe our legislative directives and then we say on the other hand to ourselves, "These laws do not apply to ourselves."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to this matter, and in order to attempt to clarify it, I would like to point out that under date of February 11, 1963, the Speaker received from the Honorable Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, a letter which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The 47th session of the International Labor Conference is scheduled to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, from June 5 to 28, 1963. The Department, in consultation with the Departments of Labor and Commerce, is in the process of composing a delegation to represent the United States at this conference.

Delegations to previous sessions of this assembly have included Members of the Congress. In view of the continuing interest of the Congress in the field of international labor, it is the hope of the Department that you will desire to nominate two Members of the House of Representatives for inclusion on the delegation as congressional advisers. Should you decide to make the nominations, it would be appreciated if they were submitted to the Department before April 15, 1963, in order to allow sufficient time for investigation by the Civil Service Commission, as required by Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 298, 82d Congress.

Sincerely yours,

After receiving this letter, and after consulting with the minority leader, as the distinguished minority leader has indicated, designations were made by the Speaker.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a national holiday set aside as a memorial to the dead. I wonder how many people who observe this day are familiar with its origin. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the origin of this beautiful custom of placing flowers upon the graves of our beloved dead each year, I should like to point out that this thoughtful gesture originated in my great native State of Mississippi.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that on April 25, 1866, shortly after the cessation of hostilities of that unfortunate fratricidal strife, known as the War Between the States, this custom was begun. Just a few months prior to this occasion, a bloody battle had been fought at historical Shiloh. Many brave men, both in the uniforms of the blue and gray, had fallen, mortally wounded. Some 1,500 to 2,000 of the dead were buried in the cemetery at nearby Columbus, which, up to that time, had long been known as the Odd Fellows Cemetery.

On that memorable day, April 25, 1866, the good women of Columbus gathered all of the flowers available in that beautiful little city and marched in procession to the burial ground of these soldiers. There they tenderly laid the flowers upon the graves of both friend and enemy. This act inspired Francis Miles Finch's poem, "The Blue and the Gray."

Mississippians, proud of their heritage and traditions, still observe April 25 rather than May 30 as Decoration Day.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention, incidentally, that Columbus, Miss., is also the site of another splendid first. It is the home of the first college authorized and created by State law exclusively for women in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote in part the poem by Francis Miles Finch to which I referred:

From the silence of sorrowful hours
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers,
Alike for the friend and the foe—
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgement Day—
Under the roses, the Blue;
Under the lilies, the Gray.
No more shall the war-cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red:
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead.
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day—
Love and tears for the Blue;
Tears and love for the Gray.

It is ironical that today, within a few miles of the site of this noble gesture on the part of the women of Mississippi, Federal troops are again bivouacked at the University of Mississippi to enforce upon the people of that great State the violation of another custom of its people, the right to control the administration of its own State university. While, at the same time, under the powerful protective wing of the same Federal Government, a minority group is defying the laws and customs of that once sovereign State, in its capital at Jackson. There, the modern carpetbaggers are endeavoring to stir up sufficient strife, conflict, and racial discord to bring about bloodshed and an excuse for another armed invasion of my beloved State.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 52, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—278

Addabbo	Fisher	Marsh
Albert	Fogarty	Mathias
Arends	Ford	Matsunaga
Ashley	Fraser	Matthews
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	May
Avery	Friedel	Meader
Ayres	Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Calif.
Baker	Fuqua	Miller, N.Y.
Baldwin	Garmatz	Milliken
Barrett	Gary	Mills
Barry	Gavin	Minish
Bass	Glaimo	Monagan
Bates	Gibbons	Moore
Becker	Gilbert	Moorhead
Beckworth	Gill	Morgan
Belcher	Glenn	Morris
Bell	Gonzalez	Morse
Bennett, Mich.	Goodling	Morton
Berry	Grabowski	Mosher
Betts	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Boland	Green, Pa.	Multer
Bolton	Griffin	Murphy, Ill.
Frances P.	Grover	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolton	Gubser	Natcher
Oliver P.	Hagen, Calif.	Nix
Bonner	Halleck	Norblad
Brademas	Halpern	O'Brien, Ill.
Bray	Hansen	O'Brien, N.Y.
Brock	Harding	O'Hara, Ill.
Brooks	Hardy	Olsen, Mont.
Broomfield	Harris	Olson, Minn.
Brotzman	Harrison	O'Neill
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Patman
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Patten
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey, Mich.	Pelly
Buckley	Hawkins	Perkins
Burke	Hays	Pike
Burkhalter	Healey	Pirnie
Burleson	Hebert	Poage
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Price
Cahill	Hollfield	Pucinski
Cameron	Holland	Quie
Cannon	Horton	Reid, Ill.
Carey	Hosmer	Reid, N.Y.
Casey	Hull	Reifel
Cederberg	Jarman	Reuss
Celler	Jennings	Rhodes, Pa.
Chamberlain	Jensen	Rivers, Alaska
Chelf	Joelson	Rivers, S.O.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calif.	Robison
Clark	Jonas	Rodino
Clausen	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Cleveland	Karsten	Rogers, Tex.
Cohelan	Karth	Rooney
Conte	Keith	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kelly	Rosenthal
Corbett	Keogh	Rostenkowski
Corman	Kilburn	Roudebush
Curtis	Kilgore	Routh
Daddario	Kunkel	Roybal
Dawson	Kyl	Rumsfeld
Delaney	Lankford	Ryan, N.Y.
Dent	Leggett	St. George
Derounian	Lindsay	St. Germain
Derwinski	Lipscomb	St. Onge
Downing	Lloyd	Saylor
Dulski	Long, La.	Schadeberg
Duncan	Long, Md.	Schenck
Edwards	McCulloch	Schwengel
Elliott	McDade	Senner
Evins	McDowell	Sheppard
Fallon	McFall	Short
Farbstein	Macdonald	Shriver
Fascell	MacGregor	Sibal
Feighan	Madden	Sickles
Findley	Mahon	Sikes
Fino	Mailliard	Sisk

Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubbsfield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott

Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson

NAYS—52

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Aiger
Ashbrook
Baring
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bromwell
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Dole
Foreman

Fountain
Gathings
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hechler
Huddleston
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Kastenmeier
Kornegay
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Martin, Calif.

Martin, Nebr.
Murray
Pool
Quillen
Rich
Rogers, Fla.
Schneebell
Schweiker
Selden
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—103

Adair
Anderson
Andrews
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Battin
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Burton
Clancy
Collier
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Goodell
Gray

Griffiths
Hanna
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoffman
Horan
Hutchinson
Knox
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Lesinski
Libonati
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Morrison
Nedzi
Nielsen
Nygaard
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmer
Ostertag

Passman
Pepper
Philbin
Plicher
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Secret
Shelley
Shipley
Siler
Snyder
Stephens
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Wharton
Widnall
Willis
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winstead
Wyman

So the resolution was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nielsen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Devine.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. King of California with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Nygaard.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Denton with Mr. Wharton.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Burton.
 Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Clancy.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pillion.
 Mr. Forrester with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Battin.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Weaver.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Knox.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McClory.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hutchinson.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Pilcher.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Purcell.
 Mr. Andrews with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Winstead.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Randall.
 Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Pepper.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Montoya.

Mr. SKUBITZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 350, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 350 provides for consideration of H.R. 5497, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

During World War II, and until 1951, Mexican workers were admitted into the United States for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture under various authorities, none of which were entirely satisfactory either to the workers, the employers, or the two Governments involved.

In 1951, the Congress approved Public Law 78, 82d Congress, which added title V to the Agricultural Act of 1949. This

legislation authorized the negotiation of an agreement with the Republic of Mexico establishing procedures for the admission of Mexican nationals into the United States for temporary employment. It also authorized the Department of Labor to undertake a recruitment and placement function with respect to such workers, assist workers and farmers to enter into contracts for agricultural employment, and guarantee the payment of wages and transportation by farmer employers.

Public Law 78 was scheduled to expire December 31, 1953. Subsequently it has been extended for 2-year periods and the present expiration date is December 31, 1963. H.R. 5497 would extend this authority for an additional 2 years, until December 31, 1965.

The program is almost entirely self-supporting and will not burden our financial structure. The user of such labor pays almost the entire costs of the program.

Mr. Speaker, this particular program has been under considerable fire for the past several years. I certainly would not deny that it is under fire today, so there is no question but what this matter is controversial. I recognize the problems involved in supporting legislation to import foreign workers into this country in the face of the fact that we have at present something over 5 percent of unemployed people in America today. However, the type of work for which these people are employed is a type of work which, frankly, Americans generally have refused to perform.

Now, I realize that there will be a great deal of discussion later on in general debate as to some of the reasons why it is impossible to recruit domestic workers to do this so-called stoop labor which is prevalent particularly in the West and in California's interior valleys especially, but it has been most difficult particularly in view of the fact that in these areas and in other areas, such as the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and in Arizona and other areas in our country, where perishable commodities are grown, and which, after all, are important to the consumers at a price which they can afford to pay—it is most difficult to harvest those commodities without some source of labor which can be quickly acquired and quickly built up in numbers to meet the emergency.

For example, a peach has to be picked within 12 hours after it reaches a certain stage of ripeness. A melon has to be harvested within a matter of 24 hours after that melon is ready, or else it rots; it is simply no good and it cannot be shipped.

Mr. Speaker, this is true of a multitude of products grown in the West and in other areas of the country as, for example, Michigan, and unless there is a readily available supply of labor to quickly move in and take care of this type of work then that fruit or those vegetables will simply rot and the consumer will be denied the use of them. To the extent that such commodities will be unavailable, the price will be substantially increased. This is basically the reason why some of the Members of the

House felt that until such time as mechanization has been developed to meet the need or that a substitute domestic program had been developed that would bring the workers to the farm to do this job, it was necessary to continue this authority in the Department of Labor to negotiate with the Republic of Mexico for the use of these people.

Mr. Speaker, it will be explained later in debate that this program is surrounded with a vast number of protective regulations, rules, laws, and so on, regarding wages, working conditions, hours, housing, insurance, and all other details that go into it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not cheap labor for the farmers. That is not the purpose of it. It is much more expensive labor for the American farmer than is domestic labor, if domestic labor can be secured. So do not fall for any fallacy that this is cheap labor.

Mr. Speaker, I for one happen to believe that the farm workers of this Nation are entitled to a great deal more money than a lot of them are getting. I will repeat a statement made just 2 years ago at the time we debated this bill, that I personally supported a national minimum wage for agricultural workers. I realize that this too is controversial and that a number of my good friends from some areas of the country object. But it is my frank opinion that the domestic farm worker in this country does need an upgrading in wages, an upgrading in housing conditions and in living conditions all across the board. I for one am for doing that very thing. To the extent that we can move forward within the next couple of years to do that, it would be my hope that never again will it be necessary for me or for anyone else to take the floor of the House to seek an extension of this particular act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution which will permit the House to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of debating the issue.

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I would be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. As I recall, in past years the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has given the House some very valuable information concerning the effect of this program on the small farmers of the country.

Can the gentleman tell us how he feels about the allegations to the effect that this is a program only for a handful of large farmers?

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the question which has been propounded by my colleague from California, and thank him for calling it to my attention. Here is one of the attacks that is made from time to time on this program, that all we are doing is providing workers for a small group of large corporation farmers. Now, I am not here to deny but what some large farmers do use Mexican nationals under this program. But I am here to state to the Members of the House—because we use these people in my district and I know how this program

is handled—that the people who would be hurt by an abrupt ending of this program first would be the small farmer who does not have housing and who has to depend on the Mexican nationals to harvest his grapes, his peaches, his apricots, his melons, his vegetables, his tomatoes, whatever the case may be; because the small farmer does not have housing; he does not have year-round work and only uses a substantial amount of labor at harvest time.

He must have a source from which to seek and to obtain this labor. The large corporation farmers who, of course, are used as whipping boys, first by politicians and by others, let me say, do use some of this Mexican national labor. They have to justify that they cannot get their work done otherwise, but in most cases they do have substantial blocks of housing; they have a great deal of year-round work and keep a great number of people there—keep them on the ranch year round and, therefore, they are not caught in the bind that many of these small farmers are. So here again is a fallacy that is sometimes preached that it is only for a few very large farmers. That is absolutely not the fact of the case, certainly as it is demonstrated in my own particular district.

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

Mr. SISK. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I would like to say to my friend from California, in line with this large farm situation, he is talking about the very thing that inspired me to oppose this last year. For several years, serving on the committee that writes this legislation, I tried to pass an amendment which would prohibit the use of Mexican labor for crops that have controlled acreage and price supports. I would hope that my friend from California and the people who represent areas where stoop labor is needed for crops that are not acreage controlled or price supported would assist me in amending this bill so that it would make some sense to bring in labor they cannot get in these areas. However, at the same time we are bringing in foreign labor to produce crops in the United States for which we have acreage controls and support prices, that the farmers in Tennessee, or the farmers in California, or the farmers in Michigan would like to have acres on which to produce these same crops. It just does not make sense to me to import labor to produce a crop for which an American farmer is denied an acreage allotment that he could get if this foreign labor were not brought in to produce these crops.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee I also find myself very sympathetic to the position which he takes in this matter and if I am not mistaken I believe I supported his amendment 2 years ago. I agree with the gentleman. However, I know that there are some areas of the country that have problems somewhat different from those which we have in California but, so far as my own area is concerned, I would not mind this amendment at all. I think it would be an excellent one because I agree it is foolish

to bring in foreign workers to produce commodities in surplus. What I am pleading for, frankly, and that only, is at least for a short extension and an opportunity to do what I believe will be a phasing out effort. I am inclined to think that a couple of years more is about it on this program, but until such time as we can develop a source of labor supply for these perishable commodities such as fruits and vegetables, we are simply going to increase the price to the consumers across the country if we are unable to harvest them when they are ripe or mature. Otherwise they will rot. They are not controlled commodities.

Mr. BASS. This is true. As I say, I will not oppose Mexican labor coming in to produce those types of commodities but I certainly hope the people who need this assistance in the field of Mexican labor would support an amendment to restrict this against the controlled crops.

Mr. SISK. I thank my colleague from Tennessee and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 350 will authorize an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 5497, a bill entitled "Continuation of Mexican farm labor program." This is known as Public Law 78 and referred to as the "bracero program."

On each occasion that this particular program is considered I rather imagine it brings back some definite memories to many of the senior Members, for it is my understanding that this particular subject matter was under consideration at the time the shooting occurred in the Chamber some years ago.

This is a controversial subject, and my mail of recent date indicates that much of organized labor is in opposition to it. I am further aware, Mr. Speaker, that there will even be a difference of opinion among the California Members in regard to this program.

Public Law 78, for the temporary employment in U.S. agriculture of Mexican workers, will expire on December 31, 1963. H.R. 5497 will extend this authority for an additional 2 years; until December 31, 1965.

During World War II and until 1951, Mexican workers were admitted into the United States for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture under various authorities, none of which were entirely satisfactory, either to the workers, the employers, or the two Governments involved. In 1951, Congress approved Public Law 78, which added title V to the Agricultural Act of 1929. The seven major features of this legislation are set forth on pages 1 and 2 of the committee report.

Experience in this program has shown that in spite of effective recruiting programs carried on by the Federal and State employment agencies there are not sufficient people to do the kind of work being performed by the Mexican nationals that are admitted under this act. This same experience has shown that there is only one really effective way of reducing the numbers of foreign workers needed to be imported and that

has been and is through mechanization and automation of the stoop tasks.

Mechanization in cotton since 1959 is proof of this statement. In 1959, 34 percent of the crop was harvested by machines—in 1961 it had increased to 59 percent. Although the figures for the 1962 crop are not in yet, the drop in the use of Mexican nationals in the cotton-producing States of Texas, New Mexico and Arkansas shows machines are replacing them at a rapid pace. In 1961 these States used 151,720 Mexican nationals and in 1962 they used 40,636, a drop of 73 percent. Agriculture is doing everything possible to reduce these stoop tasks by mechanization.

Let me point out to the Members of the House who represent urban districts that your consumers also have a stake in this program. There are those who show that the farmer could pay 20 to 50 percent more in farm wages and it would have a small effect on the retail price in the market. Statistically this is true, but they fail to also show that in the table food crops, labor often is 50 to 70 percent of the farmers' total cost of production. When you increase his cost that much he is going to shift to other crops that use less labor. This then would make table foods in short supply. I need only to remind the housewife of the sharp rise in prices last winter when crops were frozen in the South and West to show how short supply would create leaping prices. So your consumers do have an interest in a supply of labor to keep an even flow of these table foods.

There are those who would like to extend this law for only 1 year. I would like to point out that there is ample authority in this law for the Secretary of Labor to bring this program to a complete halt any day there are enough Americans to do the work.

To further substantiate the fact that this program will be needed more than 1 year, I would like to point out information from a report made by the University of California, Gianini Foundation. This report was made at the request of Governor Brown of California to study the need for imported and supplemental farm labor in the State of California. During the hearings Mr. Charles Paul, director of agriculture from California, accompanied by Mr. Donald Larin of the department of employment and Dr. Mamer of the university who made this report, testified before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the House Agriculture Committee. I would like to quote Dr. Mamer's summary of this report of the necessity of supplemental labor:

The university as such, of which I am a part, does not take a position either on extension or the termination of this program, but we have prepared this study, which indicates that seasonality of employment will be as high in up to 1968, or higher than it is now, and, consequently, the need for supplemental labor will be as great or greater, at least 5 years hence.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House are interested in passing laws that are clear, administrable, and germane to the subject under consideration. H.R. 5497 is an act to allow and control the importation of foreign agri-

cultural workers. It should not be made a vehicle for amendments pertaining to broad subjects concerning American farm labor. These subjects are being considered separately, and properly so, by both Houses of Congress and should not be subjects of amendment to this bill.

There are continued attacks on this program stating that it has been the vehicle for depressing farm wages. Let me call your attention to some facts that were contained in the last report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on the wages being paid by States and by regions across the United States. The highest using State of imported workers which are workers from the British West Indies is Florida. Yet the State of Florida pays the highest wages in the Southeast, and this is against many States in the Southeast who use no imported workers. The second State in the use of men from the British West Indies and the Bahamas is the State of Connecticut, and the State of Connecticut pays the highest wages in the Northeast. This same report shows that last year the State of California used more imported Mexican nationals than any other State in the Union, and California pays the highest wages in the West. If these imported workers are depressing wages, it seems strange that these Government reports would show that the three high using States are also the three highest wage States in their regions and area of influence.

Mr. Speaker, if this measure is passed extending the date to December 31, 1965, and if I am still a Member of this great body in 1965, it is my present intention not to support any further requests to extend this program. I believe that agriculture will just have to figure out some way to solve this dilemma during the next 2 years. If they are unable to harvest their crops, then the consumer will not have the benefit of them. In turn, if it costs more money to harvest them, then this will simply have to be added to the price and the consumer will have to pay.

But, in this instance, Mr. Speaker, I believe they are entitled to this additional extension and, accordingly, I urge the adoption of the rule and recommend that H.R. 5497 be passed without amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I merely want to call attention to the gentleman's reference to wages. I was wondering whether he could not insert in the RECORD for the benefit of those who will read the RECORD what those "high" wages are.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will say to the gentleman, you have figures just the same as I do. I know you are opposed to the program. You opposed it last year, and rightfully so. I just happen to be for it. The figures on wages have been reported, of course.

Mr. COHELAN. I realize that. I think the gentleman is to be complimented on his statement. We obviously disagree as to the time of termination,

but I do think it is important to get data in the RECORD on what the wages are that we are talking about.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time, not to oppose the rule—I favor the rule—but I would like to take the opportunity and state why a great number of us—I sincerely hope a majority of us—will urge you to vote against this bill on final passage.

I should also like to say that those of us who are opposing this bill, will make our case and we will hope that on the merits we can vote it up or down at some reasonable hour this afternoon. We realize that we have a holiday tomorrow and many of us would like to get away.

I should also like to say at this point, in connection with some of the statistical data, that there is ample data available from all of the Government sources, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor, all of which I intend to put in the RECORD to support some of the arguments which we are going to make, particularly in terms of wage rates, the range of wage rates, the difference in wage rates, the impact of adverse effect in connection with the existing program. We are going to argue that this is a subsidy for a very specialized group and a very small group of American agriculture.

Contrary to the arguments advanced by the proponents of the measure, who want to continue the bill for 2 more years, we will show that the Bureau of Employment Security came in again this year and asked for over \$1,300,000 just to administer the program. So, on top of everything else, the cost of the program is increasing in terms of compliance costs and of course this is coming out of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78 is a wartime emergency measure, which no longer has a valid place in our society. It is a program which serves as a subsidy to less than 1 percent of America's growers but which has been cited by the leaders of national farm organizations for its detrimental effects on the great majority of American farmers. It is a program which is supported by those who espouse the free enterprise system but which is a complete denial of that system by making inoperative the basic law of supply and demand.

Essentially, the Mexican farm labor program raises the important question: Should the power and authority of the Federal Government be used in such manner as to perpetuate a farm labor system rooted in underemployment, unemployment, and poverty, both at home and abroad?

H.R. 5497, by providing a carte blanche 2-year extension of Public Law 78 would answer this question in the affirmative. It would do so for it is based upon the proposition that the Nation's

largest industry—agriculture—is dependent on cheap labor for its survival; that U.S. growers are incapable of solving their labor problems without help from the Federal Government. It means that growers who have benefited from this program over the years will continue to believe that the Government owes them a labor force.

I deny the validity of this proposition. I believe that it should be public policy to accomplish in agriculture what we have already accomplished in other sectors of our economy; namely, the restoration of respect and dignity, based upon good wages, good working conditions, and steady employment to the men and women who labor for hire on American farms.

If this program were to pass from the American scene—and I am convinced that its termination is long past due—I submit that an insignificant number of American growers would be affected—less than 1 percent of all the farmers and farm employers in the United States. I submit further that those growers who now use Mexican nationals would find no difficulty in getting their crops harvested. It is my firm belief that Public Law 78 is a "crutch"—an excuse for evading the very real labor problems that confront agricultural employers. I submit, further, that the extension of this program is more to the advantage of farm labor associations—which is a glorified way of saying "farm labor contractors"—and to other middlemen who provide services to Mexican nationals, than it is to farmers themselves.

Farmers are interested in having their crops harvested; they are not particularly concerned with who does the harvesting. There is no doubt in my mind that if foreign labor was not available to those few growers who have become accustomed to its use, they would institute recruitment practices which would attract domestic labor—or they would mechanize. Either solution is better than delaying the inevitable by prolonging the use of Mexican labor.

The managers and other employees of farm labor associations, who, for the past 10 to 15 years have made their living off the backs of Mexican braceros, might suffer, it is true. These are the people who recruit labor from Mexico for a living—and who live very well indeed. Very often, these are the people who fly by first-class jet from California to Washington to lobby for extension of Public Law 78. If you happen to meet them at the Carleton Hotel here in Washington, the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, or the St. Francis in San Francisco, they will wine and dine you to your heart's content. And where did the expense money come from? From the bracero program.

There are others who would grieve to see Public Law 78 fade from the American scene. The catering firms who provide board for Mexican nationals at \$1.75 per person—the maximum allowed by the Government—would be very disappointed if the bracero program should be terminated. Why should they not be? For every \$1.75 they receive, they spend approximately 80 cents—that is not a bad profit. The concessionaires who sell

Cokes at the reception centers for 15 cents a bottle; the Mexican officials who accept bribes from prospective braceros; the insurance companies that provide occupational insurance for braceros while they are in this country; the bus lines which transport braceros from reception centers to the central labor camps—all of these individuals and firms would hate to see the end of the bracero program. And they have been the backbone of its support for the past 10 years.

The charge is made, Mr. Speaker, that growers need Public Law 78; that American farmworkers will not do stoop labor. This simply is not true. Let me remind the House that coal mining is stoop labor, and nobody is suggesting that we import foreign laborers to do this work.

American farmworkers are available, but wages must be raised to a decent minimum wage, and recruiting programs, not unlike that involved in Public Law 78, must be inaugurated. If the money spent attempting to perpetuate the bracero system had been invested in a program to better utilize the domestic farm labor available throughout the country—a program such as that contained in the recruiting-transportation bill and other measures before the Congress—we would today have a far more sensible, more logical, and more equitable farm labor system in American agriculture. This, I submit, is the type of program we should be supporting.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to recognize Public Law 78 for what it is—a subsidy to less than 1 percent of America's growers. At the same time, it is a program which works to the direct disadvantage of the great majority of America's farmers—the 88 percent which use no or very little hired labor. And, it further depresses the incomes of America's farmworkers who are already on the bottom rung of our economic ladder; a group with an unemployment rate of 7.3 percent; a group which in 1961 was able to work on the average only 134 days in agriculture for the pittance income of \$881.

This is a program, Mr. Speaker, which is unnecessary and harmful—both economically and to the American conscience—and I urge that when the roll is called we vote to end this injustice by defeating this bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with leave granted I include, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, the fourth monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of April 30, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected by the President at \$85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—a projected increase of \$4,091,000,000 over actual budget revenues for fiscal year 1962. Through the first 10 months—to April 30, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 10 months of fiscal 1962—to April 30, 1962—by \$4,591,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of \$85,500,000,000 for all of fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of \$18,138,000,000 in the 2 months May–June 1963. In the corresponding 2 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues amounted to \$18,638,000,000.

According to the recent report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt limit bill, the administration, as of April, apparently still adheres to the full year revenue estimate of \$85,500,000,000.

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the pattern of budget receipts shows the months of September, December, March, and June as the peak months; and receipts in the second half of the fiscal year, January–June, are usually higher than in the first half.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected in the President's January budget at \$94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of \$6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal year 1962, of which \$1,901,000,000 is for national defense and \$4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 10 months—to April 30, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 10 months of fiscal 1962—to April 30, 1962—by \$5,001,000,000, of which \$2,366,000,000 is for national defense and \$2,635,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that budget expenditures during the first 10 months of fiscal 1963 averaged \$7,745,000,000—somewhat less than the projected budget average of \$7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the January official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the January net budget expenditure prediction of \$94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 2 months May 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least \$16,-

854,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least \$8,427,000,000 during the 2-month period as against the actual monthly average of \$7,745,000,000 in the first 10 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average expenditure in the 2 months, May–June, could rise \$712,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 10 months without exceeding the budgeted total of \$94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. The table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal year 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average \$544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average of all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison with this, in the first 10 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 10-month average of fiscal 1962 by a little less—namely, by \$500,000,000. Stated another way, in the first 83 percent of the fiscal year about 77 percent, or \$5,001,000,000 of the officially projected \$6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

But in connection with expenditures, it is pertinent to note from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the recent debt limit bill that as of April, the administration apparently expects budget expenditures for fiscal 1963 to total \$93,907,000,000—which would be \$404,000,000 less than the January budget estimate from the President—\$564,000,000 less for other than national defense, partially offset by \$160,000,000 more for national defense.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The January official budget estimate of the deficit for all of fiscal year 1963 is \$8,811,000,000, or \$2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit for all of fiscal 1962. But as noted above, the more recent official administration view, according to the report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt limit bill, is that the fiscal 1963 deficit will approximate \$8,407,000,000.

Through 10 months of fiscal year 1963, the actual deficit is \$10,095,000,000 or only about \$410,000,000 larger than the actual deficit during the corresponding 10 months of fiscal year 1962. These figures would seem to suggest the possibility that the budget deficit for all of fiscal 1963 may be less than the \$8,407,000,000 mentioned in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The comparisons and the trend will of course vary in the 2 months of May and June in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The official January budget projection is that the public debt at the end of fiscal 1963—on June 30, 1963—will be \$303,494,000,000, a projected increase of \$5,293,000,000 from the actual debt of \$298,201,000,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962. But the Treasury's more recent estimate, according to the report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the recent debt limit bill, is that the debt on June 30 next will approximate \$305,300,000,000.

The actual public debt on April 30, 1963, stood at \$303,165,000,000—or \$6,-

214,000,000 above the corresponding date at the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962. The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 10 months of fiscal 1963 versus 10 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 10 months			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1963 compared to actual for all of fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net).....	67,362	62,771	+4,591	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification).....	43,648	41,282	+2,366	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense.....	33,809	31,174	+2,635	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures (net).....	77,457	72,456	+5,001	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (-), line 1 minus 3.....	-10,095	-9,685	-410	-8,811	-6,378	¹ -2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense.....	4,365			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense.....	3,380			3,442		
Total monthly average.....	7,745	7,245	+500	7,859	7,315	+544

¹ That is to say, the January official budget projects an estimated increase of \$2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Apr. 30, 1963.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

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 consideration of the bill H.R. 5497, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is a very simple piece of legislation. It extends the authority to the Secretary of Labor to maintain for an additional 2 years beyond December 31, 1963, a program of bringing in supplemental labor under a treaty arrangement with the Government of Mexico, to the extent that he determines to be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, this is a program which has been in continuous operation since 1951. It has had its difficulties, but it has worked very well, we feel, not only for the people from the Republic of Mexico who are involved, but for our people here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that we are merely extending the authority of the Secretary of Labor to conduct this program. It is he who determines the need for the program. He could operate no program if he should find that there was no need.

Mr. Chairman, in order to give the members of the Committee some brief outline as to how this works, we have a treaty with the Republic of Mexico. It will have to be extended at the end of this year. Everyone is confident it will be extended without any difficulty. The Mexican Government handles the problem of locating qualified laborers in Mexico. These workers are screened for diseases, willingness to work, and so forth, and then they are brought to the United States and are signed up under a standard work contract which provides guarantees with respect to wages, and so forth. But before any workers can be brought into any area, the Secretary of Labor has to make a determination that these workers are needed and that local labor is not available to do the same job. Further, that bringing in the Mexican workers will not have an adverse effect

APPROPRIATION BILLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House doubtless noted in yesterday's newspapers a reference to what was designated as the slowness of some of the committees of the House in reporting bills this year. There seemed to be especial emphasis on the desire to know why the appropriation bills are not coming to the floor at a more rapid rate.

May I say briefly that the reason is a very simple one and is both statutory and parliamentary. The Committee on Appropriations cannot appropriate a dollar—and no official of the Government can spend a dollar until its appropriation and expenditure is authorized by law.

The legislative committees of the House are in complete control of such situations. Until they get a bill through

the House and Senate and until it has been signed by the President, we cannot turn a wheel on many of the measures which must be implemented by funds from the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, for some time over past years it has been necessary to call attention to this situation and to the importance of the committees reporting out the necessary authorization bills. And I am again taking up this unhappy and too often futile task of urging authorizations in order to expedite the processing of the supply bills in order to permit early disposition of the fiscal program for the session and permit prompt adjournment as required by law. We have to wait upon the legislative committees before we can proceed with the appropriation bill. We cannot appropriate a single dollar until it is authorized.

I include at this point in the RECORD a tabulation indicating the application of this requirement to which this applies to the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. The extent to which this applies to the various subcommittees is shown in the following table:

Subcommittee bill	Area of the bill	1964 budget estimate
		<i>Billions</i>
Department of Defense.....	Procurement of aircraft, ships, and missiles.....	\$12.2
	Research and development work on aircraft, ships, and missiles.....	3.1
Foreign operations.....	Major portion of entire program: Unauthorized.....	3.7
	Export-Import Bank (this year only).....	2.0
Independent offices.....	NASA, space program.....	5.7
Military construction.....	Entire military construction program.....	\$1.2
	Some military housing.....	.734
		1.9
Public works.....	AEC plant and equipment.....	.4

on the wages and working conditions of local workers.

Mr. Chairman, we are confident that the present Secretary of Labor, as his two predecessors before him, is not anti-labor, and that he will administer this program in the best interests of the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, one of the gentlemen from California who spoke on the rule referred to this as a subsidy program. It is not. The only Government outlay involved is that for compliance features of the program. The other costs of the program are handled by fees collected from the growers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an emergency wartime program. It first went into effect in 1951, I believe, and there were other programs that were different which preceded it during the wartime period.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the only real issue here is the question, is there need for this program? I think the gentleman from California who spoke on the rule would stipulate that if there were a demonstrable need for these workers he would be for the program. So the only argument between us really is the question of the necessity for bringing in supplemental labor. On this question of need I again refer to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. Certainly he is not anti-labor. Yet he came before our committee and recommended a 1-year extension of this program, I am sure purely on the basis of finding that there was need for a 1-year extension. We support a 2-year extension because we say that the size of the program, the magnitude of it, is completely in his hands. He can make this determination of need at the end of 1 year if conditions warrant it, and I think he will do this honestly.

Furthermore, our farmers have to plan ahead. Let us take the grower of tomatoes. Tomatoes is one of the large crops in California, and the grower needs to know in advance whether he will have a source of labor available before he plants his tomato crop.

So we do not want to be involved next year with our tomato growers being uncertain at the beginning of the season whether there will be labor available to harvest the crop. We do not want to bring this up in the middle of a Presidential election year. That is why we want a 2-year program rather than a 1-year program as recommended by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, in good conscience, this is a difficult problem for us who come from farm areas where these laborers are used. We in good conscience try to represent the interests not only of our farm employers but of our farmworkers and we would not be for this extension if there were not in our own minds a demonstrated need for the program. We would be the first to request its termination if we became convinced otherwise.

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

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the gentleman tell the Committee whether he is suggesting that he would accept the Secretary's

recommendation in connection with a 1-year extension and the workmen's compensation provisions that would also be provided for?

Mr. HAGEN of California. May I answer the gentleman from California this way? The workmen's compensation provision would mean nothing in California because every farmworker is covered by workmen's compensation.

Mr. COHELAN. This is a national program. We are talking not just about California. Is the gentleman saying that this would apply in Arkansas and Texas?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I do not know what the situation is either in Texas or Arkansas. In this respect I can speak only for California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman saying that he favors the workmen's compensation provision? Because, if so, maybe we can do some talking.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer the gentleman address his inquiry in that regard to one of the gentlemen from Arkansas or Texas.

Mr. COHELAN. I should assume that the gentleman, a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, is not in favor of the workmen's compensation provisions as presented by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Let me say this to the gentleman, traditionally workmen's compensation has been a field of activity of State law. These systems vary so greatly from State to State, I think it would be an unwarranted intrusion into an existing pattern of workmen's compensation law for us to legislate at this time in connection with this program on that subject.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the folks of Texas' 16th District, and in the interest of reasonability and sensibility in our foreign assistance and self-help programs in our dealings with other countries, Mexico in particular, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to speak in favor of H.R. 5497, Mr. UNALL's bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which will extend the termination date of the act to December 31, 1965.

Along with the great majority of my colleagues and the administration, I, too, favor first consideration of U.S. citizens for employment in this country in preference to alien workers when domestic workers are available. However, after a thorough investigation of this situation, and after being closely associated with the industry, I find that there is very definitely a tremendous shortage of domestic workers in our west Texas-New Mexico area, and the hiring of braceros to help in our farm and ranch work is a necessity if we are to maintain a healthy agriculture program.

Admittedly, there are a few unemployed persons in our domestic labor market, but we are unable to get those few who are available to do the stoop-labor work necessary in our farm operations. Our big problem today, causing the unemployment that we do have, not only in Texas, but across the Nation, lies in the

fact that with our high unemployment compensation rates made available through costly Federal Government assistance programs, our people can be, and are, gainfully unemployed. Too many people are looking for work and hoping they can't find it, because they make as much take-home money loafing as they do working. Also, I hasten to point out that the present act provides that any time domestic workers do become available to do the job being done by the braceros, the domestic workers have priority over the braceros and will be hired to do the work.

I strongly recommend your favorable consideration of H.R. 5497 and a continuation of the bracero labor employment program. We can achieve a three-fold benefit through employing braceros in our labor-shortage agriculture areas.

First. We can boost our own economy by hiring these vitally needed workers, not now domestically available, to help in the operation of our farms and ranches. We must keep our farms in operation if we expect to have a healthy agriculture economy.

Second. We can better demonstrate and sell the free enterprise system to our good neighbors to the south by their participation in the various projects and developments on our farms and in our ranching industry. It is somewhat of a Peace Corps in reverse, you might say, and a new twist to foreign education and assistance.

Third. We can help these dependent people help themselves by the money they earn from this work, rather than giving them millions of U.S. dollars in foreign assistance programs. Since 1945, we have granted Mexico approximately \$630,300,000 in assistance of one type or another, such as grants, loans, aid, and so forth. I cannot see justification in the continuance of this kind of aid plan as compared to the earn-it plan that the Mexican bracero labor program offers.

For these three primary reasons briefly discussed, and particularly, in the interest of working toward a free-market-controlled economy with decreasing Federal controls and regulations over our farmers, I respectfully urge you to vote in favor of the bill, H.R. 5497.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would explain, since he has asserted that the American agricultural worker may be indolent and lazy, if he considers the adverse rate which I notice is paid in the gentleman's State, 70 cents an hour, which incidentally was raised from 60 cents an hour last year, and which was 50 cents an hour the year before, to be an adequate incentive for this particular attitude?

Mr. FOREMAN. First of all, in reply to the gentleman, I did not say they were indolent and lazy—he did. Secondly, I say that even at \$1 an hour we are unable to get these people to do the work on our farms that I indicated here. Even at \$1.25 an hour we have tried in west Texas to have people who are available to do the stoop labor work that we

are talking about here and we have been unable to get the people to do the work—mostly because the people are not there to do the work.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is aware that his State is using far less braceros than it used in previous years?

Mr. FOREMAN. Primarily because of continued mechanization of the work that is being done and very possibly, with an extension of this act, we will be able to completely get away from the need for bracero labor in the next 2 years.

Mr. COHELAN. The Secretary of Labor has called for a 1-year extension of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I wonder if the gentleman goes along with that program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I am very happy that by coincidence I am following my colleague from Texas because it gives me the occasion to recall the truth of an old Irish saying to the effect, "It is very easy to sleep on the wounds of another man."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] neglects to tell you that in his district there are many areas in which that very same person, who has been described as a Mexican, has faced for many years a systematic, prejudicial discrimination in salary, in housing, in minimal standards of living that we here in America take for granted. He ironically refers to a "good neighbor policy in reverse." Do you think it has been conducive to good neighborly relations to have had thousands of these same braceros herded and rounded up like cattle and thrown in concentration camps and put in a ship and sailed down the Gulf of Mexico to be disembarked at some point in Mexico far from their homes? These are things that have happened. I can conceive of my colleague from Texas speaking in the fashion and in the manner that he has spoken only because he is ignorant of how the other half is living within the 16th Congressional District. But when he says it is impossible to get the farm laborers to do the stoop labor, may I remind him that from my district comes the greatest number of migratory laborers of any point in Texas and they are so willing to work they go thousands of miles away, even as far as Oregon and Minnesota. They make these yearly pilgrimages to such distant points and they go to those places because they get more than what is offered to them in west Texas—to say nothing of the indignity to which they are subjected by signs such as I have seen in Pecos, Tex.—visible for all to see and, as I say, I myself have been there and I have seen them—"No Mexicans allowed."

To say that they are not willing to do stoop labor is not true. What they are no longer willing to do is to do stoop labor for stoop wages. They want fair, equal, and the right kind of wages for their work. In this same State from which I come, we have no minimum

wage. We have reached this anomalous, ironic, unjust, and shameful point—and I call this legislation a shameful piece of legislation, because it perpetuates inequity upon inequity, and it is using the miseries of the people of one nation to trade on the miseries of other unfortunate workers in our country—that is all that this represents.

And to talk about phasing it out; so far as I am personally concerned, it ought to be phased out right now. This is the best time to phase it out.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I would like to ask the gentleman if he feels there are enough migratory workers in his district to serve the needs of agriculture in the various areas of the Nation?

Mr. GONZALEZ. The migratory laborers from my district have picked the strawberries south of my district and out of my State. They have picked cotton in the gentleman's district, the 16th District; they have picked cotton in east Texas, but they have been displaced because there are some now if they wished to remain in these very same districts would earn as little as 20 cents an hour for doing the work.

I have been to places where we have had native workers earning as little as 20 cents an hour because Texas has no minimum wage and hour law. Therefore, if we had a strict and explicit enforcement of this agreement, which is international in nature, maybe, perhaps, it would be different. But a survey was run several years ago with respect to the average wages paid to braceros, which at that time was supposed to be 50 cents an hour. That survey revealed they never received the 50 cents an hour on the average, that the total was less than 30 cents an hour. Therefore, we have competition. The native Texan can be found in many fields working shoulder to shoulder with the imported foreign worker. So this native worker who works shoulder to shoulder with the imported foreign bracero is not guaranteed a minimum; and, as I say, gets as little as 20 cents an hour. This imported bracero, if the law were enforced, would today be entitled to 70 cents an hour.

But if the gentleman is so desirous of having this inadequate supply of labor, and it becomes necessary to dip into the reservoir of this excess labor in the Republic south of us, why not do it as good neighbors? Why not let them come in as immigrants, not as slaves? The moment these people do not show satisfaction they can be deported and thrown back, with very little chance of protest. Let us give them the chance to come to America, as our parents did, and remain if they wish.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to emphasize to the Members of the House the importance of this program to agriculture in the State of Michigan. We feel it is very vital and necessary to us.

A reading of the report will indicate that we use a considerable number of these people, and we do not know how we could get these crops harvested if we did not have them. We have great concern for our domestic labor, and I agree that in every instance, where it is possible, domestic labor should be used first. However, as the report further indicates, and it refers to the Michigan Department of Labor, domestic labor is unable to do that job in Michigan. We recognize that stoop labor in the hot sun is a difficult task for those who are not used to it, and they just have not been able to do it in the past. We have had instances in my State where some of the crops spoiled in the field because we had a lack of agricultural workers, resulting in a great cost, not only to the consumer but to the grower.

We have had wonderful community relations with those who have come up to do this work in the State of Michigan. In my community, in cooperation with the Council of Churches and others, we have done everything we could to make their stay in our area pleasant. We appreciate their presence in our State. We are grateful for the work they do and have been doing for us.

We look forward to the time when it will not be necessary for them to come to our State to do this work. Mechanization and improved methods of handling these crops will in a few years eliminate our need for these workers. But as of now I cannot see how we can get along without this particular program, and I sincerely favor this extension.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members will not get the idea that this is simply a California-Texas party this afternoon, because the whole Nation is involved, and I think that our concern should go a great deal further than most of the speakers have seemed to indicate.

There is, of course, the domestic problem of how we will gather our crops. Obviously we have to have people who will do the type of work it is necessary to do if you are going to get the crops gathered. I am sure that there is always a relationship between the price that you pay and the volume of labor that you can get.

Unfortunately, agriculture has been the least remunerative of all of the business activities of the United States for a good long time and has been unable to pay the wages that other segments of our economy have been able to pay. I would, therefore, call the attention of the membership to the fact that it does not make much difference what kind of laws you pass here, you are not going to materially raise agricultural wages until you raise agricultural prices. That is just plain commonsense. It always works. You are not going to get people to pay more to gather a cotton crop or to gather a fruit crop or to gather a lettuce crop than the crop is going to sell for, so if you are going to raise these wages, as all of us would like to do, you are simply going to have to raise the price of the product. Bear that in mind.

Now, the next thing that I think we should consider is that we are moving, as several of the speakers have said, toward mechanization, and moving rather rapidly. But, I could not more disagree than I do with the gentlemen who said that if we cannot get domestic labor, let us mechanize as rapidly as possible.

Now, why should we want to do that sort of thing? Why is it desirable to take away from anybody employment whether he is an American citizen or Mexican bracero. Why should we say that it is of no value whatever to pay these wages to Mexican braceros and let them take this money home as something they have earned by the sweat of their brow rather than something that Uncle Sam reached in his pocket and handed to them as a gift?

We are handing out gifts all over the world. We are reaching into the taxpayer's wallet and handing it out without a thing in the world in return. Here we are getting something in return. We are giving Mexico aid in the very most effective way. Are there Members who are so callous that they would like to see us deny to our sister republic the opportunity to earn some aid?

Most of you talk about trade and not aid. Most of you talk about giving people an opportunity rather than giving money. Here we are giving the Mexican workers an opportunity, and yet the opponents of this bill come along and say "Why, even though it will not put one American to work, we would like to stop this use of Mexican labor and mechanize everything so that nobody would get any wages out of it." I cannot agree to such a philosophy as that.

I believe it is sound to keep these people, as many of them as we can, consistently at work. Now, it is true that we are working only about 30 percent as many as we one time used of this Mexican labor, and it is true that that percentage is going down. But, it is also true that if you repeal this Mexican bracero law and wipe out the legal method of getting Mexican labor, you are going to have a flood of "wetbacks," and somehow or other this House has never distinguished between wetbacks and braceros. There are no women and children with the braceros. That problem is entirely one of the wetbacks. There is no deportation from the United States by shipload across the Gulf of Mexico into some interior point of braceros. That is entirely wetbacks that the gentleman talked about. Those are the illegal entrants, and you wipe out the legal way of working in the United States and you but invite a repetition of the very scandalous situation that existed before we had this bracero law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is really the choice you have. You do not have a choice of providing labor for some needy American citizen from San Antonio or anywhere else. You have the choice of providing it legally through the use of braceros or providing for it illegally through the use of wetbacks.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I shall not address myself to the ignorance of any person present, as has happened here today. I am not going to personally vilify any particular person for the position he has taken.

Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that because of the high unemployment that we have in this country we should not indulge in this type of program. I do not believe that can stand the test of logic. In the past 20 years on the farms in America the labor force has been reduced by one-third. This has been due to mechanization in part and also due to the fact that the production per man-hour has increased by about 5 percent per year over the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, I say this to the Members of the House today: If you want to help alleviate the unemployment problem that we have in America, you should bear in mind some simple facts. For instance, for every \$1 of agricultural income \$5 inures to the benefit of the nonfarm segment of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I have said in my own congressional district to the labor leaders, the union leaders, that I support this program because for every dollar of agricultural income that I help this country to obtain I am helping the nonfarm segment of this economy by an additional \$5. I am creating more by keeping this program in effect, keeping more men working—union members and nonunion members, those who are in the trucking, the shipping, the packing industries and so forth.

So if you want full employment or if you are trying to attain full employment, I would say to you this program is an excellent one. It is needed. If you knock this program out today you place the American farmer in a position where he cannot continue and you will be destroying many of the resources of this country. You will be hurting and adding to the unemployment problem in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, we are not just talking about farmers today. I deplore the fact that on the floor of this House the farmers—the big farmers especially—have been knocked around a good bit of the time. Well, the time has come, my friends and my colleagues, when you cannot place the farmer in the garbage can on the floor of this House and then put him on a pedestal at campaign time. It is about time that some of you who have your heart on your sleeve recognize that.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to be faced in the next few weeks with another aspect, another program, the foreign aid program, are we not? For years this Congress has fought and struggled with the idea that we have got to get the moneys down to the people; is that not true? As a byproduct of this program—and I defy anyone to challenge it—we have a built-in process right in the bracero program which does not cost this country 1 cent.

Where does it start? It starts right down at the people. A byproduct of it here is that you have thousands upon thousands of salesmen going back into

Mexico carrying a good image of this country, and the people, the taxpayers are not obligated for 1 cent of this program. None of you will challenge that, because it is absolutely true.

Remember this: We only got into the foreign aid program because we wanted to stop communism. Right now you have a serious threat of exportation of communism both to the south of Cuba and to the north. It is a very serious problem in Mexico at the present time. So, I respectfully urge each one of you gentlemen, as you vote today, you can cast a vote for foreign aid which does not cost you a cent; you can cast a vote not only for the farmer but for business and for the entire economy of this country. I respectfully urge you to do so.

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

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman said it did not cost any money. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the enforcement provision of this program costs about \$1,300,000 a year?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I am aware of that, and the only reason for that is that the Department of Labor would not let the farmer pay for it himself, although he was willing to do so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. So that, when you said it did not cost any money, you meant to the extent of only \$1,300,000?

Mr. MARTIN of California. Obviously that is part of the cost of the program.

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

Mr. MARTIN of California. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman and the previous speaker are talking about the fact that expenditures for hired labor constitute an undue burden upon the farmer in this country. At the appropriate time—I do not want to burden the House with statistics—I will insert in the RECORD a table showing the realized gross farm income, total production expenses, and expenditures for hired labor, in the United States and selected States for 1961, which shows in our great State of California the realized gross farm income expenditure for hired labor as a percentage of realized gross farm income is 16.5 percent and the total production expenses for hired labor are 22.8 percent.

I am very proud to say that that figure is the highest figure in a table of States that consists of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Michigan, New Mexico, and Texas. In these States these figures are considerably lower. Of course, what this shows is that as a percent of the gross expenses it is a relatively small item. I would remind the gentleman that realized gross farm income in the United States as a whole last year was \$39,912 million.

Mr. MARTIN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD the table to which I have referred, and other significant tables bearing on this problem.

The tables referred to follow.

Realized gross farm income, total production expenses, and expenditures for hired labor, United States and selected States, 1961

State	Realized gross farm income (million dollars)	Total production expenses (million dollars)	Expenditures for hired labor			State	Realized gross farm income (million dollars)	Total production expenses (million dollars)	Expenditures for hired labor		
			Million dollars ¹	As percent of—					Million dollars ¹	As percent of—	
				Realized gross farm income (real)	Total production expenses					Realized gross farm income (real)	Total production expenses
United States.....	39,912.0	27,109.0	3,048.0	7.6	11.2	Colorado.....	712.2	560.2	52.6	7.4	9.4
Arizona.....	484.4	330.0	62.5	12.9	18.9	Michigan.....	894.7	615.8	71.9	8.0	11.7
Arkansas.....	848.7	504.4	79.8	9.4	15.8	New Mexico.....	265.7	192.5	25.4	9.6	13.2
California.....	3,381.7	2,446.9	556.7	16.5	22.8	Texas.....	2,670.7	1,799.6	301.2	11.3	16.7

¹ Includes cash wages, perquisites, and social security taxes paid by employers.

Source: "Farm Income, State Estimates, 1949-61," USDA Economic Research Service, August 1962.

Farm wage rates, Jan. 1, 1963¹

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes, composite rates (1910-14=100) ²
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board or room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine.....	\$207	\$153	\$39.00	\$56.00			\$9.50		\$1.14	\$1.02	595
New Hampshire.....	227	167	44.00	63.00			10.20		1.23	1.13	714
Vermont.....	206	160	41.00	56.00			9.60		1.19	1.04	668
Massachusetts.....	247	167	47.00	67.00			10.60		1.35	1.20	750
Rhode Island.....	247	167	47.00	68.00			10.70		1.36	1.22	812
Connecticut.....	247	168	47.00	68.00			10.80		1.36	1.22	815
New England.....	227	163	43.75	62.00			10.10		1.30	1.12	712
New York.....	218	152	38.50	54.50			9.20		1.17	.943	580
New Jersey.....	235	170	46.50	58.50			9.70		1.17	1.01	716
Pennsylvania.....	200	138	36.50	49.75			8.50		1.09	.869	694
Middle Atlantic.....	215	150	38.75	53.50			9.00		1.15	.929	644
Ohio.....	183	133			\$6.70		8.60		1.11	.826	632
Indiana.....	190	140			6.60		8.60		1.11	.849	669
Illinois.....	210	160			7.90		9.60		1.15	.947	687
Michigan.....	220	152			7.00		9.10		1.11	.918	641
Wisconsin.....	208	150			7.00		9.30		1.12	.907	609
East North Central.....	206	150			7.20		9.10		1.12	.902	650
Minnesota.....	191	148			7.80		9.80		1.14	.927	587
Iowa.....	214	170			8.40		10.30		1.19	1.01	604
Missouri.....	171	119			6.30		8.00		1.05	.798	705
North Dakota.....	180	138			6.50		8.40		1.04	.843	509
South Dakota.....	195	153			7.00		8.80		1.07	.839	545
Nebraska.....	227	177			8.20		10.10		1.18	1.02	670
Kansas.....	211	160			7.70		9.70		1.16	.968	766
West North Central.....	198	151			7.40		9.30		1.12	.922	630
Delaware.....	170				\$6.90		8.80	\$0.95	1.05	1.06	882
Maryland.....	182				6.70		8.40	.97	1.06	1.04	955
Virginia.....	5.50				5.50		6.80	.68	.87	.784	814
West Virginia.....	5.10				5.90		5.90	.67	.79	.720	529
North Carolina.....	5.30				6.10		6.5	.65	.78	.716	762
South Carolina.....	3.85				4.50		5.0	.59	.59	.531	665
Georgia.....	4.40				5.10		6.2	.73	.625	.625	657
Florida.....	6.00				6.00		6.40	.81	.90	.795	731
South Atlantic.....					5.30		6.10	.70	.81	.730	745
Kentucky.....					4.55		5.60	.65	.84	.694	618
Tennessee.....					4.20		5.00	.53	.67	.610	565
Alabama.....					4.25		4.90	.55	.66	.601	595
Mississippi.....					4.20		4.50	.53	.59	.558	545
East South Central.....					4.30		5.00	.56	.68	.612	579
Arkansas.....					5.90		6.40	.68	.77	.771	680
Louisiana.....					5.00		5.50	.60	.70	.667	650
Oklahoma.....					7.30		8.30	.90	1.04	.995	731
Texas.....					6.30		6.90	.77	.89	.841	644
West South Central.....					6.10		6.70	.74	.85	.815	668
Montana.....	221	167					9.30		1.23	.994	510
Idaho.....	262	207					10.80		1.28	1.15	642
Wyoming.....	242	165					9.20		1.28	1.02	523
Colorado.....	246	166					9.80		1.17	1.01	662
New Mexico.....	192	135					7.30		.94	.799	638
Arizona.....	265	180					9.00		1.04	1.02	639
Utah.....	244	203					10.20		1.25	1.11	648
Nevada.....	260	180					9.80		1.30	1.08	579
Mountain.....	247	173					8.90		1.07	.994	599
Washington.....	270	210						1.24	1.35	1.32	640
Oregon.....	257	191						1.19	1.26	1.24	608
California.....	310	230						1.20	1.30	1.33	597
Pacific.....	305	227						1.20	1.30	1.32	609
United States.....	205	161	36.25	48.00	5.70	6.60	6.80	.88	1.13	.948	663

¹ Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

² Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Average farm wage rates, 1961¹

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes of composite rates (1910-14=100)
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board or room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine.....	\$200	\$147	\$37.50	\$55.50			\$9.50		\$1.13	\$0.969	584
New Hampshire.....	219	159	44.50	59.50			9.60		1.16	1.02	673
Vermont.....	200	157	39.50	53.75			9.20		1.14	.963	634
Massachusetts.....	232	161	45.50	62.50			10.50		1.24	1.08	708
Rhode Island.....	234	160	45.75	63.75			10.70		1.23	1.10	762
Connecticut.....	233	160	45.00	63.75			10.90		1.32	1.13	777
New England.....	214	155	41.50	58.50			9.90		1.19	1.02	669
New York.....	213	148	38.25	54.25			9.20		1.15	.959	596
New Jersey.....	220	156	41.50	56.00			9.70		1.16	.952	680
Pennsylvania.....	189	135	35.50	47.50			8.30		1.07	.840	677
Middle Atlantic.....	206	145	37.75	52.25			9.00		1.13	.900	629
Ohio.....	177	129					\$6.60	8.50	1.09	.825	625
Indiana.....	180	133					6.50	8.40	1.07	.823	648
Illinois.....	201	155					7.60	9.40	1.12	.889	659
Michigan.....	211	143					6.90	8.80	1.09	.867	624
Wisconsin.....	202	149					7.00	8.90	1.10	.866	593
East North Central.....	196	143					7.00	8.90	1.10	.857	630
Minnesota.....	190	149					8.00	9.90	1.10	.919	581
Iowa.....	205	164					8.40	10.30	1.16	.967	590
Missouri.....	159	116					6.20	7.80	1.01	.771	688
North Dakota.....	187	157					7.20	9.00	1.04	.860	494
South Dakota.....	191	152					7.30	9.00	1.05	.880	533
Nebraska.....	216	166					8.10	10.00	1.13	.960	640
Kansas.....	202	154					8.10	9.70	1.14	.933	746
West North Central.....	190	148					7.70	9.40	1.10	.894	617
Delaware.....					\$6.90		8.90	\$0.94	1.00	.939	861
Maryland.....					6.60		8.10	.93	1.04	.901	910
Virginia.....					5.40		6.50	.70	.84	.707	786
West Virginia.....					5.30		5.80	.66	.78	.647	513
North Carolina.....					5.10		5.80	.63	.72	.626	720
South Carolina.....					3.70		4.20	.46	.53	.456	616
Georgia.....					4.25		4.80	.57	.67	.545	619
Florida.....					5.70		6.20	.79	.86	.709	723
South Atlantic.....					5.00		5.70	.66	.74	.624	701
Kentucky.....					4.45		5.50	.63	.87	.654	617
Tennessee.....					4.05		4.80	.51	.65	.550	556
Alabama.....					4.05		4.55	.55	.61	.530	582
Mississippi.....					3.85		4.20	.48	.53	.479	515
East South Central.....					4.10		4.85	.53	.65	.548	565
Arkansas.....					5.40		5.90	.63	.73	.666	622
Louisiana.....					4.75		5.30	.59	.66	.597	628
Oklahoma.....					7.20		8.30	.89	1.01	.916	689
Texas.....					6.20		6.70	.69	.80	.746	617
West South Central.....					5.80		6.40	.68	.78	.716	634
Montana.....	227	179					9.60		1.16	.934	489
Idaho.....	255	200					10.40		1.20	1.02	594
Wyoming.....	230	164					9.60		1.14	.923	494
Colorado.....	226	167					9.70		1.13	.932	634
New Mexico.....	194	137					7.40		.87	.747	638
Arizona.....	252	179					8.80		.99	.907	617
Utah.....	242	206					9.80		1.23	1.01	641
Nevada.....	260	176					9.80		1.19	.982	546
Mountain.....	236	176					9.40		1.09	.921	583
Washington.....	271	212						1.23	1.30	1.26	620
Oregon.....	256	194						1.18	1.23	1.19	591
California.....	300	230						1.20	1.27	1.25	585
Pacific.....	294	226						1.20	1.27	1.25	591
United States.....	195	151	35.75	46.50	5.30	6.50	6.60	.90	.99	.834	642

¹ Weighted average of 5 quarters. Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State

composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

Average farm wage rates, 1962¹

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes, composite rates (1910-14=100)
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine.....	\$203	\$154	\$39.75	\$55.50			\$9.70		\$1.15	\$1.00	604
New Hampshire.....	223	163	45.00	60.50			10.00		1.20	1.06	700
Vermont.....	204	160	40.25	55.50			9.50		1.17	1.00	659
Massachusetts.....	243	165	47.25	65.50			10.70		1.31	1.14	746
Rhode Island.....	244	166	47.25	66.00			10.80		1.27	1.14	794
Connecticut.....	245	168	47.25	66.25			10.90		1.36	1.17	808
New England.....	221	161	43.25	59.75			10.10		1.22	1.06	695
New York.....	218	151	39.50	55.75			9.30		1.17	.938	583
New Jersey.....	224	163	45.25	59.00			10.20		1.19	.991	708
Pennsylvania.....	195	137	36.50	48.75			8.50		1.09	.858	692
Middle Atlantic.....	211	148	39.25	54.00			9.10		1.15	.920	643
Ohio.....	178	134					\$6.70	8.60	1.10	.832	630
Indiana.....	185	138					6.80	8.50	1.09	.836	658
Illinois.....	208	159					7.80	9.70	1.16	.913	676
Michigan.....	218	151					7.00	9.00	1.10	.883	635
Wisconsin.....	206	151					7.20	9.10	1.13	.884	605
East North Central.....	201	148					7.20	9.00	1.12	.874	643
Minnesota.....	195	154					8.10	9.90	1.15	.941	596
Iowa.....	213	168					8.60	10.50	1.20	.996	607
Missouri.....	164	122					6.50	8.10	1.05	.802	716
North Dakota.....	194	165					7.50	9.60	1.09	.905	520
South Dakota.....	196	157					7.50	9.20	1.09	.905	548
Nebraska.....	224	172					8.40	10.30	1.17	.987	658
Kansas.....	212	165					8.30	10.20	1.17	.969	775
West North Central.....	197	154					7.90	9.70	1.14	.926	639
Delaware.....					\$7.00		8.60	\$0.95	1.05	.945	867
Maryland.....					6.80		8.20	.94	1.04	.907	916
Virginia.....					5.50		6.80	.71	.85	.725	806
West Virginia.....					5.20		5.90	.67	.80	.658	522
North Carolina.....					5.30		6.20	.65	.75	.656	754
South Carolina.....					3.85		4.45	.47	.55	.474	641
Georgia.....					4.35		5.00	.60	.69	.564	641
Florida.....					5.90		6.50	.78	.85	.719	734
South Atlantic.....					5.20		5.90	.67	.76	.646	726
Kentucky.....					4.50		5.70	.65	.85	.655	618
Tennessee.....					4.15		5.00	.53	.67	.566	572
Alabama.....					4.20		4.75	.55	.63	.543	597
Mississippi.....					4.10		4.40	.52	.59	.514	553
East South Central.....					4.25		4.95	.55	.66	.563	580
Arkansas.....					5.70		6.20	.66	.77	.697	651
Louisiana.....					4.85		5.30	.59	.69	.615	647
Oklahoma.....					7.40		8.60	.91	1.02	.935	714
Texas.....					6.40		7.00	.73	.83	.772	638
West South Central.....					6.10		6.70	.70	.81	.743	658
Montana.....	231	179					9.80		1.19	.956	501
Idaho.....	267	211					11.00		1.27	1.07	626
Wyoming.....	236	165					9.90		1.15	.938	502
Colorado.....	237	171					9.90		1.15	.950	646
New Mexico.....	196	142					7.60		.89	.759	649
Arizona.....	263	179					9.10		1.00	.927	631
Utah.....	251	213					10.20		1.28	1.05	667
Nevada.....	259	186					9.70		1.25	1.01	563
Mountain.....	245	180					9.60		1.12	.948	600
Washington.....	277	214						1.26	1.33	1.29	633
Oregon.....	256	193						1.19	1.26	1.22	605
California.....	309	234						1.21	1.29	1.27	595
Pacific.....	301	229						1.21	1.29	1.27	601
United States.....	200	155	37.00	47.75	5.60	6.70	6.90	.92	1.01	.856	658

¹ Weighted average of 5 quarters. Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

Impact of adverse effect rate

Man-months of Mexican labor, by State, 1959-62

State	Adverse effect rate	Hourly rate most commonly paid domestic workers	
		1962	1961
Arkansas.....	\$0.60	\$0.50	\$0.50
Arizona.....	.95	.95	.75
California.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Colorado.....	.90	.90	.75
Georgia.....	.75	(1)	(2)
Illinois.....	1.00	(2)	(2)
Indiana.....	1.00	1.00	.80
Iowa.....	1.00	(2)	(2)
Kansas.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kentucky.....	.80	(1)	.50
Michigan.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Minnesota.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Montana.....	1.00	(2)	(2)
Nebraska.....	1.00	1.00	.95
New Mexico.....	.75	.75	.70
Nevada.....	1.00	1.00	.75
North Dakota.....	1.00	(1)	(2)
Oregon.....	1.00	(2)	(2)
South Dakota.....	1.00	(2)	(2)
Tennessee.....	.65	.55	.50
Texas.....	.70	.60	.50
Utah.....	1.00	1.00	.75
Wisconsin.....	1.00	\$1.15	.85
Wyoming.....	1.00	(2)	(2)

State	Man-months				
	1959	1960	1961	1962	Percent change, 1959-62
U.S. total.....	1,630,950	1,358,058	1,148,800	716,426	-56
Texas.....	733,724	569,177	496,702	188,409	-74
California.....	560,690	487,680	406,255	378,570	-32
Arizona.....	110,608	104,078	86,810	61,666	-44
Arkansas.....	84,689	78,436	52,988	18,664	-78
New Mexico.....	81,368	60,362	46,783	17,888	-78
Michigan.....	22,776	21,381	23,788	18,361	-19
Colorado.....	15,747	16,112	19,192	19,690	+25
Montana.....	3,257	3,376	3,122	2,644	-19
Nebraska.....	2,733	2,712	2,474	2,715	-1
Wyoming.....	1,816	1,852	2,423	2,010	+11
Georgia.....	1,812	1,806	1,454	0	-100
Wisconsin.....	1,496	1,531	1,340	1,327	-11
Utah.....	1,837	1,804	1,276	1,850	+1
Tennessee.....	2,474	2,283	1,060	330	-87
All others.....	4,945	4,013	1,835	2,302	-83

¹ Because of rounding, sum of items may not add to total.
Source: In-Season Farm Labor Reports, Bureau of Employment Security.

¹ No Mexican nationals employed in 1962.
² Mexican nationals employed only in piece rate activities.
³ Based on only 1 survey (pea harvest).
Source: ES-232 Domestic Agricultural Wage Reports.

Annual average Mexican worker employment, by State, 1953-62

[In thousands]

Year	United States	Texas	California	Arizona	Arkansas	New Mexico	Other States
1953.....	70.7	22.7	25.0	6.0	3.9	8.7	4.4
1954.....	85.3	34.0	30.3	7.1	3.9	6.6	3.4
1955.....	112.8	50.8	40.1	6.9	4.8	6.6	3.6
1956.....	125.7	48.9	50.3	8.1	4.8	6.2	7.4
1957.....	132.2	55.6	50.8	8.3	4.5	7.1	5.9
1958.....	131.8	60.4	46.1	10.2	3.0	7.4	4.7
1959.....	135.9	61.1	46.7	9.2	7.1	6.8	5.0
1960.....	113.2	47.4	40.6	8.7	6.5	5.0	5.0
1961.....	95.7	41.4	33.9	7.2	4.4	3.9	4.9
1962.....	59.7	15.7	31.5	5.1	1.6	1.5	4.3

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Adverse effect rates and peak employment of Mexicans, by State, 1960-62

State	Adverse effect rate	Peak Mexican worker employment ¹		
		1962	1961	1960
Arizona.....	\$0.95	8.4	10.9	14.3
Arkansas.....	.60	6.7	21.2	31.3
California.....	1.00	71.7	65.4	73.4
Colorado.....	.90	6.4	6.6	6.6
Georgia.....	.75	0	.8	1.3
Illinois.....	1.00	.1	.1	.2
Indiana.....	1.00	.4	.6	.6
Iowa.....	1.00	.2	.2	.1
Kansas.....	1.00	.1	.1	(2)
Kentucky.....	.80	0	.1	.2
Michigan.....	1.00	12.7	14.3	11.2
Minnesota.....	1.00	(2)	.1	.1
Missouri.....	1.00	0	0	.5
Montana.....	1.00	2.1	2.3	2.6
Nebraska.....	1.00	1.6	2.0	2.3
Nevada.....	1.00	.1	.1	.1
New Mexico.....	.75	2.0	8.0	11.3
North Dakota.....	1.00	0	.1	.1
Oregon.....	1.00	.3	.3	.3
South Dakota.....	1.00	.1	.3	.2
Tennessee.....	.65	.2	.4	.7
Texas.....	.70	24.2	104.1	103.7
Utah.....	1.00	.4	.3	.4
Wisconsin.....	1.00	.6	.8	1.0
Wyoming.....	1.00	1.3	1.6	1.2
U.S. total:				
Peak employment.....		114.2	208.5	234.1
Number admitted.....		195.0	291.4	315.8

¹ From ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports. The term "peak" refers to the highest employment at any time during the year.
² Less than 50 workers.

Percent distribution of annual average Mexican worker employment by State, 1953-62

Year	Percent of U.S. Mexican employment						
	United States	Texas	California	Arizona	Arkansas	New Mexico	Other States
1953.....	100	32	35	9	6	12	6
1954.....	100	40	35	8	5	8	4
1955.....	100	45	36	6	4	6	3
1956.....	100	39	40	6	4	5	6
1957.....	100	42	38	6	3	5	6
1958.....	100	46	35	8	2	6	3
1959.....	100	45	34	7	5	5	4
1960.....	100	42	36	8	6	4	4
1961.....	100	43	35	8	5	4	5
1962.....	100	26	53	9	3	3	6

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Annual average employment of seasonal hired workers in agriculture, by nationality, United States and major user States, 1959-62

State and year	Employment (in thousands)				Mexican as percent of total seasonal	State and year	Employment (in thousands)				Mexican as percent of total seasonal
	Total seasonal	Domestic	Total foreign	Mexican			Total seasonal	Domestic	Total foreign	Mexican	
U.S. total:											
1962	702.1	631.4	70.7	59.7	9	Colorado:					
1961	742.2	635.7	106.5	95.7	13	1962	7.9	6.2	1.6	1.6	20
1960	760.9	637.8	123.3	113.2	15	1961	8.7	7.1	1.6	1.6	18
1959	802.4	656.6	145.8	135.9	17	1960	8.5	7.1	1.3	1.3	15
California:						1959	9.3	8.0	1.3	1.3	14
1962	134.8	102.0	32.8	31.5	23	New Mexico:					
1961	142.7	107.4	35.4	33.9	24	1962	3.2	1.7	1.5	1.5	47
1960	140.9	98.8	42.2	40.6	29	1961	5.6	1.7	3.9	3.9	70
1959	150.4	102.3	48.1	46.7	31	1960	6.8	1.8	5.0	5.0	74
Texas:						1959	8.7	1.9	6.8	6.8	78
1962	142.9	127.2	15.8	15.7	11	Michigan:					
1961	175.0	133.5	41.5	41.4	24	1962	23.7	22.1	1.6	1.0	4
1960	184.7	137.2	47.5	47.4	26	1961	24.4	22.4	2.0	1.9	8
1959	202.2	141.0	61.2	61.1	30	1960	26.0	24.2	1.8	1.8	7
Arizona:						1959	24.9	23.0	2.0	1.9	8
1962	17.6	12.5	5.1	5.1	29	All other States:					
1961	30.4	13.1	7.2	7.2	35	1962	351.1	340.4	10.7	1.7	(1)
1960	24.1	15.4	8.7	8.7	36	1961	339.6	329.1	10.5	1.4	(1)
1959	23.5	14.2	9.2	9.2	39	1960	339.8	329.7	10.3	1.9	1
Arkansas:						1959	349.7	339.6	10.1	1.8	1
1962	20.9	19.3	1.6	1.6	8						
1961	25.8	21.4	4.4	4.4	17						
1960	30.1	23.6	6.5	6.5	22						
1959	33.7	26.6	7.1	7.1	21						

¹ Less than 0.5 percent.

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Employment of Mexican workers, selected States, data of peak Mexican employment, United States, 1962

[Employment in thousands]

State	Date of peak employment	Mexican	Other foreign worker	Domestic	Total	Mexican employment as percent of total seasonal
California	September	71.7	11.3	167.6	249.6	29.8
Texas	October	24.2	(2)	180.4	204.6	11.8
New Mexico	June	2.0		2.2	4.3	47.7
Arkansas	September	6.9		55.2	62.1	11.1
Michigan	August	12.7	(2)	48.5	61.2	20.8
Colorado	May	6.4		10.1	16.5	38.5
Arizona	November	8.4		15.9	24.2	34.5

¹ Japanese nationals.

² Less than 50 workers.

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Payments made under the Sugar Act to producers in States where Mexican nationals were used in sugarbeet work, 1961¹

State	Amount of payment (thousands)
California	\$10,265
Colorado	6,075
Kansas	378
Michigan	2,630
Montana	2,300
Nebraska	2,861
Utah	861
Wyoming	1,774

¹ Payments data for 1962 not complete.

Price-support costs

The table below shows the amount of cotton price-support loans on the 1962 crop which were outstanding as of January 25, 1963, in States where Mexican nationals were used in 1962 cotton activities:

State	Millions
Arizona	\$31.7
Arkansas	72.7
California	50.5
New Mexico	6.0
Tennessee	22.1
Texas	168.1

Since growths have until July 31, 1963, to repay loans and take their cotton out of the price-support program, it cannot be determined at this time how much of the loan amounts shown above will eventually remain outstanding. The figures for the 1961 crop provide some indication. The amount of price-support loans which the Government finally took over on the 1961 crop is shown below:

State	Millions
Arizona	\$18.6
Arkansas	51.6
California	9.1
New Mexico	14.3
Tennessee	23.7
Texas	158.2

Number of Mexican contract workers admitted for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture, 1942-62

Calendar year:	Number admitted
1942 ¹	4,203
1943	52,098
1944	62,170
1945	49,454
1946	32,043
1947	19,632
1948 ²	35,345
1949	107,000
1950	67,500
1951	192,000
1952	197,100
1953	201,380
1954	309,033
1955	398,650
1956	445,197
1957	436,049
1958	432,857
1959	437,643
1960	315,846
1961	291,420
1962	194,978

¹ Data from 1942 through 1947 were obtained from reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

² Data from 1948 through 1962 compiled from administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Mexican working force, man-months of employment, and related data

Year	Working force			Months worked by average Mexican worker ²	Total man-months worked by all Mexican workers	Annual average Mexican employment ³
	Total ¹	Carried over from preceding year	Admitted during year ¹			
	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands		Thousands	Thousands
1956	526.7	81.5	445.2	2.86	1,507.8	125.7
1957	511.1	75.1	436.0	3.11	1,587.8	132.3
1958	530.2	97.4	432.9	2.98	1,581.5	131.8
1959	511.4	73.8	437.6	3.19	1,631.0	135.9
1960	387.6	71.8	315.8	3.50	1,368.1	113.2
1961	344.3	52.9	291.4	3.34	1,148.9	95.7
1962	243.6	48.6	195.0	2.94	716.4	59.7

¹ This involves duplication since the same Mexican was sometimes admitted more than once during the year.

² Total man-months divided by total working force.

³ Total man-months divided by 12.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security administrative reports and in season farm labor reports.

Number of Mexican workers contracted and recontracted, by State, 1959-62

State	1959	1960	1961	1962	State	1959	1960	1961	1962
U.S. total.....	506,003	380,381	349,055	226,948	Missouri.....	1,203	594	0	0
Arizona.....	29,779	24,557	21,352	16,906	Montana.....	2,210	2,438	2,640	1,814
Arkansas.....	44,780	42,443	34,073	12,410	Nebraska.....	2,144	2,280	2,162	2,119
California.....	152,746	127,658	113,169	127,002	Nevada.....	153	222	83	66
Colorado.....	9,281	9,617	10,649	10,372	New Mexico.....	19,253	11,336	8,311	2,144
Georgia.....	1,094	1,264	777	0	North Dakota.....	0	45	0	0
Illinois.....	219	375	95	113	Oregon.....	418	350	327	365
Indiana.....	558	710	780	587	South Dakota.....	217	240	252	98
Iowa.....	75	134	212	174	Tennessee.....	1,228	1,139	703	165
Kansas.....	42	17	145	142	Texas.....	225,498	140,308	135,515	36,289
Kentucky.....	436	269	57	0	Utah.....	532	523	415	640
Michigan.....	11,693	11,301	14,890	13,327	Washington.....	0	69	0	0
Minnesota.....	144	139	55	39	Wisconsin.....	1,090	1,238	954	778
					Wyoming.....	1,160	1,215	1,549	1,398

Source: Administrative reports, Bureau of Employment Security.

Mexican nationals contracting activity January through December 1962 as reported by reception centers

States	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Arizona.....	110	592	501	917	2,996	64	93	1,160	3,297	562	1,693	0	11,985
Arkansas.....	0	0	0	0	3,996	802	0	0	4,045	7	0	0	8,850
California.....	2,089	1,043	2,378	14,652	19,858	4,493	5,438	42,910	17,611	4,295	1,291	897	116,455
Colorado.....	0	0	0	0	6,556	349	966	1,163	85	0	0	0	9,119
Indiana.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	25
Kansas.....	0	0	0	0	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Michigan.....	0	0	0	0	846	0	7,717	1,405	0	0	0	0	9,968
Montana.....	0	0	0	0	1,716	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,814
Nebraska.....	0	0	0	0	1,935	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,119
Nevada.....	0	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
New Mexico.....	0	0	110	35	608	199	22	97	307	236	20	0	1,634
Oregon.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	221	0	0	0	253
South Dakota.....	0	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Tennessee.....	0	0	0	0	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Texas.....	197	0	786	967	8,683	2,149	3,029	3,174	4,053	4,995	1,916	203	30,152
Utah.....	0	0	0	0	160	32	0	33	146	0	0	0	371
Wisconsin.....	0	0	0	0	20	0	205	158	0	0	0	0	383
Wyoming.....	0	0	0	0	1,398	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,398
1962 total.....	2,396	1,635	3,775	16,571	48,717	8,377	17,495	50,132	29,765	10,095	4,920	1,100	194,978
United States, 1961.....	2,393	1,493	7,493	22,929	39,680	15,897	25,839	39,467	102,059	29,605	3,028	1,046	291,420
United States, 1963.....	2,478	2,209											

Source: ES-362.

Mexican nationals recontracting activity, January through December 1962, as reported by reception centers and regional offices

States	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Arizona.....	106	27	952	831	277	3	133	0	41	1,314	1,131	106	4,921
Arkansas.....	0	0	0	0	1	118	0	0	532	2,909	0	0	3,560
California.....	398	60	235	841	728	495	1,661	722	240	2,500	1,612	1,055	10,547
Colorado.....	0	0	0	0	126	61	661	360	17	28	0	0	1,253
Illinois.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	23	0	0	0	113
Indiana.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	10	152	0	0	0	562
Iowa.....	0	0	0	0	0	75	99	0	0	0	0	0	174
Kansas.....	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	1	5	0	0	19
Michigan.....	9	1	0	0	0	0	2,076	1,273	0	0	0	0	3,359
Minnesota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	0	0	0	39
New Mexico.....	31	16	9	10	37	49	149	50	61	61	33	4	510
Oregon.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	0	0	112
Texas.....	662	155	236	263	366	698	1,329	571	282	477	944	244	6,137
Utah.....	0	0	0	0	0	118	113	38	0	0	0	0	269
Wisconsin.....	0	0	0	0	0	50	259	36	20	30	0	0	395
1962 total.....	1,206	259	1,432	1,945	1,540	1,581	6,884	3,160	1,398	7,436	3,720	1,409	31,970
United States, 1961.....	1,456	1,115	5,217	1,611	3,382	6,806	6,106	12,250	4,092	6,596	5,579	3,425	57,635
United States, 1963.....	567	504											

Source: ES-362.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1962

State (1)	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers ¹ (6)	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6) (7)
	Number (2)	Members using Mexicans (3)	Number (4)	Farms using Mexicans (5)		
Total, all States.....	231	24,492	57	6,458	2,264	33,214
Arizona.....	4	305	0	0	2	307
Arkansas.....	51	2,650	0	0	37	2,687
California.....	45	7,679	8	420	15	8,114
Colorado.....	3	204	8	3,511	65	3,780
Georgia.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois.....	0	0	0	0	2	2
Indiana.....	1	25	1	14	0	35
Iowa.....	0	0	1	18	2	14
Kansas.....	0	6	1	26	0	26
Kentucky.....	0	0	7	57	0	64
Michigan.....	14	1,369	0	0	5	1,429
Minnesota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montana.....	0	0	3	832	0	832
Nebraska.....	0	0	1	540	0	540
Nevada.....	1	11	0	0	0	11
New Mexico.....	13	1,250	0	0	211	1,461
North Dakota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon.....	1	37	0	0	0	37
South Dakota.....	0	0	1	20	0	20
Tennessee.....	1	18	0	0	0	18
Texas.....	93	10,794	17	386	1,912	13,092
Utah.....	4	144	0	0	1	145
Wisconsin.....	0	0	7	127	3	130
Wyoming.....	0	0	2	529	0	529

¹ Those contracting workers only for their own use.
Source: Administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1959

State (1)	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers (6)	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6) (7)
	Number (2)	Members using Mexicans (3)	Number (4)	Farms using Mexicans (5)		
Total, all States.....	305	38,715	86	4,942	5,131	48,788
Arizona.....	4	923	0	0	0	923
Arkansas.....	56	2,463	0	0	178	2,641
California.....	54	11,585	11	547	44	12,176
Colorado.....	5	266	7	1,759	35	2,060
Georgia.....	0	0	0	0	102	102
Illinois.....	0	0	0	0	3	3
Indiana.....	1	39	0	0	7	46
Iowa.....	1	10	0	0	0	10
Kansas.....	0	7	1	2	3	5
Kentucky.....	1	7	0	0	2	9
Michigan.....	43	3,785	8	123	13	3,921
Minnesota.....	1	6	1	9	6	21
Missouri.....	3	193	0	0	13	206
Montana.....	0	0	3	749	0	749
Nebraska.....	0	0	1	550	12	562
Nevada.....	2	27	0	0	0	27
New Mexico.....	16	1,868	0	0	20	1,888
North Dakota.....	0	0	1	12	1	13
Oregon.....	1	15	0	0	0	15
South Dakota.....	0	0	1	75	1	76
Tennessee.....	1	64	0	0	1	65
Texas.....	113	17,258	42	374	4,678	22,310
Utah.....	3	206	0	0	5	211
Wisconsin.....	0	0	8	207	6	213
Wyoming.....	0	0	2	535	1	536

Number of farms using Mexican contract workers, total number of farms, and farms reporting expenditures for hired labor, United States and selected States, 1959

State	Total farms ¹	Farms reporting hired labor expenditures ¹	Farms with Mexican contract workers		
			Number ²	Percent of—	
				All farms	Farms with hired labor
United States ³	3,703,894	1,782,735	48,788	1.3	2.7
Arizona.....	7,233	4,700	923	12.8	19.6
Arkansas.....	95,007	39,775	2,641	2.8	6.6
California.....	99,274	62,284	12,176	12.3	19.5
Colorado.....	33,390	19,650	2,060	6.2	10.5
Georgia.....	106,350	54,681	102	.1	.2
Illinois.....	154,644	77,092	3	(4)	(4)
Indiana.....	128,160	54,133	46	(4)	.1
Iowa.....	174,707	92,975	10	(4)	(4)
Kansas.....	104,347	53,454	5	(4)	(4)
Kentucky.....	150,986	74,506	9	(4)	(4)
Michigan.....	111,817	48,398	3,921	3.5	8.1
Minnesota.....	145,662	65,013	21	(4)	(4)
Missouri.....	168,672	69,232	206	.1	.3
Montana.....	28,959	16,143	749	2.6	4.6
Nebraska.....	90,475	44,175	562	.6	1.3
Nevada.....	2,354	1,360	27	1.1	2.0
New Mexico.....	15,919	7,853	1,888	11.9	24.0
North Dakota.....	54,928	27,596	13	(4)	(4)
Oregon.....	42,573	19,500	15	(4)	.1
South Dakota.....	55,727	26,598	76	.1	.3
Tennessee.....	157,688	72,576	65	(4)	.1
Texas.....	227,071	123,929	22,310	9.8	18.0
Utah.....	17,811	9,514	211	1.2	2.2
Wisconsin.....	131,215	59,637	213	.2	.4
Wyoming.....	9,744	5,352	536	5.5	10.0

¹ 1959 Census of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census.
² Bureau of Employment Security.
³ U. S. totals include 48 contiguous States only.
⁴ Less than 0.05 percent.

Mexican program costs

(Thousands of dollars)

Fiscal year	Total cost	Revolving fund	Salaries and expenses	Compliance
1963 ¹	5,569	2,131	2,048	1,390
1962.....	5,941	2,773	2,019	1,149
1961.....	5,315	2,650	1,496	1,169
1960.....	5,426	3,216	1,337	873
1959.....	6,032	3,841	1,673	818
1958.....	5,225	2,890	(4)	(4)

¹ Fiscal year 1963 data are estimates.
² Separate accounting was not started until fiscal year 1959.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1961

State (1)	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers ¹ (6)	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6) (7)
	Number (2)	Members using Mexicans (3)	Number (4)	Farms using Mexicans (5)		
Total, all States.....	295	26,792	72	5,116	3,802	35,710
Arizona.....	4	480	0	0	2	482
Arkansas.....	61	2,915	0	0	97	3,012
California.....	47	7,162	8	420	17	7,599
Colorado.....	3	317	9	1,911	71	2,290
Georgia.....	0	0	0	0	99	99
Illinois.....	0	0	1	0	1	1
Indiana.....	1	48	2	10	10	68
Iowa.....	0	0	1	27	0	27
Kansas.....	0	0	1	11	3	14
Kentucky.....	1	14	0	0	1	15
Michigan.....	14	1,424	9	89	4	1,517
Minnesota.....	1	1	0	0	5	6
Montana.....	0	0	3	756	0	756
Nebraska.....	0	0	1	540	12	552
Nevada.....	1	11	0	0	0	11
New Mexico.....	16	1,698	0	0	23	1,721
North Dakota.....	0	0	0	10	0	10
Oregon.....	1	44	0	0	0	44
South Dakota.....	0	0	1	65	0	65
Tennessee.....	1	52	0	0	1	53
Texas.....	140	12,477	23	573	3,448	16,498
Utah.....	4	149	0	0	2	151
Wisconsin.....	0	0	11	163	6	169
Wyoming.....	0	0	2	541	0	541

¹ Those contracting workers only for their own use.
Source: Administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

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

Mr. MARTIN of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, as one who disagrees with the gentleman from California, I want to stand up and say that he has made the best argument for his position I have heard on this floor and I respect him for it.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 5497 which would extend the Mexican farm labor import program. I believe this bill should be defeated because it would continue an injustice to our own American citizen farmworkers and also to the family farmers of our country. In brief it is an unjustified subsidy to less than 1 percent of the growers of the United States.

Some 4 years ago, James P. Mitchell, the great Secretary of Labor during the Eisenhower administration, called attention to the evils of this program and appointed four very distinguished consultants to study it.

These consultants were Edward J. They, a former Republican Senator of Minnesota; Msgr. George G. Higgins, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. Rufus B. Van Kleinsmid, then chancellor of the University of California, and Glenn A. Garrett, then chairman of the Texas Council on Migrant Labor.

This distinguished study group pointed out the tremendous hardships and suffering which this program caused among our American citizen farmworkers. It unanimously urged in 1959 that the existing law authorizing the imported labor be extended only temporarily and then dropped.

That was 4 years ago. Certainly, now the program has continued far longer than justified.

Public Law 78, which authorizes the program is really a denial of the free enterprise system. It not only prevents competitive conditions setting the price of labor but it prevents seasonal utilization of our own American transient labor pool. It serves to increase our own unemployment and the time has come to end it once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes a mockery of the free enterprise system. If we believe in the free enterprise system, then let us practice it in all cases. Let us not simply turn to it when it serves our purposes and turn from it when that serves a purpose.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5497 and thereby bring the work begun by former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to a successful conclusion.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly concur with the observations of the gentleman from Washington insofar as the merits of the presentation of the gentleman from California are concerned, but I disagree with him very heartily on his other comments. I should like to point out that I am not sure that he and some of the other Members of the House realize that Sec-

retary Mitchell or Secretary Goldberg could have and Secretary Wirtz can phase out this program or he can stop it right now. Not one Mexican bracero may be employed without a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that there is not a domestic prospective employee available for the job. So if Secretary Mitchell felt that way, if Secretary Goldberg felt that way, they never phased it out. Obviously Secretary Wirtz does not feel that way because he has recommended an extension.

Mr. MARTIN of California. The gentleman has brought out a very important point that is often neglected in the argument on this subject. This does not put out of work any domestic worker at all who is willing and available to work.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Furthermore, under the regulations covering this program, the domestic worker can come on the farm and displace the bracero.

Mr. MARTIN of California. That is true. If he presents himself to the employment bureau and they send him to the field, if the domestic worker and the bracero are both there, the bracero is laid off and the domestic worker is put to work. That is quite true.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, as I rise here I am reminded of the wornout story of the man who was asked how he felt when he saw his mother-in-law drive his brandnew uninsured Cadillac off the cliff. He answered that he had mixed emotions. I have mixed emotions about this bill, but I support it because I think it is necessary. I think we will phase out this program. I think it will not be with us very much longer. But I do not want to see it done with a meat ax.

Just 4 years ago 427,000 Mexican nationals came in under this program. How many last year? Only 194,000. We are phasing it out. It is down more than half in just these 4 years. I do not think we will have any extension beyond the 2 years we are trying to get today, if we are successful in getting it.

I think a lot of the arguments against this—and they are sincere; I feel deeply the emotions my friend from San Antonio [Mr. GONZALEZ] expresses—but a lot of opposition is from people who have not seen the bracero program. I want to talk to some of my city friends who are somewhat emotional against this. I share with them the concern about 5 million Americans being unemployed. You say, "How in the world can you justify bringing these Mexican nationals across the border to do this to your own people? How can you do it when Americans are hungry and do not have jobs?"

The short answer is that you are not going to help Americans by killing this legislation today. You think it will but you will not. I share the concern about the American migrant worker. We must do something for him. If we can get constructive migrant labor legislation I

will support it. It is a shame that in this great, prosperous country with cars in every garage for most of us, good food, paid vacations, television, and all the rest that we have left this small number of Americans at the bottom of the economic totem pole. These people have a right to their share of our general prosperity.

The farmers who grow oranges, beets, tomatoes, peas, and the other crops did not cause the migrant labor problem. The bracero program did not cause the plight of the migrant workers. The problem was here before the bracero program and it will still be here tomorrow even if we vote this program down today.

We are told that defeat of this bill will make jobs for Americans. We are told that this program depresses the wages in the farm industry. It does not. In the time I have I am going to discuss a couple of these points.

My friends who oppose this program cannot have it both ways. They tell you in one breath it is just 1 percent of the farms that use braceros, therefore, it is a subsidy and we should do away with it. In the next breath they tell you that using braceros on 1 percent of our farms has depressed wages all over the country. I submit they cannot have it both ways.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] made another important point.

Let me tell you about the wetbacks. I have the whole Mexican border from Yuma to Douglas in my district—about 400 miles of it. Do you know in 1955 how many Mexican people came illegally across the border looking for work? There were a million of them—a million Mexicans in 1 year were rounded up by the immigration service. We had some disgraceful things happen. We did have Mexicans deported way down to the interior of Mexico when they came across several times—there were a million of them. Last year, how many came across? Because we had an orderly program to utilize Mexicans who wanted to work where they were really needed and where they would not displace American workers—not a million came last year but only 30,000—just 30,000. You will have a flood of wetbacks again if we cannot phase this out in a somewhat orderly fashion.

Now let us get another thing straight here. You would think from the arguments that you are going to hear that a farmer in his air-conditioned house picks up the telephone and says, "Please send me one gross of Mexican workers," and that they shortly arrive in a bus. That is not the case. You cannot get Mexican workers in this program unless you satisfy the Secretary of Labor. He administers this. I do not think the migratory workers of America have any better friends than Arthur Goldberg and Mr. Willard Wirtz who is now Secretary. They hold the trump cards and they run the show. You get workers only when you have tried to find them yourself and you have satisfied the Labor Department people that you cannot find them, and after the employment agencies have tried to find them for you and cannot find

them. You get them only when you are willing to pay wages that will not depress the wage standard in that area as determined by the Secretary and only when you have paid for the transportation and only when workers are not available from any source. Then, and only then, do you get them. And even then at that point when they go out in your field to work, if an American worker comes up and says he is ready, willing, and able to work, you are required to lay off the bracero and put the American worker on right then and there.

These are facts which people who get emotional about this problem do not realize. I do not think that two wrongs make a right. We have done a wrong to our migratory workers. We should improve their condition. But we cannot help them by damaging the small farmer; we cannot help migratory workers by choking off the flow of strawberries and lettuce and vegetables to the eastern cities and raising the prices. Doing a second wrong is not going to right the first wrong.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Does not the gentleman feel, if all this is so, that we could at least offer the American domestic migratory worker the same thing that we are offering to the Mexican worker?

Mr. UDALL. We do substantially offer them the same thing. Of course, the situation is not exactly comparable. American migratory workers have their families with them while the braceros do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 5497, a bill extending the Mexican national farm labor program for 2 years. I want to address my remarks today primarily in behalf of the beet sugar industry. I represent a district in Colorado which produces sugarbeets. I might state that Colorado is one of the largest producers of beet sugar in the Nation. I have two beet sugar plants in my district. We use Mexican nationals in Colorado for other crops and we depend upon them to harvest several of our important crops. Mr. William M. Carson, of Weiser, Idaho, a director of the National Beet Growers Federation appeared before the committee in support of this bill. He stated that he represented the sugarbeet growers associations in 11 Western States, which included 18,000 growers of sugarbeets, who harvested 700,000 acres of sugarbeets. All of us are aware of the fact that there has been a substantial increase in the price of sugar. No doubt you are getting mail from your constituents inquiring about the reason for this increase. Three congressional committees are going to investigate this situation in an effort to determine the reasons for this sudden and unusual increase. We recognize the importance of our domestic sugar program, both cane and beet, and the necessity for expanding the same. It is very obvious to me,

and should be obvious to anyone who is familiar with the production of sugarbeets, that this act is absolutely necessary for the survival and continuance of the beet sugar program.

The production of sugarbeets requires a large amount of hand labor. It is impossible to produce a crop of sugarbeets without this labor. It has been impossible to obtain this labor in the domestic market, and for many years the beet growers have relied upon the Mexican nationals to thin and weed the fields and prepare the beets for harvest.

I sincerely hope that Members of the House will realize the absolute necessity of continuing this program if the beet sugar industry is to grow and expand, as we have provided in the recent sugar bill. Certainly we must produce more sugar to meet our increasing needs, and a greater burden will be thrown on our domestic sugar industry, both cane and beet, than ever before.

I appeared before the committee and urged the extension of the present law for 2 years. I hope the bill will be passed without amendment.

We had as a witness from Colorado Mr. Bernard Teets, who is the executive director of the Colorado State Employment Service. Mr. Teets has occupied that position for the past 25 years, and certainly is in a position to know the employment needs and the agricultural labor requirements of the State of Colorado. He told the committee that about 25 percent of our farm labor in Colorado is composed of Mexican nationals. He stressed the need for continuing this program, and stated that we must have these nationals in Colorado in order to harvest our crops.

I received a letter, dated May 4, from Mr. Cover Mendenhall, of Rocky Ford, Colo., secretary-treasurer of the Southern Colorado Beet Growers Association. I would like to read excerpts from that letter, as follows:

The consensus of opinion among the farmers, and more particularly the sugarbeet growers, of this area, is that the extension of Public Law 78 (the Mexican national bill) is vital to our diversified farming in the Arkansas Valley.

I have recently received many, many calls from different farmers advising me of this and requesting that I write you concerning it. I am sure that you will appreciate the necessity for this and give it your support when it comes up on the floor of the House.

Mr. Mendenhall is in a position to know the needs of the farmers in his area. He is in daily touch with them, and he states that the extension of this law is vital to the farmers he represents.

I have always supported this program because I believe it is essential to our agricultural economy.

I call attention to the fact, and emphasize what has already been mentioned several times here today, that this program does not displace any domestic migratory workers. It should be made very clear that if there is a domestic migratory worker who is willing to do the job, then the Mexican national must be dismissed and replaced by the domestic worker. I feel this is proper. I certainly want to do everything I can to promote employment among our do-

mestic workers. I would not support this program if I thought it would be detrimental to our own workers. I challenge those who contend that the Mexican nationals have taken jobs away from domestic workers. On the contrary, I feel that this program has been of definite help to our domestic workers. It has brought about higher wage rates and better standards of living for all farm labor.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall Mr. Teets appearing before our committee. The gentleman introduced Mr. Teets to our committee. He did a splendid job in emphasizing the value of this program for the sugarbeet growers. There are only two States in the Union that have increased the use of braceros, and I think the State of Colorado is one of them. Wyoming, another State that grows sugarbeets, is the other one. The reason being that they were needed in the harvest of sugarbeets. It is essential that this crop be provided the labor that cannot be obtained from local sources. I commend the gentleman from Colorado for his consistent work in behalf of this bracero labor program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, who has done such a fine job as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to speak in opposition to extension of the Mexican labor program and to deal specifically with the adverse effect it has on our family farms. A family farmer for purposes of this discussion, quite simply is a unit in which the operator and the members of his immediate family have accumulated and invested enough capital to provide themselves with a permanent place of employment.

On page 3 of the report on H.R. 5497 you will note that 73 percent of the farm work force qualifies as being self-employed. In the light of these facts, it is clear that the individual farm operator must not be forced to compete with artificially controlled farm wages because his income is largely controlled by the prevailing wage rate. I submit that a wage scale has never prevailed in the so-called stoop labor jobs in agriculture to indicate that it was impossible to hire domestics for these jobs. On the contrary, there is evidence that farm families have done and do these jobs as long as they can possibly remain on their farms.

It is also evident that when the return for their labor must compete with foreign labor, they no longer can afford to meet the demands made on them for capital and are forced to liquidate.

Farm wages have gone up, but are still the lowest of all major industries and the lag in farm wages continues. The following figures on family incomes are taken from the statistical abstract for 1962.

Of all families in the United States, 31½ percent of them receive incomes of less than \$4,000 annually. While at the same time, rural farm families in this same income group of less than \$4,000 annual income amount to 65.3 percent.

Again, if any argument prevails in the face of such evidence, it is the assertion that domestic labor will not perform the duties required in the areas employing braceros.

I have only one last figure. The Agricultural Census of 1959 shows that we have 1,047 farms in Minnesota growing cucumbers. In 1962, not one of the 39 foreign workers to be brought to Minnesota engaged in the work connected with cucumbers. Yet in this same year, another State employed all but 18 of its Mexican nationals out of over 12,000 in harvesting cucumbers at the peak period. There are also, according to the 1959 farm census, 896 farms producing sugarbeets in Minnesota. We use no bracero labor in this production.

If we go to mechanization then I suggest that our unemployed in the industrial centers will go to work building that machinery.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but I believe that some of the statements just made should be answered; that is, what effect does this program have on the small farm and the small farmer? So, I would like to refer to some testimony several people gave us in the committee hearings on this bill.

The first was Mr. Matt Triggs, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who testified in behalf of his organization in support of the bill. And, he was asked this question by me:

I believe there are about 1,600,000 members of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. TRIGGS. Right.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Can you give us any rough estimate as to the number of your members who are what are generally termed "family farmers"? In other words, farmers with perhaps one hired man, except in harvest seasons.

Mr. TRIGGS. Well, certainly the great majority of our members have to be family farmers as measured by any interpretation.

Then, a little later in the day we had Mr. Charles Paul, director of agriculture, State of California, in Gov. Pat Brown's cabinet. Now, whether all of us agree with Governor Brown in all matters, certainly no one can reasonably maintain that Governor Brown is pro-big-farmer or antilabor. But, he sent this man down here and he made it entirely clear that he was speaking for Pat Brown, and he has this to say on the subject of small farms. I asked him whether he had heard Mr. Triggs' testimony, and he said:

Yes, sir.

Then I asked him:

With your wide knowledge of California agriculture, do you concur with that view that Mr. Triggs expressed? In other words, that this is equally important, if not more so, to the small farmer as it is to the large farmer if he is engaged in the growing of

strawberries or tomatoes or something where he needs a supplemental harvest labor supply?

Mr. PAUL. Yes, sir. I concur in that.

I will not take the time to read the rest of the testimony, but if any of you are interested, you can find it in the hearings.

Mr. Creuziger, president of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, testified that this was of vital importance to the small farmers in his part of the country.

Mr. Carson, representing some beet growers, testified to the same effect.

Incidentally, Mr. Creuziger testified that this program is of equal or more importance to the small grower than it is to the large grower.

Mr. Teets, referred to by the gentleman from Colorado, testified the same way.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in 1951 when this bill was first introduced I spoke against it, even though it was considered a wartime measure because of the Korean conflict. There might have been some slight justification at that time, but the Korean conflict came to an end years ago. Certainly there is no justification for the continuation of this program at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, having had this problem before our Appropriations Committee every year since 1951 and studying it in some detail because of the cost of administering this program, if there was ever a slave labor piece of legislation adopted by the Congress, this is it. If there was ever a piece of legislation that could be classed as immoral, this is it.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post this morning contained an editorial concerning the continued employment of Mexican farmworkers in this country under Public Law 78. I would like to read this editorial into the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Hired Hands," and I quote:

A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.

There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be no shortage of domestic workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.

Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the

House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family farmers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

I agree with that statement, Mr. Chairman, except that I would not say there was "sound justification" for starting the program in the first place. I certainly agree that there are good and valid reasons for letting this law expire.

One of the reasons is the difficulty of enforcing this law. The use of Mexican workers inevitably depresses wages in those areas where they are employed. This necessitates the holding of public hearings throughout the country in an effort to determine proper wage rates that will not have an adverse effect on our domestic farmworkers. It involves considerable effort and expense by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in finding and deporting those braceros who remain in this country illegally. It involves the constant problem of trying to assure decent housing for the braceros. The load of administrative difficulties involved in the enforcement of Public Law 78 is a constant source of irritation.

Even if we agree that the use of these braceros during the Korean action was necessary, and I do not, their continued use during a time when we are beset with the problems of declining farm employment and continued high unemployment of our own workers is indefensible. Between January 1 and May 24 of this year, approximately 63,000 braceros have been imported into the country for work. These 63,000 jobs would more properly have gone to domestic farmworkers.

It is little wonder that during the last few years in California, for example, there have been scores of strikes staged by domestic workers in protest over the continued use of braceros.

Another extremely important consideration here involves the continuing problem of the outflow of American dollars to other countries. The wages earned by braceros represent the third largest outflow of dollars to the Mexican Government, a situation that would be corrected by the demise of this law.

I must also point out that this law, with all its difficulties of enforcement and other disadvantages already mentioned, has been kept in force for the benefit of a few large, corporate farmers—representing fewer than 2 percent of all farms in this country—who use Mexican labor.

We are concerned with the growing Federal budget. The only way to reduce the budget is to cut spending. It seems to me that the Government's cost of administering Public Law 78, which last year totaled more than \$3 million, is a good place to wield the shears. This cost does not include almost another \$3 million drawn for this program directly out of the labor supply revolving fund financed by the employers themselves.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], made two points a short time ago. One of the points has been made several times in the past 8 or 10 years since these bills have been before Congress for extensions of this program. That point has been the wetback problem.

Mr. Chairman, this act has had practically no application to the wetback problem during the past 12 years, since 1951. In 1954 and 1955 the wetback problem was one of the biggest problems we had to face. But in some areas along the border there were not enough Immigration people and it was reported that some Immigration people were found at that time to be turning their backs and allowing these wetbacks to cross into this country and doing nothing about it. Congress was apprised of this and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] when he had his appropriation bill for the Department of Justice before the House, in 1955 I think it was, recommended an additional appropriation of about \$3 million to hire more people under General Swing, to send more people down to the border and patrol the border in order to prevent the wetbacks from coming into this area. That was the only reason the wetback problem was diminished at that time. Mr. Chairman, this Mexican farm labor program had little or nothing to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how in the world we can justify on the one hand the subsidies that we are paying for cotton and other crops and then ask the taxpayers of our country to pay \$3 million a year to administer a cheap foreign labor program in order to help grow more.

As far as the State of Florida is concerned, as far as the Northeast is concerned, in fact the whole east coast area, when they have a problem of digging potatoes, or picking peaches, or picking apples, or harvesting vegetables, they make their own contracts with the labor from Canada, the West Indies, or from the Bahamas, if there is not enough local labor available, and it does not cost the taxpayers of this country 1 single dime. I think special consideration, at the expense of the taxpayers, for one small segment of our agricultural economy is wrong, and I hope this bill is defeated.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN].

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the comments of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this legislation. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I make known to you that my predecessor here in the House who was on the other side of the aisle, took a similar view. I represent the counties of Sonoma, Napa, and Mendocino, Calif. In this area we have many of these perishable crops, including grapes. I have observed this program in general. It has worked out very successfully. I think possibly if I were to refer at this time to the report, wherein the justification for the current extension includes these matters, I could better substantiate my point of view. The report reads as follows:

It is the committee's view that the benefits of the Mexican farm labor program have substantially outweighed its disadvantages. The committee would include among such benefits the following:

1. It has supplied farmers with workers that were not available from the labor force

of the United States. Experience has shown that most American labor is unwilling to accept reasonable agricultural employment.

2. It has virtually eliminated the wetbacks, illegal aliens who once swarmed across our southern border. It should properly be referred to as the antiwetback bill.

This is dramatically illustrated by reports of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, which indicate the tremendous drop in illegal wetback entries since the program has operated. As can be seen from the following table, the number of wetbacks has dropped from 1,075,168 in fiscal year 1954 to only 30,272 in fiscal year 1962:

Fiscal year:	Number of persons
1952.....	534,538
1953.....	875,318
1954.....	1,075,168
1955.....	242,608
1956.....	72,442
1957.....	44,451
1958.....	37,242
1959.....	30,196
1960.....	29,651
1961.....	29,877
1962.....	30,272

Source: U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C., March 29, 1960—Mexican nationals apprehended in the United States in violation of immigration laws by fiscal years.

3. It has benefited Mexican workers and the communities to which they return, by providing employment to such workers that would otherwise not be provided, and at wages many times what they could earn in Mexico.

I could continue on in the report, but I believe it is in the RECORD. I will direct further attention to my own personal experience and background in the farming field. It is a simple fact that the program has been successful and is needed; I think we should support this. I think the fact that we have only requested a 2-year extension speaks for itself and affords an opportunity to further the efforts to encourage our domestic migrant workers to assume this responsibility. Presently they do not.

In the matter of foreign aid much has been said in this regard. I have personally devoted a substantial amount of time in the foreign field and mission field.

I have seen firsthand evidence of the benefits of such a program where these people come up into this country and have an opportunity of seeing how we do it here, and then go back and are motivated to be more self-sufficient in their own right.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the people who are liberal and the people who are conservative all ought to join in opposing this legislation. This legislation runs counter to the basic principles of the free enterprise system, in my opinion. Free enterprise must be a two-way street. It must be possible to provide the capital for the farms and equipment or what have you. Our labor should then also have a chance to participate. We have told our farm labor that they cannot have the benefit of laws for unemployment compensation and for reasonable wages and hours. Nor do we have an adequate old-age retirement system for them, nor collec-

tive bargaining. Now by this legislation we seek to repeal even the protections of supply and demand, which might provide more adequate wages and conditions for these people.

We have a shortage of jobs for people in this country. We have unemployment, we all know it. We have a great boom in this country for a Youth Conservation Corps. A great many of us when we were a little younger than we are now worked on farms. I certainly experienced work on farms when I was a boy and a young man and I am glad of it. What greater help could there be for a young man than to go to work on a farm? Why not help our own young people rather than sending our help overseas?

This labor law that we have before us today is one which in my opinion runs counter to everything which is basically American. It tells the people of America they have to go on unemployment compensation. They do not go on unemployment compensation in the farm field because they do not get compensation that way. They have to do it some other way, by getting unemployment compensation in the cities. It was an emergency matter in time of war to do this thing. Maybe it made sense then but it does not make sense today.

Some people take the position that this is immoral. I cite the opposition to it by many church groups.

Somebody said organized labor ought to be for this because it is beneficial to organized labor. I am sure most of you received a letter from the AFL-CIO saying it is against this bill because it is depressive of wages and job opportunities and everything that America stands for.

I repeat that I think if you believe in the free enterprise system you must believe in the opportunity of labor to contribute to the free enterprise system. That is exactly what you have here. I am talking about American labor. It should have the right and opportunity to have adequate wages. If we have to pay a little more for the tomatoes, so what? That is exactly how they ought to be paid for, not by income taxes all over the country. The people who consume potatoes, tomatoes, or cherries ought to pay for them. That is the way we ought to do it. That is why we should not extend this law.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield. Mr. HAGEN of California. To explore the gentleman's thinking on this subject, he is aware that in Florida they bring in a large number of workers from the West Indies and they are placed under a very similar arrangement to that of the braceros. Does the gentleman advocate the termination of those labor imports also?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. That piece of legislation is not one that I have studied carefully, but I think I do oppose it. I have no reason to think I do not. I may feel politically insecure about this, but my conscience tells me I ought to feel this way about this legislation before us today.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The gentleman is talking about their being brought in under the provisions of the immigration law. One of the reasons for the bracero law is the fast setup in the immigration law to bring in more people. I think the results are more disadvantageous.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The real answer is to raise the price of commodities to cover the costs of adequate wages, not to increase immigration.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks to this bill out of practical experience with the subject involved. I state quite frankly that I have in the past been certified as eligible to employ bracero laborers on four occasions. On two of those occasions, I was successful in finding enough domestic labor, which is the aim of every farmer, so it was not necessary for me to employ braceros. But on two occasions, I employed them and I think I know something about the program.

There is no conflict of interest involved here because I am not now engaged in the type of farming which requires that I employ bracero labor. I am an orchardist now whereas I used to be a row crop man.

On February 1, about 5 years ago, I attended a meeting at the Mayflower Hotel when the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor was formed. It was a very large meeting. One of the banquet rooms was filled. I saw notable personalities and fine, well-intentioned individuals, but to my knowledge I was one of the few farmers present. This was when the program of propaganda in opposition to Public Law 78 was shifted into high gear. Since that time I have never heard more misstatements, more cliches or more misguided emotionalism than I have heard about this program.

Braceros are not treated like cattle and I defy anyone to prove that braceros are not treated just as American citizens are treated. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that in my own congressional district an Army barracks which housed U.S. troops was turned down as not being suitable for the housing of bracero laborers? Do you know that at this very minute your secretaries laboring in your offices have less cubic feet of space per person than is required under regulations concerning the quarters of a bracero laborer? Do you know that the bracero program has improved the conditions of the farm laborer in the State of California? We now have buses to transport workers to and from work. We have health programs. Have you ever eaten in a bracero camp at one of their tables—which are always spotlessly clean? Their kitchens pass rigid health inspections. I have eaten at these tables and it is good food—as good as you get downstairs in the House Restaurant.

Speaking further about the misrepresentations which have been made about this program, I would like to go back to the February 1 meeting of 2 years back, when I went to the so-called hearing where evidence was being amassed about this program. I listened

to Ernesto Galarza, a labor organizer, who stood up before a mass of club-women who had come to this hearing. I wish I could put the word "hearing" in quotes, because it was anything but a hearing in the sense that we think of it. He stood there with a hoe, which I recognized as being a hoe that was especially adapted to the thinning of beets. They gasped and shuddered when he told them about the farmers in Watsonville, Calif., who required their workers to use these short-handled hoes. Mr. Galarza alleged that if long-handled hoes were used, the farmer could not tell from his front porch vantage point that the worker was working. With short-handled hoes it was obvious that he was working if he stooped over.

This was not true and the gentleman who uttered it knew he was not telling the truth, because there never has been any beet thinning except with a short-handled hoe.

I think it is about time that some of the cliches were cast aside and we got down to looking at some of the facts about this program. First of all, the bracero laborer does not replace the domestic laborer at all. To use that argument is to indict the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, with malfeasance of duty because he is charged under the law to restrict the certification for the use of braceros when local labor is available.

One gentleman stated on the floor of the House that these shortages were local and extended for only 5 or 10 miles. That is not true. To my personal knowledge, I know farmers who run buses daily 60 miles away from the place of employment to pick up sometimes as few as three or four laborers to bring them back to the job. They advertise on the radio and they advertise in the newspapers. They even recruit across State lines. This is not a local situation. The farm labor shortage extends over a large area.

Farmers, believe it or not, prefer local laborers if they can get them. This is the very reason why in the two times out of four when I could get local labor, I got it because I had less headaches and less to worry about in taking care of the personal requirements of my crew. It was just much better and much easier for me all the way around to use a domestic worker.

The simple fact of the matter is that domestic laborers just do not like to do stoop labor; and having done quite a bit of it in my life, I can say I do not blame them.

The bracero program, in my opinion, insures stability of employment for skilled labor in allied industries. In my congressional district, and in much of my former district, one of the great industries is food processing. Canneries preserve perishable commodities; can factories make cans for use in the canneries, truckers haul the produce and case goods to and from the market. Shipping workers earn their living because of the food industry; so do brokerage house employees. These people are dependent upon getting perishable crops harvested. If they are not harvested, they, the skilled workers, are out of work.

It is well known that only 37 cents out of every consumer's dollar spent for food

in this country goes to the farmer. This means that 63 cents goes to nonfarmers, and I would presume a good part of this goes to organized labor. So for every 37 cents of farm crops which are not harvested because of a labor shortage, it means almost 63 cents worth of employment for skilled and union labor is eliminated.

Bracero labor does not depress wages. As a matter of fact, it escalates them. The States with the bracero programs have higher agricultural wages than the States that do not have the bracero program. Growers, to my knowledge, are happy to pay 5 to 10 cents an hour more for a domestic worker, rather than put up with the trouble and the regulation that goes with the hiring of braceros. As the rate goes up to attract domestic workers then the built-in protection of Public Law 78 starts to operate. A wage survey reveals that the prevailing rate for domestic labor is above that for braceros. The bracero rate is raised and the cycle starts all over again.

Farm wages have gone up at a faster rate since 1950 than have industrial wages. Farm wages, according to the committee report on this bill, have gone up 98 percent since 1950. They are not high enough yet. But I say to you that agriculture is making the best rate of progress in raising wages from an inadequate scale than industry made in the same period of time.

Fringe benefits have been improved for the domestic worker because of the bracero. Because of the requirement that domestics receive the same benefits as braceros, we now find growers furnishing transportation, public health services, and other improvements. Agricultural labor has come a long way and has further to go. But it has come a long way because the bracero program has provided the impetus for improvement instead of retarding it.

Public Law 78 is necessary in many instances to stabilize consumer prices. Let me give you one instance, and it is typical of many others that I could name. In 1961 this Congress took a long time in extending Public Law 78. If you remember, we only extended it for 6 months, from June 30, I believe, to December. For a time it was highly questionable that the law would be extended at all. This was tomato planting time in California. The farmers did not dare run the risk of planting tomatoes unless there was an assured source of labor available. As a result the planting was 20 percent off in 1961. What happened to the price? Where tomatoes had been \$24 a ton in 1960, for the 1961 crop year the grower received \$35 per ton due to the shortage. And, what happened to case goods and canned goods in the marketplace? They went up by an even higher percentage because the raw material is a very important factor in the cost of the canned goods. In 1962, you, the consumer, paid 25 percent more for a very basic item on the grocer's shelves, canned tomatoes, than you paid the year previously, simply because Congress did not extend Public Law 78 in a timely fashion, and the growers feared that they would not have a labor source

and did not plant as many tomatoes in 1961.

The growers need stability and the insurance of a labor supply. Mother Nature does not stop the assembly line because there is a labor shortage. Once you have committed all you own, all you can borrow, to the growing of a crop and the seed is in the ground, nothing can stop it.

Some of you do not realize how critical time is in some of these crops.

Let me give you an example of a thing that a lot of us take for granted, as a simple condiment on our table, the pickling cucumber. When a producer starts picking, he divides his field in three patches. He picks the first patch Monday, the second on Tuesday, the third on Wednesday, then Thursday, back to No. 1, Friday No. 2 and Saturday, No. 3, and Sunday you lay off. If he misses 1 day, his pickle crop is down the pickle barrel, because once the cucumber has gotten just so large, the seed has formed and it has performed its biological function of reproducing itself and the fruiting is finished, the vine dies, and that is the end of the crop. One day can do this to a lifetime investment. The same is true of strawberries.

The question of foreign aid has been mentioned. I think the facts will bear me out that the land reform system in Mexico, which is such a basic part of their economy, actually depends for its existence upon the savings of braceros who come from the United States and the experience that they gain. I regret that Mexico was referred to in this debate as a miserable country, because I think our neighbors to the south have a very fine country, and I am sure they will resent the reference. Mexico is not miserable. It is a proud and noble nation.

The last point I want to address myself to is this: Is this program for the large farmer alone? By no means. The large farmer has the better housing to attract domestic labor; he has the better recruiting facilities, and he will have a more efficient operation. But if you abolish Public Law 78, it is the large farmer who will take the small farmer's domestic labor away, and the small farmer will be on the outside looking in.

When you do not have an adequate supply of farm labor, mechanization is more than desirable; it is absolutely essential. And, what happens to the small farmer if he has to mechanize? Let us consider the mechanization of tomato growing.

Right now they are developing a tomato harvester, but this requires a specially bred plant which matures all of the fruit at the same time and is expensive. And, your yield is about half of what you would normally get with seed which is commonly used today. The harvesters cost several thousand dollars as well. As a result, you must have big acreage over which your overhead can be spread in order to take care of this lowered yield and higher cost.

The small farmer cannot operate under such circumstances.

The big farmer is the fellow who can buy the D-8 tractor costing \$20,000, instead of the D-4 which costs \$10,000. He can disc his ground for 50 cents an acre,

while the fellow with the little D-4 does it for a dollar an acre. It is just common sense that the big fellow can absorb these costs because he has the financial ability to spread his overhead over a larger acreage thereby making it profitable to operate.

If you are against Public Law 78 do not justify it on the fallacious grounds that you are helping the small farmer because you are hurting him.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is urgently required.

The arguments which have been made in favor of the extension of the bracero program are excellent. I know the time is limited but I want to join with members of the House Committee on Agriculture and others in urging passage of the pending measure.

I have watched this program operate for quite a number of years. Having observed the dramatic improvement in the wage standards and in the living standards of farmworkers in the areas where braceros are used, I find it difficult to understand the position of those who oppose this legislation. In areas where braceros are used it will be found that the wages of all farmworkers are higher than in areas where braceros are not used. The highest wages and the best living standards that are maintained in agriculture in the Nation will be found in areas where braceros are employed. The point is that braceros do not depress wages and living standards of domestic workers. The exact contrary is true.

Actually the Department of Labor has used the bracero program as a lever to raise wages and working conditions of all farmworkers. This cannot be successfully disputed.

Domestic labor has been benefited, not hurt, by the bracero program. Domestic labor has reaped a benefit in better living standards and in better wages.

In my opinion the Department of Labor has gone far afield in using the bracero program as a back door approach for fixing minimum wages for all farm labor, a procedure for which there is no authority in law.

The farmer has done an outstanding job in providing food and fiber to the people at reasonable prices. If you take away from farmers the opportunity to use a minimum number of bracero workers the farmers in certain areas will be seriously crippled in their farming operations and the general public will suffer.

The Department of Labor sees to it that bracero labor is not permitted to displace domestic labor or beat down wages. I feel strongly, as I know others do, that domestic workers should be protected and given preference. But the fact is the bracero program is urgently required to meet a serious farm labor shortage in certain areas and the proposed 2-year extension should be approved.

Those of us who represent farm districts where braceros are used are not making an unreasonable request. We

urge the passage of this legislation in order to prevent undue hardship upon farmers and farm families.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on this measure while in the Committee of the Whole in general debate be given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the newest State in the Union, I have now served as a Member of this body for nearly 5 months. During these 5 months, I have been overly gratified to discover that this legislative body is truly a great body. I have learned that its Members are dedicated men and women of good will and good intentions, possessed of the highest ideals, who, when called upon, will do what is right, and only what is right.

It is with confidence in this belief that I appeal to Members of this great body to vote down H.R. 5497.

Because of the limited time allotted me, I shall confine myself to a brief discussion of two questions here involved. An issue which is perhaps bigger than the issue of pure economics presented here is the question of morals: Is it morally right for us as the greatest Nation on earth, enjoying the highest standard of living in modern civilization, to perpetuate a Federal law which not only permits but also assists the hiring of Mexican Nationals at substandard wages by our own citizen-employers? Certainly, we do not expect any of our citizen-workers to work for less than a living wage. Yet we are being asked today to continue, in effect, for another 2 years a law which permits the hiring of Mexican workers for jobs within our own borders for as little as 60 cents an hour, which is less than one-half the minimum wage otherwise determined by Congress.

Is it not significant that representatives of all three major religious faiths testified against the continuation of Public Law 78? Clergymen of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions joined in complaining vigorously about the Mexican farm labor importation program. It is also noteworthy that churches have been the strongest critics of Public Law 78. In resolutions, in public statements, and in testimony, they have gone to the extent of calling Public Law 78 immoral.

Labor unions, civic organizations, family farm groups, consumer organizations, veterans organizations have opposed this law because of the harm it continues to bring to our own domestic farm workers and family farmers. It appears that the only ones in favor of the law are the small percentage, less than 1 percent of the farmer-employers who use these so-called braceros to their own advantage.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say here quickly that I do not advocate putting these small number of growers who do use braceros out of business. I do believe that it is incumbent upon us that

we do aim to improve the economic and social condition of the American farmworker.

A second basic question here involved is whether or not we should permit the free enterprise system to work. In urging an end to Public Law 78, I am appealing for the allowance of the free enterprise system to work. The two bases of this system are competition and the law of supply and demand. The Mexican farm labor importation program negates both and therefore runs counter to the free enterprise system.

Under the protection of the umbrella of Public Law 78, some of our growers have no need to compete for labor. They need not rely upon supply and demand to set the price for the labor they hire. Instead, they offer to hire domestic workers at a certain wage. This wage need not, and often is not, based upon the supply of and demand for labor. It is a low and arbitrarily set wage. If the wage is not good enough to attract domestic workers, which often is the case, the grower need not raise the wage. He can simply avail himself of the benefits of Public Law 78 by asking the U.S. Government to supply him with braceros from Mexico.

Because of the undeniable poverty in Mexico, farmworkers are readily available there. Their importation in large numbers and the willingness of the braceros to work for low wages under conditions which are alien even to our poverty stricken American farmworkers, bring about competition for the first time to the labor market in bracero-using areas. But this is competition of poverty against poverty which brings about still greater poverty to our American farmworker. It is competition which not only lowers wages but which also has seriously increased unemployment among American farmworkers, as is noted in the minority views of the committee report.

I ask that we do the right thing here today—and the right thing to do is to vote down H.R. 5497.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my friends on this side of the aisle will attach no particular significance to the fact that I was recognized by my friend on the Republican side, other than the mutual respect and esteem we hold for one another.

We have heard many times this afternoon the history of this legislation and I do not intend to go into it again, but I do want to discuss my own position on this matter briefly because of the fact that in one county, my home county in my district, we use, I think, some 350 to 450 braceros in the harvesting of the pear crop.

I have worked on this problem of migratory labor and bracero labor for some 6 years in the Oregon Legislature and I recognize many of the things which have been said here today as being valid. I recognize that this is a downtrodden group and one that is substantially unable to help itself, and one that therefore needs help from those who are stronger than they.

Also I have had the privilege of sitting in on the hearings before the committee on this particular bill and I have noted the rising opposition by church, civic and labor groups, and actually on the floor of this Congress today to the continuation of Public Law 78. In all frankness I have to admit that there is some evidence to their contentions that the use of Mexican workers has, to an extent, had an adverse effect on the employment opportunities of domestics. I was especially impressed with the eloquence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

I note also, under the migrant labor agreement between this country and Mexico that there are some benefits offered to Mexican laborers that are not offered to domestic workers. This furnishes us with an anomalous situation where U.S. nationals in looking for jobs in this country may actually be put to a certain amount of disadvantage. But there is also evidence that the total agricultural labor needs of this country cannot, at specific times and places, be met from domestic sources; and I think the key to this issue this afternoon are those words "specific times and places."

As the gentleman from California just pointed out, when the crops are planted they cannot be slowed down. When they are ready to be harvested they must be harvested or the crop is lost.

Further, I am convinced that the arguments advanced in general against the continuation of this program do not apply specifically to the situation we have in my State of Oregon. Braceros there are used only in the harvesting of pears, and that is in the Rogue River Valley. The growers in this valley conscientiously and at their own expense have tried and do try to hire domestics in times of harvest and turn to braceros only when they cannot find domestics. They work closely with our department of employment and have offered employment to all domestics who are willing to work. They have imported American labor from the southwestern part of the United States, including members of the Navajo Tribe, in what seems to me to be a conscientious effort to comply not only with the letter of this law but with the spirit of it.

Further, the wages paid in my valley, while low by industrial standards, are high by any agricultural standard. I am advised that domestics average \$1.46 in my valley and that braceros average \$1.76 an hour.

In addition, I speak with some pride that Oregon has what I consider to be the most advanced migratory labor legislation on its books to protect these people from exploitation and to relieve them from the most pressing of the social problems with which they are faced. These laws include laws that license labor leaders, that impose strict standards of public health with which growers must comply, safety regulations affecting the transportation of migrants on the highways and—get this—a pilot program to provide education for the children of these migrants who, because of the transitory nature of their parents'

employment, frequently reach adulthood without proper education.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he is making, and call attention to the statistical tables which I will subsequently put in the RECORD, which show that Oregon has consistently used only 300 workers for use in harvesting the pear crops. Currently the Great State of Oregon has all of these requirements in its laws. The gentleman is aware, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, that this does not necessarily follow as far as the other States of the Union are concerned. I would urge the gentleman as a member of that great committee to try to get such legislation adopted in his committee.

Mr. DUNCAN. The gentleman's comment is well taken.

I would certainly commend to the other States in the Union the example of my State in this field.

I would point out, too, that in my district we have little diversification. Our economy is tied to what sometimes seem to us the gyrations of the lumber market. The little diversification we have consists, in my own home county, of pears. It is very important to us that pears be harvested when they are ripe.

I do believe we should offer employment to domestics on at least the same basis we do to braceros. Accordingly, in both the subcommittee and the full committee I offered two amendments which I thought would help to do this. Perhaps not surprisingly, since I am a freshman, my two amendments garnered unto themselves one vote each, respectively, and that of course was my own. Two amendments were suggested by the administration. One I changed a little to make it more adaptable, I think, to the situation with which we are faced. The third offered by the administration I thought was administratively impractical, and I did not offer it. These amendments, I thought, offered a middle ground to which both the proponents and opponents of this legislation could repair as all of us seek to solve a very difficult problem. Although these were not adopted, as the Congressman from the Fourth District of Oregon I intend to support this law and its extension for 2 years. I do not support the administration's proposal to extend it 1 year. I am convinced the administration has the power under the terms of this law to phase this program out should the need vanish.

I realize the great opposition to this program. I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the growers of Oregon and our own department of employment the absolute necessity of taking the next 2 years to find alternative sources for obtaining labor from the American market. I know the growers in Oregon would prefer to get this labor from the American market, and I stand ready to help in any way I can.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, this debate has been the most enjoyable debate I have heard this year. I want to express my sincere congratulations to both the proponents and opponents of this measure. I have said to those who differ with me—even though I oppose you on this bill, I am for you personally. I think it is awfully important never to make any enemy in the House of Representatives. I certainly think no one has done that this afternoon. This has been an excellent debate on the merits of this matter. Fireworks are natural because you will recall it was during this same debate when from yonder gallery some people shot at the House of Representatives a few years ago, and if I should look askance about the gallery I hope I will be forgiven.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do so because as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been convinced that we need this available supply of labor to take care of the harvesting of crops of the farmers of America—a harvesting which is necessary to give the consumers of this Nation food at reasonable prices. I would plead with my colleagues who have said that perhaps in another 2 years we would not need this bill, to think rather carefully because I am concerned over the future about the availability of manpower to harvest the crops, especially the vegetable crops of America.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to pay tribute to the great eloquence of those who pointed out the problems with reference to our migrant laborers and the braceros. I am not here, Mr. Chairman, to maintain that this type of labor has been treated perfectly or that they have been given all of the consideration that they perhaps should have been given. But yet let me emphasize again that this program, supervised as it is by the Department of Labor, and the other programs that have to do with the supply of labor for the farms of America—supervised as they are by the Department of Labor—are, in my opinion, programs that our Secretary of Labor will take great pains to see that they do not harm our migrant laborers and the braceros.

In Florida, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] mentioned, we do not have the Mexican braceros but we do have the British West Indies laborers. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we could harvest our crops in Florida without this labor. As chairman of the Committee on Family Farms of our Subcommittee on Agriculture, we have set as a brief definition of a family farm: a farm that is big enough to enable the family to make a living on it and, yet, not so big that the members of the family cannot provide 50 percent of the labor except at harvest time. That is the exception—at harvest time. The problem of the family farmer is to harvest his crops at harvest time. In my particular congressional district, is it moral to deny to the family farmer the right to employ labor when the laboring man has agreed to do the work and when the Secretary of Labor has supervised the conditions? Is it moral to say to the family farmer, "No, your particular vegetable must rot in the fields."

In connection with the harvesting of strawberries, for example, most of you ladies and gentlemen know that just a few hours means the difference between a spoiled crop and a crop that can be harvested. Immediate labor at harvest time is necessary.

Let us take the situation that we had with oranges in Florida last year when many orange crops were frozen. Is it moral to deny a man the right to harvest that fruit while it still can be used? If the fruit had been harvested and used for juice within a certain period of time, it could have been used. Of course, much of it was harvested and it was able to be used because of available labor, but to have denied the citrus producer the right to employ people in the available labor market would have denied to him the right to harvest that particular crop.

Mr. Chairman, much of this work in vegetables and citrus is paid for by the piece. It is not uncommon for a person picking oranges to make \$20 a day. That is not an unprofitable operation. So, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the laborer, the consumer, and for the benefit of the family farmer, I am convinced that this program is necessary, supervised as it is by the Department of Labor. I hope the House will approve the extension of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] that perhaps he would like to yield time at this point?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I come from the State of California. We have the particular problem of getting out our crops. It is a very important matter, but I come here with clean hands, because I favor man's humanity to man. Certainly I favor a national minimum wage and the highest and best wages we can pay to domestics or anybody else who comes along and can go to work. In our part of the country we have and produce about 37 percent of all the fruits, nuts, and vegetables of these United States.

I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], if he can work out some program whereby we can extend the provisions of Public Law 414 and allow Mexican nationals to come to the United States, to immigrate here, and do the work, I will support that legislation.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there has been introduced a bill in the past to the effect that we would amend and authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved voluntary methods of recruiting and training agricultural workers. There are several such bills pending. I am wondering

whether the gentleman would support that legislation.

Mr. LEGGETT. I would certainly support it in its proper place, but not as an amendment to this legislation.

We have a situation here where we have the bad guys versus the good guys. I am a bad guy, I suppose. But you can tell the good guys because they all come from Manhattan, Brooklyn, and downtown Oakland, and they do not have to get out the crops as in some of these rural areas. I am a Democrat, a liberal Democrat, but we have a problem in the seven counties of the Central Valley of California to get 15,000 workers in there for a period of only 3 months. We pay them the best wages in the country.

The braceros in California make \$1.85 an hour. They average \$1.45 an hour. We utilize every effort we can bring about to get domestics in. We make every effort to utilize the domestics, and we bring domestics from Texas, Arizona, and everywhere else. We do have a particular problem, however.

I think the sole authority in the United States, as far as whether or not the bracero program is going to affect our unemployment situation, is Mr. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

I want to call your attention to his testimony before our committee where he said:

I think as the program is presently being administered; that is, currently being administered it is fair to say—and this is really only to say that the congressional intention is being carried out—that as it has been administered this last year it has not resulted in the displacement of any substantial number of domestic workers.

Some of the members have been talking about reforming the total agricultural problems of the United States. That has nothing to do with the total bracero program which we are here talking about.

In this respect I would like to tell you something about our recruitment efforts in the Sacramento Valley of California. In 1962 we recruited from the city of Sacramento 1,798 domestics to work in the Fourth Congressional District of California. I might state these workers come from the district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], who is supporting this legislation.

Out of a total of 1,798, 133 failed to report for work; 938 worked less than 3 days; 561 less than 7 days; 134 worked 14 days or less; 31 less than a month; and only 1 of the 1,798 worked more than a month.

We have similar records for all of California.

I have one further thing I would like to talk about in this respect, and will refer to our recruitment efforts to bring workers from out of State; that is, domestics, to California. If you are unappreciative of the contract requirements for bringing Mexicans into California under the bracero program, you should see the way they handle the domestics. I would like to read a letter written to the labor recruitment people in Yolo County; it appears at page 324 of the record made before our committee.

The letter reads as follows:

EL PASO, TEX.,
June 15, 1961.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Woodland, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Myself and associates have opened a farm labor recruiting agency in El Paso, Tex., and are interested to know if you have growers associations in your area that may be in need of this type of laborers.

We are fully licensed and bonded, and in our operations have done everything possible to meet all requirements of the laws pertaining to the transportation of seasonal farmworkers. We will transport these men to any place in your area in fully insured buses, with a capacity of 52 men per bus load.

We have experienced men to screen these applicants for work, and will send only what we believe to be capable and willing workers, some U.S. citizens, and some so-called green-card men, who have been cleared for work in the United States by the various governmental agencies, so that growers need have no fear of any unpleasant complications of any kind. We have investigated the requirements of the law, and we can assure you that no troubles will arise from our neglect or legal violations.

The cost to the growers will be \$45 per man for full loads, to be delivered in most of the California area, and any additional cost would be negligible for added cost of transportation. We will require one-half of the fee with the order, and the balance upon delivery at the designated terminal or receiving point.

We would appreciate your passing this information to any of your members or people in your area who are in need of farm help.

We will of course want to know the wages to be paid, and general working conditions. We have all different kinds of men for the various jobs, and are in a position to furnish men suited to your particular type of work. We will send only experienced men.

Thanking you in advance for your courtesy in this matter, we are,
Sincerely yours,

EL PASO FARM LABOR
RECRUITING AGENCY,
ELMER LARSON.

Domestic recruitment, Nogales: ¹	
116 men at \$21 transportation cost.....	\$2,436.00
3 men reimbursed travel expenses.....	40.00
Recruiter expenses (includes telephone calls, radio ads, etc.).....	563.63
Subsistence paid to workers for lack of work available upon arrival.....	180.00
Total.....	3,220.40
Domestic recruitment, El Paso:	
213 men at \$38.....	8,094.00
Recruiter expenses.....	251.02
Legal expenses (contracts with agency in El Paso and individual workers contracts).....	120.00
Total.....	8,465.02
Total expense.....	11,685.42

¹ No records of employment available.

Of 215 men shipped from El Paso, 213 arrived in Woodland; 178 actually assigned to growers, the balance disappeared upon arrival.

July 22: 30 Half Moon; 27 worked until August 3, 4 worked until August 8, replaced by braceros.

July 22: 6 Oclaray; all skipped, no melon work available, refused hoeing.

August 5—5 Nick Lopez: 2 worked 2 days, 2 worked until September 30; 24 Rose Valley:

only 2 finished harvest; 4 N. D. Thomas; 3 remained until end of almonds, September 30; 1 left on August 28; 2 Rominger Bros.: 1 completed harvest, 1 left September 4.

August 4—38 Hatanaka Bros.: 10 left August 23, 6 left on September 20, 4 left on September 28, 4 left on September 30, 1 man remained until October 14; 4 John Spies: transferred from Half Moon and Rose Valley, all skipped.

August 5—7 Rose Valley, transferred from Half Moon (see above); 3 Don Mumma: 2 from Rose Valley, all completed harvest.

August 7—5 Frank Ramos: not all stayed for employment.

August 8—4 Rose Valley, transferred from Half Moon (see above).

August 9—20 Hitomi: all skipped by August 16; 21 Oclaray: 17 dumped at office at night, and skipped, balance skipped from camp, all refused further employment; 4 Frank Lopez: 1 finished harvest, 4 worked to September 2; 11 Frank Ramos: some never accepted employment; of these and the 5 on August 7, 11 were actually employed for various periods.

August 11—5 Tom Holland: from Rose Valley, 3 finished harvest.

August 13—1 A. W. Boyce: from Hitomi, stayed to October 17.

August 23—1 Holland, transferred from another grower (see above).

August 25—7 Ramos and Donaldson: 4 from F. Ramos, 2 worked full harvest, balance left during first payroll period.

August 29—1 Rominger Brothers: from Thomas (see above).

August 30—1 Ahrens: from Spies, finished harvest.

Eighteen men actually completed harvests. Many of these had been transferred from one grower to another because of their refusals to work. Of these 18, 6 were offered additional employment in walnuts and refused.

Melons: 92 assigned; 2 completed harvest, 0.2 percent.

Almonds: 88 assigned; 15 completed harvest, 17 percent.

Peaches: 16 assigned; none completed harvest.

Tomatoes: 79 assigned; none completed harvest.

(Numbers assigned differs with number shown as originally assigned due to transfers from one grower to another.)

The letter sounds like you are buying bananas. As a result we expended in this program, to take some of these fine people from Texas, \$2,436 to get them in cars and bring them down there. We reimbursed three men's traveling expenses in the amount of \$40. We paid recruiter expenses in the amount of \$563.63, a total of \$3,220.40 for 116 men. For domestic recruitment in El Paso we paid the additional sum of \$11,685.42, making a total of about \$15,000 for 339 men. I have the records here in our files showing where these men went, the ranches that they were assigned to, the number of days they worked on each ranch, showing they all worked less than a month, and at the expiration of a month only 18 men were left. Of these 18, 6 were offered additional employment in walnuts and refused.

Mr. Chairman, I think we do have a problem, and I want to be just as direct as I possibly can. We want to pay the best wages possible. If my good friend from Alameda County will put his people on a bus and bring them to our district, we will hire them, but to date we have not got them.

How about a final consideration of foreign aid and I ask your indulgence?

I ask you, is this program not about the ideal method of foreign aid?

To begin with, what is the criticism of our foreign aid program?

First. Too much money goes to unfriendly countries who are not appreciative.

Second. Too much money is sopped up by defective foreign governments—by politicians at the top.

Third. Funds do not get to the little people.

Fourth. Funds do not get to people who help themselves.

Take a second look at the labor program with our sister country of Mexico we are here asked to extend.

Laborers are not conscripted in Mexico but they are allowed to compete for positions to come to the United States to work in agriculture.

Laborers are allowed to individually contract and terminate their contracts at will.

Third, they are allowed to work under controlled conditions of housing, safety, wages, and medical care in an admittedly very difficult occupation. The effect of setting a minimum wage for braceros has had the effect of setting a minimum wage for domestics in the State of Colorado and other States.

The bracero usually is not a chronic migratory worker, but actually saves 50 to 75 percent of his net pay which he uses to buy a tractor, improve a farmstead or buy a business. The dollars spent in Mexico are effective to improve our relations with that country because of the manner in which the money is expended.

The net effect is that little people of a friendly foreign land are allowed to earn small amounts of money which stimulates private enterprise in their own country. No expensive intervening defective governments and politicians and, best of all, not one cent goes out of the Federal Treasury.

While we have spent billions in Asia in a foreign aid effort to stimulate that economy with questionable results and a questionable check of communism, we have been effective unknowingly in our own backyard—Mexico—through the bracero program, creating a group of middle class Mexican farmers, private enterprise farmers who got their start by working with their hands—not a gift from a foreign government.

You say great, but it is at the expense of the American working man. Nonsense. More braceros work in California than any other State but simultaneously we have the highest standards in American agriculture labor, best safety conditions, minimum wages for women and children and minimum age limit for children in agriculture.

If the Secretary does not think wages are high enough he can raise them administratively. If domestic workers feel left out they can preempt bracero jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a system better than we know. The alternative to the program is obvious. Until a future depression comes along we are not going to have an adequate domestic supply of labor. As a result without a labor force the crops will not get planted or there will be an alternative stampede to further mechanization.

We are barely competitive worldwide at the present time. Like anything else, we can price ourselves out of the market and rely on an export subsidy to get our crops out of the country.

I do not think this is necessary.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago this same piece of legislation was debated on this floor. Upon reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that there are individuals who made the statement that that was the last time that they were going to support that piece of legislation. These are some of the same individuals that are today taking the floor in favor of it. But, the situation has not bettered itself during the last 2 years. It is still a piece of legislation that thrives on the poverty of both Mexican nationals and American farm laborers. It is a piece of legislation that relegates those American citizens who work on the farms of our country, to a status of an underprivileged minority and forces them to live in an atmosphere of poverty and squalor. I think it is well known that the farmworker of this country is the lowest paid; that he is poorly paid, poorly housed, and poorly cared for, but still we force them to compete with a foreign worker that comes into this country. I think it is also well known that the average wage for the farmworker in our country is \$881. This is a good reason why they are poorly educated and with limited skills and training.

The point was made a little while ago that this was foreign aid. Well, if this is foreign aid, then this is surely foreign aid that is being made available at the expense of people relegated to this particular deplorable status and is foreign aid that is not compatible to the American way of living or the best interests of the people of this Nation.

The charge has been made that Americans will not do stoop labor; that Mexican nationals are necessary. This is just plain nonsense. The American workers today perform exhausting tasks in coal mines and steel mills and foundries and the oil fields of our land.

They work on garbage trucks, on cesspools and sewers. They work under rivers as sandhogs and in the boiler-rooms of ships and factories. They perform sweaty labor in the kitchens and laundries and heavy labor in our various industries.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I think we must point out that there are Americans who exhaust themselves, their families and their resources, for the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress. This all means that the principle of hard work has not been abolished from our land. I feel that that same principle of hard work can continue to be applied by the farmers themselves who can go out and get the labor that is available to them at all times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] yield to me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked by a previous speaker if we were familiar with the conditions under which the braceros live. As a health educator in the State of California I did enter a bracero camp, and found that their facilities were good. But then I crossed to the other side of the road, to the river, and I found our own workers eating on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the question was also asked if we had seen the sleeping quarters of the braceros, and I say that I have. I have also seen how the American worker has to live and sleep right near the bracero camp.

Mr. Chairman, we were also asked if we had seen the health facilities made available to the braceros, and I say that I have.

But, I have also seen the type of health facilities that are made available to the American workers, which are in effect no facilities at all.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the House that since I have 1 additional second in which to conclude my remarks, that I wholeheartedly request that you join me in voting down this unfair, and immoral piece of legislation.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the enactment of this legislation. I am firmly of the belief that Public Law 78 should end on its termination date, December 31, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, we have no business importing foreign agricultural workers when we have an abundance of domestic workers. This domestic labor supply will be almost instantly available when wages and working conditions in the farming industry are made commensurate with American standards.

Mr. Chairman, in the Ninth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives, the domestic agricultural workers are seriously injured by the bracero program. And this is the situation throughout the United States wherever Mexican workers are imported to compete with our local people.

The reason we have the bracero program is because Mexico adjoins our southern border, and Mexico has a huge supply of poverty-stricken agricultural workers who will submit to being herded here to work on our farms under the most austere conditions at substandard wages.

I cannot agree that this program constitutes a healthy foreign aid program to Mexico when it is at the expense of our most underprivileged working group, the agricultural workers. In 1961 the average U.S. farmworker's income was \$881 for the year's work. I do not think that this citizen should be financing the Mexican foreign aid program.

It was said during the hearings on this bill that the farmers need the braceros

because the domestic workers will not work. This is simply not true and most insulting to our domestic work force which asks only to be afforded the opportunity for decent employment which should be the right of any resident of America.

It has also been said today by the proponents of this legislation that the growers cannot harvest their crops if they are not allowed to import the braceros. This argument is, basically, the one used for centuries to oppose all efforts to improve the lot of working people. "It will ruin business."

When George III was King of England, and Parliament was considering the law limiting children to working not more than 10 hours per day, the cotton factory owners warned that they would have to close down should this ruinous law be passed. They objected in 1842 when the State of Massachusetts limited the hours of work for children under 12 to 10 hours per day. They predicted bankruptcy and unemployment when Congress passed a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour in 1938. They said the same thing in 1961 when it was raised to \$1.25 an hour.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States, if an employer needs employees, he must offer jobs at sufficiently attractive wages and working conditions. That is the traditional American way, with free employers dealing with free labor, which has contributed so much to our high standard of living. But—should an employer, wishing to avoid this free bargaining, be allowed to refuse to deal with the American workers and instead substitute a cheap imported supply? Should General Motors, for example, dissatisfied with the wages of the auto workers on the Pontiac assembly line, be permitted to import several thousand single men from Mexico who will work for a dollar an hour?

There is no great difference between separate industries. Each has its own stubborn problems. The American farmer, too, has his problems. Most of them he has worked out magnificently, with imagination, skill and devotion which have blessed this country with an abundant supply of food.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that given the necessity by our termination of the bracero program, the farmers will quickly adjust to the plentiful but neglected domestic supply, to the great benefit of themselves, the American agricultural worker, and our Nation.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a brief moment to dispel the notion that there are no domestic workers available to do the work of the bracero.

The figures supplied by the committee show the adequacy of the domestic labor supply.

The domestic migrants and local seasonal employees in every month of 1962 far exceeded the number of Mexican nationals in the farm labor force.

The cutback in farm jobs because of mechanization indicates clearly that a large part of the domestic farm labor

force is being lost to agriculture. If, as the majority of the committee suggests, the average number of hired farmworkers has declined by half a million since 1950, because of technological developments, the half million is over twice the number of braceros in the country last year. If you go beyond hired hands and look at total agricultural employment you find a cut of 300,000 in 1962—this well exceeds the number of braceros in the country last year.

The long-range loss in farm employment is even more striking. The Manpower Report of the Department of Labor stated that 3 million family and hired agricultural jobs were lost between 1947 and 1962; another 1,500,000 will disappear by 1975. These lost agricultural jobs are low skill jobs—the very type that are disappearing everywhere in the Nation today. At this very moment we are struggling to upgrade and retrain our labor force. We know that even our maximum effort will not reach many of the presently untrained and unemployed. It is obvious that we need even the undesirable unskilled jobs found in agriculture to help take up slack in our structural unemployment.

We have heard the argument that stoop labor is not available in many parts of this country. Yet every job that braceros do is done by domestic labor in some part of the country.

We have heard the argument that domestic labor is undependable and erratic. True, not many of us expect American citizens to be docile and content at a wage of 60 cents an hour. However, if the same effort and organization that goes into supplying braceros and guaranteeing them benefits, went into stabilizing the domestic work force and paying them a little better wage, we could achieve the same results.

There is fear that dropping this program will cripple some farms. The present program continues until December 31, 1963, well beyond the present growing season. The large growers who use the lion's share of the braceros will have the better part of a year to recruit a domestic labor force for the 1964 growing season. Further, the elimination of roughly 200,000 braceros proposed here is less than the net drop in the bracero force between 1959 and 1962. Elimination is no more than the phase out so long promised.

Facts and figures seldom win an argument of this sort, though it is comforting to have them on our side. This is really a moral issue: Whether we allow imported peon labor to take our jobs and depress wages.

Last week in the wheat referendum the farmers struck a blow for freedom of the marketplace; let us go along and at least restore freedom of the marketplace to agricultural labor in America.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope I shall not be accused of a conflict of disinterest this afternoon, because I have never seen a farm with a bracero; I hardly know how to pro-

nounce the word. I have never been to California, Texas, Arkansas, or to the States that use 85 percent of the farm labor. It seems to me, though, somewhere, using simple logic, perhaps I can add just a little bit to the debate this afternoon, notwithstanding what I would otherwise think is a really serious disability.

I think that we have to analyze the arguments pro and con before we reach a decision as to the enactment of H.R. 5497.

Clearly the proponents of this legislation have the burden of establishing their case, particularly since this is the sixth extension of an emergency program. It is not I who have labeled this a temporary measure, but those who have urged the development of this program.

On January 24, 1951, Mr. Hill said:

There is another thing I want to say, and that is this is a temporary bill. This bill expires on December 31, 1953. What we are trying to do here is to take care of the situation during this war emergency (p. 7329, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

And again in 1953, when the first extension of Public Law 78 was sought, Mr. Hill said:

All we are doing at the present time is to ask for a temporary extension (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 3, p. 3149).

On that same day Mr. Thompson of Texas said:

The reason why this is temporary legislation, as I tried to point out a little while ago, is that the need is only temporary (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 3, p. 3153).

And in 1961, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] said:

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again supporting the extension of Public Law 78 as I have supported it throughout my service in Congress. I wish to make it irrevocably clear, at this time, however, that it is my opinion that this is the last time I shall take the floor in defense of this program. Certainly this is true unless there are substantive changes either in circumstances or in the application of the law as it applies across the country (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 6, p. 7707).

In determining whether or not the proponents of H.R. 5497 have made their case, let us examine their three main arguments.

First. Farmers are supplied with workers not available from the U.S. labor force.

Obviously American workers are not available at 60 cents per hour, or at any other subsidized wage that is lower than the minimum wages paid throughout the country. The farms that are the recipients of this giveaway labor are getting a labor force benefit that 99 percent of the American farms are denied—and rightly so. Would any of us in a rational moment suggest that any other industry in the United States be permitted to import foreign labor because domestic employers could not obtain sufficient labor at a substandard wage?

Second. Wetbacks, the illegal aliens who once swarmed across our southern borders, have been virtually eliminated as a result of this legislation.

Labeling this an antiwetback bill causes one to wonder why we have not legalized the sale and consumption of narcotics because that is difficult to control; or eliminated all other immigration laws because they are difficult to administer; or relieved the Federal Government from prosecuting all criminal statutes because they are either cumbersome or unenforceable. Is there anyone in this House willing to stand up and be counted for the proposition that, when a criminal statute becomes difficult to enforce, we should legalize the crime the statute was enacted to prevent?

Third. This program provides an important source of dollar exchange to Mexico, and is in effect a gentle assist to our foreign aid program.

With respect to the international aspects of this program, it would seem to me that the time and place to be for foreign aid for Mexico or for any other country is when the Foreign Affairs Committee reports out that bill. To cloak this bill with a fictional—and I might say, distasteful—claim of foreign assistance is a play on words that is wholly unjustified by the facts.

The Mexican farm labor importation program is a most serious violation of free enterprise. It prevents normal economic forces from working in the agricultural labor market. Yet all the material arguments made on both sides of this issue, I think, are infinitesimal considering the great moral issue involved. The fact of the matter is that this program permits trafficking in human beings as if they were commodities to be bought and sold in a fluctuating market. It is a sell-out of human rights and dignities which I should think should be terminated forthwith.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we have been told that the importation of Mexican braceros does not entail any substantial expense to the taxpayer, since the users of these imported workers foot the bill for administration of the program. But the large corporate farms that are the chief beneficiaries of this program do not pay the cost of assuring compliance with the law. The cost of checking payrolls to ascertain hourly rates, the cost of visiting the fields and labor camps, the cost of maintaining compliance with the International Agreement with Mexico—these costs are borne by the taxpayer, and they are high.

In the current fiscal year, they amount to some \$1.4 million. This involves, Mr. Chairman, about \$60 per imported worker—a heavy burden indeed on the taxpayer.

To clearly see the economic effects of this program, we need only to ask one question—what has been the trend in farm wages in areas where Mexican workers are imported as compared with farm communities that do not rely on these foreign workers? According to studies conducted over a decade by the Department of Agriculture—and I quote from information furnished to me by that Department:

On balance, over the entire 10-year period, there has been a greater increase in wages—rates as a whole in the country than in areas where Mexican nationals have been employed.

The following tables clearly demonstrate the factual evidence in support of the foregoing statement:

WAGE TRENDS IN AREAS WHERE MEXICAN NATIONALS ARE EMPLOYED

During the 10-year period, 1953-62, the annual average hourly farm-wage rate without room or board, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, rose by about 23 percent (from \$0.82 in 1953 to \$1.01 in 1962) for the United States as a whole. Studies of trends in wage rates in areas where Mexican nationals are, or have been employed, show that rates in these areas tended to remain relatively stable from 1953 to 1960. In the past 2 years, rates in areas of Mexican worker employment have tended to rise at a faster rate than for the country as a whole. However, on balance, over the entire 10-year period, there has been a greater increase in wage rates in the country as a whole than in areas where Mexican nationals have been employed.

1. Between 1953 and 1958, the USDA average hourly rate increased by about 12 percent. However, in areas where Mexican nationals were employed, rates, on the average, showed little change. A study of 471 areas for which comparable wage data for 2 or more years were available showed that there was no significant change in rate, from the earlier to later years within this period, in 55 percent of the cases, while 23 percent increased and 22 percent declined.

Trends in wage rates from earliest to latest survey, 1953-58

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased.....	109	23
Unchanged.....	261	55
Decreased.....	101	22
Total.....	471	100

2. Between 1958 and 1959, the USDA average rose about 1 percent. In Mexican-using areas, however, wage rates continued to exhibit the same pattern of relative stability which has been typical of the 1953-58 period. A study of the trend in wage rates in 572 areas in which Mexican nationals were employed in 1959 showed that no significant change in rates occurred over the year in 64 percent of the activities with 20 percent rising and 16 percent declining.

Trends in wage rates, 1958-59

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased.....	116	20
Unchanged.....	365	64
Decreased.....	91	16
Total.....	572	100

3. A study was also made of the 1953-59 trend based on the 471 areas which had been the subject of the 1953-58 trend analysis. This study showed that, in 50 percent of the areas, the rates had remained substantially unchanged over the entire period, with increases occurring in 32 percent of the cases and declines in 18 percent. A comparison of trends in activities compensated on an hourly basis vis-a-vis those compensated on a piece rate basis indicated that substantially more increases occurred in hourly rated activities than in piece rated activities. Forty-one percent of hourly rated activities showed a significant increase as compared to only 25 percent of the piece rate activities. Five percent of the hourly rated activities declined as compared to 27 percent of those compensated on a piece rate basis. The average increase in all hourly rated activities was about 13 percent, as compared to the 16-percent rise in

the U.S. Department of Agriculture's annual average without room or board over the same period.

Trends in wage rates, 1953-59

[Percent of cases]

Direction of change	All areas	Hourly cases ¹	Piece-rate cases
Increased.....	32	41	25
Unchanged.....	50	54	47
Decreased.....	17	5	27
Total.....	99	100	99

¹ Included 4 cases of time rates other than hourly.
² Adds to less than 100 percent due to rounding.

4. Between 1959 and 1960 the U.S. Department of Agriculture average farm wage rate (hourly rate without room or board) rose 2.1 percent, but in major areas where foreign workers were employed, rates remained virtually stable. A study of trends in 123 areas with 500 or more Mexican workers showed no significant change in two-thirds of the cases, although there are labor-shortage areas where wage increases would normally be expected. A significant change is a customary interval of wage payment, such as 5 cents an hour, or 1 or 2 cents in the case of most piece rates.

Trend in wage rates, major areas, 1959-60

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased.....	22	18
Unchanged.....	83	67
Decreased.....	18	15
Total.....	123	100

5. Reversing the trend noted during the 1953-60 period, wage rates in areas and activities of major Mexican worker employment in 1961 showed an increase of 2.9 percent over 1960 as compared with a year-to-year increase of 2.1 percent in the U.S. Department of Agriculture average. A study of the trend in rates in 259 major activities located in 187 crop wage areas in the 7 States—Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Michigan, New Mexico, and Texas—which accounted for virtually all of the Mexican worker employment in 1961, showed that rates increased significantly in 32 percent of the cases, while 64 percent were substantially unchanged and 4 percent declined significantly.

Trends in wage rates, 1960-61

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased.....	83	32
Unchanged.....	166	64
Decreased.....	10	4
Total.....	259	100

6. Based on the preliminary results of a study of the 1961-62 trend in the rates paid in the same areas and activities analyzed in 1961, rates in 1962 Mexican-using areas rose about 5 percent between 1961 and 1962. This compares with an increase of about 2 percent in the U.S. Department of Agriculture average.

7. In addition to the special trends studies conducted in the past 3 years, data relating to trends in wage rates are also available from monthly analyses based upon a comparison of wage rates for comparable periods. A comparison of the data available from these surveys reveals the following:

(a) In 1960, approximately 72 percent of wage findings analyzed showed no change from the previous year, with increases and decreases occurring in about equal numbers.

(b) In 1961, the proportion of wage findings which showed no change rose to about

76 percent. However, there was a decline in the proportion of findings which decreased, approximately 8 percent of all findings analyzed, as compared to 14 percent in 1960. The proportion of increases rose slightly to 16 percent.

(c) In 1962, increases accounted for 32.5 percent of all findings analyzed, with 62.5 percent remaining unchanged and the remainder declining.

The advocates of this legislation have conceded that this program is lacking in humanitarian appeal, but they urge passage of this bill because of "an economic necessity." It seems to me that the importation of human beings, and their treatment as if they were a commodity, is so offensive to our natural instincts that no economic necessity can justify the continuation of this program. The fact that these human beings are leased, rather than bought and sold, is hardly a softening of the moral blow. I would think that at this stage in our moral development we should permit free people to labor in a free market, rather than continue intervention in a free market with indentured foreign workers. I urge the defeat of this legislation.

In support of my stand in opposition to this bill, I include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

Hired Hands

A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders, and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.

There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be not shortage of domestic workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.

Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family framers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, despite the benefits that Public Law 78 may have provided in the past, both to the United States and Mexico, experience

gained over the last few years offers some startling facts concerning the migrant labor program. These facts must form the firm basis for rejecting any extension of Public Law 78.

The number of migrant farm laborers coming across the border to work the farm areas in the Southwest and California has dropped dramatically over the past 5 years. In 1959, 437,643 Mexican farm laborers came to the United States for temporary employment; but last year only 194,978 braceros entered the United States. The desire for this type of work on U.S. farms has slackened so sharply that less than half of those previously coming to the United States now seek entry. The need for these workers has obviously been reduced.

Conversely, American farmworkers have seen an annual wage of \$829 for 138 days of employment creep upward over the past few years to only \$919. In 1962 some 1,889,000 U.S. farmworkers earned this kind of bare income. And the fact is that this number has been steadily declining—forcing, since 1959, more than 425,000 American farmworkers into other labor markets where unemployment is already significant. This situation must be blamed on this low income figure, which is caused in great part by cheap labor competition.

It seems to me that we are being asked to approve something of declining importance to another country at the same time when many people in our own land would suffer considerably from this unnecessary fetter being placed once again on their continuing struggle to improve their own standard of living. Ending Public Law 78 will offer our own underemployed citizens a decidedly better chance to provide for their families.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 5497 and urge that it be defeated, allowing the Mexican farm labor importation program to expire at the end of this year.

The program is utilized principally by the large growers as a source of cheap labor. It penalizes American farmworkers and has depressed their wages to an unwarranted degree.

Under Public Law 78, which this bill would continue, 227,000 Mexicans were brought into the United States in 1962, most of them to work on large, corporation-type farms. The program actually amounts to a Government subsidy for these large growers, who make up no more than 1 percent of the total number of the Nation's growers. It prevents the operation of the laws of supply and demand in the setting of wage rates for farm labor. It falls hardest on the small farmer who either cannot afford to pay any outside help at all or who operates in an area where Mexican labor is unavailable.

Because of this program, growers do not have to raise wages if they cannot attract sufficient numbers of U.S. workers; they simply ask the Federal Govern-

ment to recruit cheap labor from Mexico. Under their contract terms, the Mexicans must work where they are contracted for and cannot search elsewhere for better conditions. Thus, the program feeds on the poverty of Mexico and creates poverty in the United States. Unemployment, a severe problem throughout the economy, is particularly severe among rural workers.

Through this program, the U.S. Government is directly intervening in the labor market, eliminating competition and blocking improvements in working conditions. It is striking a devastating blow at the rural worker and the family farm. The program has rightfully been condemned as immoral by leaders of the major religious faiths, a number of whom have protested to me.

Congress should be eager to strike down a law which has been shown to be as harmful as this one. I strongly urge the House to reject H.R. 5497.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may remain.

Mr. Chairman, we have had an excellent discussion here today of a very important piece of legislation. I think we have adequately recognized both sides of this proposal and given everyone an opportunity to be heard.

We are here arguing for this legislation because we feel it is necessary, and that is the only reason. The judgment of the Committee on Agriculture was the same as that of Secretary of Labor Wirtz with respect to necessity. He, however, recommended an extension of this program for 1 year. We are recommending 2 years. I personally trust Secretary of Labor Wirtz to administer this program in a fashion so that it will not displace any American workers from any jobs, and it will not have an adverse effect on wages and working conditions of any American workers.

I want to say to my friends from the cities you may feel that this is a vote you could cast lightly against this legislation. This is not true. It could have serious effects in your areas in terms of prices of goods to consumers in the event you made a mistake in judgment as to the necessity for this program. Again I say, the Secretary of Labor, who has great technical advice on this subject, has concluded the program is necessary.

These braceros are typically used, not entirely but typically used, in crops which do not enjoy Federal price support programs. They have not sought them. They are generally classified as field crops. I am talking about lettuce, melons, and tomatoes, these items that are sold and desired by the housewife, and the price of which, I can assure you, would skyrocket tremendously in the event they were not planted in the same quantity they are planted now or, if planted, they had to be destroyed because no one was around to harvest them. So you do have a very real stake in this program.

Those of us from agricultural areas where we try conscientiously to help both farmers and farm workers have had to wrestle with this problem not from the standpoint of the consumer but from the

standpoint of doing equity to our constituents. We feel the program can be operated properly. There is a need for it. We hope you will vote for us in extending the program for another 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is needed badly to provide the labor for work that is not sought by domestic workers. The type of work the bracero does is "stoop" labor that our own people would not and are not desirous of performing. The program authorizes our Government to negotiate with the Republic of Mexico to bring into the country a supplemental labor supply. The program has worked well. It has kept the prices of vegetables, citrus, sugar, and many other food crops including cucumber pickles at a reasonable and fair price for the consuming public.

The cost of bringing these workers to American farms and to return them to Mexico is borne by the farmer almost wholly. The farmer pays all of the cost except administrative expenses of Labor Department personnel.

This labor is expensive to the Arkansas farmer. It costs him \$42.60 per man which is nonreimbursable to him to pay the transportation to and from the Mexican border, hot meals en route, housing, kitchen utensils, fuel, and insurance. Our farmers would not pay this extra cost if there was available a dependable local supply of labor to do the work.

The program has built goodwill with our neighbor to the south of us, as it offers employment to their people at wages many times more than they could receive at home. It bolsters the economy of Mexico. These dollars are used to buy commodities from America and aid industry and labor here in this country.

The Subcommittee on Equipment Supplies and Manpower of the House Committee on Agriculture held 3 full days of hearings. Everyone who desired to do so was given an opportunity to testify for or against the legislation. The program was passed in 1951 originally and has been extended several times since that time.

I hope that the bill will be approved by this committee and the House.

The Employment Security Division—Department of Labor in Arkansas works tirelessly to recruit local labor to meet the needs of agriculture during the cultivation and harvest of various crops. I include some of the various appeals made through direct mail notices on bulletin boards posted in conspicuous places, newspaper articles and radio announcements urging workers to accept available farm jobs.

This material was furnished me by Mr. J. L. Bland, administrator of Arkansas Employment Division, Little Rock, Ark.:

WANTED: 1,000 COTTONPICKERS

See George E. Henry, from 5:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. at C. A. Statler's store in Egypt, Ark.; Woodrow Wallace, from 5:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. at pickup point, corner of Main and Drew Streets in Monette, Ark.; or R. J. "Dick" King, from 5 a.m. to 8 a.m. at pickup point at ice-plant in Marked Tree, Ark.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION.
JONESBORO, ARK.

WORKERS NEEDED TO PICK STRAWBERRIES

Workers are needed to pick strawberries in Mississippi County. The berry fields are located within driving distance of your home. The fields are clean and good wages can be made.

If your family or neighbors have a car or pickup and would be interested in driving to and from the fields daily, then you should fill out the form below, giving full information and complete mailing address.

Mail this form today to: Employment Security Division, 111 East Ash Street, Blytheville, Ark.

You will be notified when and to whom to report for work.

Your name-----
 Address-----
 Telephone where you can be reached-----
 Number of workers in your car or pickup-----
 Ages:
 Males-----
 Females-----

(Pickers must be 16 years or older.)

NORTHWEST ARKANSAS FRUIT AND VEGETABLE AREA, 1962 AGRICULTURE HARVEST BULLETIN

Harvest work will begin soon in the north-west Arkansas area. Out of area workers will be needed at various times during the season.

Listed below are the major crops which will require workers and the approximate harvest dates:

- Strawberries: May 10 to June 1.
- Green beans (early): June 15 to July 12.
- Green beans (late): August 1 to frost.
- Grapes: August 25 to September 20.

Other crops requiring some help include apples (transparent), tomatoes (both green wrap and ripe), and peaches.

There are some strawberry growers with farm housing available. Also others with camping space if you have camping equipment.

The Springdale labor camp will open as usual on April 15, but we do not recommend that you come to this area before May 1. The camp manager says they are short of stoves this year, so if you plan to stay in camp and have a stove, bring it along.

If you would like further information on any of this harvest, write to this office any time and we will send you the latest information we have.

ATTENTION STUDENTS: EARN EXTRA MONEY

Did you know that you could earn spending money this fall and at the same time help the economy of your community?

You can do this by picking cotton on Saturdays during the season. Wages are good and working conditions are excellent.

If you or any of your friends are interested in this work, please contact the Helena local office of the Arkansas Employment Security Division at 728 Cherry Street where arrangements will be made to transport you to places of employment.

Plans are underway to arrange for transportation by schools and even by classes if desired.

Do you realize how much you could add to your class fund if your entire class picked cotton for three or four Saturdays, putting the proceeds into those funds? Give it some thought.

MARSHALL SEEKING 800 BERRYPICKERS

About 800 strawberry pickers are needed in the Marshall area, the State Employment Security Division of Little Rock said yesterday.

Workers interested in strawberry harvesting were asked to contact the employment security division farm labor information office at the intersection of U.S. Highway 67 and Highway 27 at Marshall, for picking rates and job location.

MORE THAN 1,500 PICKERS NEEDED AT SEARCY

There is a shortage of pickers for the strawberry harvest in the Searcy-Bald Knob area, the State employment security division said yesterday.

"Growers in these areas need 1,500 pickers immediately and will need 4,000 to 5,000 pickers daily by the end of the week," said J. L. Bland, employment security division administrator.

He said that workers interested in this type of employment should report to the mobile farm labor office on U.S. Highway 67 at Bald Knob across from the auction shed. The office will quote picking rates and provide specific information on job location.

Bland said that production was about 7,000 crates of berries a day. With good weather this should increase as the harvest progresses, he said.

[From the Arkansas Farm Labor Bulletin, April 1962]

TELL YOUR FRIENDS

Approximately 4,000 additional cotton choppers will be needed in the Craighead-Poinsett County area by May 10. Farm-type housing, free of charge, is available for family groups.

Persons interested in chopping cotton should complete the application below, giving full information, and mail to the Employment Security Division, 528 West Monroe, Jonesboro, Ark. Upon receipt, an attempt will be made to secure a desirable job opening for you. Specific job information on wages, dates of employment, and housing will be provided by return mail.

(White or colored)

 Ages-males-----
 Number of choppers in your family or group?-----
 Ages-females-----
 Do you have complete camping equipment? Yes----- No-----
 Do you have camping equipment except shelter? Yes----- No-----
 What kind of transportation do you have? Car, 1/2-ton, 1 1/2-ton, other-----
 If not, would you be willing to pay a reasonable transportation fee? Yes----- No-----

(Date) (Name) (Address)

 EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION,
 JONESBORO, ARK.
 (Or contact your nearest employment security division office.)

DAY-HAUL

(Radio station KXJK, Forrest City, 15-second announcement)

Attention to unemployed workers in Forrest City and vicinity:

Temporary workers helping to pick cotton this season will have free transportation daily to and from the farms. Workers are needed to pick this year's cotton crop. Prevailing wages will be paid. If you do not have a place to pick cotton contact your local employment security division office located at 807 South Washington Street in Forrest City, Ark., today, and register for a job on a farm for this harvest season. Your help is needed.

That's the Employment Security Division at 807 South Washington Street, Forrest City, Ark.

[From the Forrest City (Ark.) Daily Times Herald, Sept. 12, 1962]

FARMERS IN TRICOUNTY AREA NEED 3,000 COTTONPICKERS, OFFICIAL SAYS—RAINS DAMAGE GRADE OF CROP—KEEPS MACHINES OUT OF FIELDS—SITUATION TERMED "ACUTE"

"St. Francis County farmers, plagued recently by drought followed by excessive rains, now are in need of cottonpickers and the

supply is not great enough to meet the demand," said Kenneth Graham of the State employment security division.

Graham said at least 2,000 pickers could be placed on day haul immediately in the St. Francis, Lee, and Cross County area. Another 1,000 are sought by farmers to live on the farms and pick, he added.

"If the weather stays fair and the fields start drying more, we'll need even more workers until it becomes dry enough to use machines," Graham said. The other two counties in the office's area, Monroe and Prairie, use machines more.

Rains already have damaged the grade of some cotton and farmers are very anxious to get the crop out of the field. Continued dry weather would alleviate the situation to some extent, Graham said, because machines would be used more.

Some Mexican labor already is in the area, but about 2,000 more than will arrive could be used. New restrictions about wages have cut the number of braceros because farmers are afraid of losing money on their crop, Graham explained.

Employment security division officials have been talking with leaders of the three counties, urging them to help recruit pickers.

Mechanical pickers will harvest about 94,600 acres in the tricounty area, and an additional 36,600 acres in Monroe and Prairie Counties. Graham said about 75 percent of the Prairie and Monroe County crop will be machine picked.

Many farmers will furnish houses to workers willing to live on the farm, and some furnish complete living facilities. Most of the ones wanting day-haul labor will furnish transportation, and all will pay prevailing wages, he said.

Graham termed the situation acute, but said it could easily become critical, depending on the weather. He requested all persons willing to work to contact his office, and they would be put in touch with farmers.

MR. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the renewal of Public Law 78 for another 2 years. In 1961 I opposed this measure as did many of my colleagues. The reasons for opposing the bracero program then are just as valid now.

The bracero program is inconsistent with the principles of a progressive nation. What we are doing in this program, whether we realize it or not, is "importing" human beings. A civilized nation does not "import" people as if they were objects. The conditions of peonage which the Mexican laborer is subjected to under this program are inconsistent with our principles. The bracero is a dependent and exploited worker. This program does not support a free labor force of which our Nation can be proud.

In addition to the immorality of the program, which I believe is sufficient reason to vote against the program, Public Law 78 is degrading to our own American farmworkers. Our own farmworkers being free men and women are unable to compete with imported captive labor.

Mr. Chairman, I believe American people would not tolerate this program if it were not concealed, hid away in the rural areas of California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Imagine what would happen if our textile mills and apparel factories raised money and asked the Government to use it to set up work camps to house foreign workers on the outskirts of the textile counties of North Carolina or the garment manufacturing

areas of Pennsylvania; what would happen if Government representatives were sent to other countries to secure workers to come into the United States to work for low wages in our textile mills and factories?

We would never even consider such a program in the Congress. So how can we then vote to extend Public Law 78 for another year or two? This program was set up during the Korean war. That was 10 years ago. Unemployment was 3 percent of the labor force. There may have been some need for such a program. At least there was a war emergency.

Today unemployment is nearly 6 percent. There is no war emergency. Yet the program continues. Why? Because under the program the growers of a few of our States, a few thousand of the millions of American farmers, profit from it. We have become accustomed to operating a sweatshop-in-the-fields, under sponsorship of the Federal Government.

If anything were needed to show the true character of this program, it was revealed during the recent hearings on this legislation. The growers complain about the wages required to be offered domestic or Mexican workers under the Secretary of Labor's very weak program to establish some kind of wage standards. What are these wages they object to paying? They are unwilling to pay \$1 an hour for a man or woman to endure the blazing sun of California, stooped over, cutting melons, with a 50-pound sack weighing down their shoulders. They object to paying 95 cents to pick grapefruit in Arizona. They think 70 cents an hour too much to pay for chopping cotton in the Texas Delta. Yet their neighbors in the State of Arkansas groan under the burden of paying 60 cents an hour for cotton chopping.

This is the reality behind the face of this program. The sweatshop has been driven from our cities and has found refuge on our farms.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for many years the district I represent was the leading cotton producing area in this country. While this is not necessarily true today, there is nevertheless a substantial amount of cotton produced in the blacklands located in the river bottoms. The farmers who produce this cotton need labor, and the local labor force is not sufficient to meet their demands.

While many of these farmers in my district have told me that they believe many perfections could be made in existing law with respect to farm labor, any curtailment of the law, or a repeal of the law would be disastrous to them. Most of the labor performed by the Mexican nationals is known as stoop labor and is of the type which few U.S. citizens will do, or migratory farm labor will perform. In the cotton areas it consists of weeding, hoeing, and picking of the cotton.

Failure to extend this law would be most harmful to the smaller farmers because most of the larger farmers are completely mechanized; or are in a position to recruit migratory labor from great distances and carry out compli-

cated transportation programs. Mr. Chairman, these workers assist in the harvesting of a number of crops, and without them, there would be a dilemma in many States.

The law restricts the use of Mexicans to areas and situations where the Secretary of Labor has found that no American citizens are ready, willing, or able to do the needed work. So, the American worker is protected in every respect. The Secretary must also find that the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American farmworkers and that farmers have made reasonable efforts to obtain domestic labor. So again every protection is afforded the American laborer.

However, it is the interpretations and the regulations which have been promulgated by the Secretary of Labor on these latter restrictions contained in the law which have proved burdensome to the farmer. In spite of this, I believe an extension of the program is in order, and will support the extension.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5497, a bill designed to extend for 2 years the so-called Mexican farm labor import program, Public Law 82-78, is legislation which I cannot support.

Evidence mounts, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of this program poverty competes against poverty to produce more poverty. The program, originally enacted in the 82d Congress in 1951 as a "temporary" measure, is a reason why the American farmworkers, one of the poorest work groups in the United States, were able in calendar 1961 to earn an average of about \$880 that year for the 134 days of farmwork they were able to obtain.

True, there are provisions in the existing program designed to mitigate against "adverse effect" upon American farmworkers. But in effect it has depressed farm wages where Mexican farmworkers are employed, as I shall shortly detail.

After all, what else is to be expected when the following can occur: a grower offers employment to American farmworkers at, say, 60 cents an hour. The wage is inadequate to attract American farmworkers. The grower then has only to say that he has been unable to obtain American fieldworkers and seeks permission to import Mexicans, the so-called braceros. In 1962, I am informed that about 227,000 braceros were contracted and recontracted under the program.

At this point, I introduce into the RECORD some statistics relating to the program, which to my mind amply demonstrate that the bracero program is a blight upon the national conscience:

FACT SHEET ON PUBLIC LAW 78

I. How serious are the agricultural users of braceros about eliminating the bracero program?

Peak employment of Mexican nationals
Calendar year: Workers
1942..... 4,200
1959..... 291,515

This number should be considered in view of the labor shortage caused by World War II.

II. How Mexican contract nationals destroy wages.

Wages in tomato crop in San Joaquin County?

Calendar year	Picking wages	Employed	
		Number of Mexican national workers	Number of local workers
1955..	18 to 32 cents per 50-pound box.	1,000	9,000
1960..	11 to 27 cents per 50-pound box.	9,000	1,000

III. How farmers comply with Public Law 78:

Fiscal year 1961

	Number of investigations	Violations
Housing.....	10,557	13,474
Vehicles.....	3,300	(1)
Migrant labor agreement (wages and working conditions).....	4,424	23,094

¹ 1/2 in violation.

² 46 percent in violation.

Source: Page 95, Annual Report, Department of Labor, 1961.

Over 550 employers were declared ineligible to contract for the quarter ending December 31, 1962.

An additional \$284,650 recovered in payment of wages to Mexican nationals as a result of the above investigations.

The above is more revealing when one realizes that the small number of compliance officers under the Bureau of Employment Security are so few in number as to make proper enforcement of Public Law 78 an impossibility.

The program also hurts the family farms, as the corporate farms are the principal employers of braceros, and are thus able to cut costs in a way not available to family farms who employ few hired workers. The import farmworker program should be ended for reasons I have just cited and because it aggravates the unemployment situation. It should be permitted to expire when the existing authority for the program ends December 31, 1963.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the May 29, 1963, edition of the Washington Post relating to the problem:

Hired Hands

A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders, and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.

There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be no shortage of domestic

workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.

Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family farmers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my opposition to the bill we are presently considering. To extend for another 2 years the authorization for the recruitment of Mexican workers for U.S. farm labor, I feel can only aggravate the present high rate of national unemployment.

When our country is faced with the problem of more than 4 million unemployed Americans, it clearly is not in the national interest to import a quarter-of-a-million Mexicans to additionally burden the internal labor market. I feel a far better method of assuring an adequate work force for those farms where Mexican labor has been employed would be for this Congress to enact a similar program of recruitment, transportation and contracts for American farm workers.

Beyond enacting legislation which is plainly prejudicial to our own American labor market, the provisions of H.R. 5497 also contain adverse consequences for a large segment of our agricultural economy. Because the hired labor costs of large corporation-type farms using Mexican workers are less than those of competing family farms, the value of family farm labor becomes less. Areas which must rely on domestic farmworkers lose their markets to the production of farms with cheaper labor, further depressing farm income.

Born at a time when farmworkers were in short supply, this program performed a necessary function. Now, that need is no longer with us. The importation of Mexican farmworkers should be terminated, thereby, ending a Government subsidy to less than 1 percent of the Nation's farms.

I fully concur in the concise and well stated analysis of this issue contained in the Washington Post editorial included with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5497 even though I come from a district which last year did not use any braceros. However, it is the feeling of representatives of Idaho agriculture that this program has played an important part in making available Texas Mexicans and Navajo Indians for the seasonal work in the sugarbeet and potato industries. Failure to extend the program could result in a shortage of much needed seasonal labor in these two industries.

It is true that the sugarbeet and potato industries in Idaho are becoming more mechanized just as they are throughout the United States. However, I want to point out that it is the larger farmers that are able to mechanize first. It is the more wealthy farmer that can afford a sugarbeet thinning machine

and a potato harvester. On the smaller farms the work of thinning sugarbeets and picking potatoes is still done largely by hand. It is these smaller farmers that to a large extent use the migratory labor to accomplish this work. Therefore, I feel that should the law not be extended and the predicted labor shortage follow, it would work a real hardship on the smaller sugarbeet and potato farmers of my State.

For that reason, I join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]; the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]; and the majority of the House Agriculture Committee who after hearing extensive testimony on this matter had only three dissenting votes in recommending that this program be extended.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5497, the Mexican farm labor bill. While it is true that the Mexican farm labor program has provided certain economic advantages to some U.S. farmowners, chiefly in the form of a supply of cheap labor, the disadvantages of continuing the program and the severe hardship that it causes to our rural labor force far outweigh the assistance that it gives to some of our farmers. The program should be allowed to expire.

The rate of unemployment in our rural labor force is 7.3 percent. This is an unhealthy condition that must be corrected by a variety of attacks. But surely the Federal Government has no business being a party to arrangements that aggravate the problem.

There is certainly an element of unfair competition here as well. In effect it is a kind of a subsidy to a few at the expense of the many.

The committee report in favor of the bill sets forth several arguments along the lines that the program has been a boon to the Mexican economy and to Mexican workers. But our problem is the unemployment rate here and conditions of work here. This is not to be considered a foreign aid program for Mexico.

Finally, let us not be led into voting for this bill on the grounds that Americans will not perform stoop labor. This just does not stand up under the evidence. In many cases it is true that the conditions of work and the pay are substandard so that Americans avoid the work and the area, but that is quite different from "will not." Americans are used and entitled to working for a fair wage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

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 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963", and inserting "December 31, 1965".

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is purely technical in nature.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 1, line 3, strike out "509" and insert "510".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 350, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The question is 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 a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BECKER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BECKER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5497, to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 174, answered "present" 1, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—158

Abbutt	Colmer	Halleck
Abernethy	Cooley	Harding
Albert	Cramer	Hardy
Alger	Curtis	Harris
Arends	Dague	Harrison
Ashbrook	Davis, Tenn.	Harvey, Mich.
Aspinall	Derwinski	Healey
Avery	Dole	Hemphill
Baldwin	Dorn	Herlong
Barry	Downing	Hoeven
Beermann	Duncan	Jarman
Belcher	Elliott	Jennings
Bell	Fascell	Johansen
Berry	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Betts	Fisher	Jonas
Bolton,	Ford	Jones, Ala.
Frances P.	Foreman	Keith
Bonner	Fountain	Kilgore
Brock	Frelinghuysen	Kornegay
Brotzman	Friedel	Langen
Brown, Ohio	Fuqua	Latta
Broyhill, N.C.	Gary	Leggett
Broyhill, Va.	Gathings	Lennon
Bruce	Gavin	Lipscomb
Burleson	Grant	Lloyd
Burton	Griffin	Long, La.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Long, Md.
Casey	Gubser	McCulloch
Cederberg	Gurney	McFall
Chamberlain	Hagan, Ga.	McMillan
Chelf	Hagen, Calif.	MacGregor
Chenoweth	Haley	Mahon
Clausen	Hall	Malliard

Marshall	Selden	Trimble
Martin, Calif.	Senner	Tuck
Martin, Nebr.	Short	Udall
Matthews	Shriver	Ullman
May	Sikes	Utt
Meadler	Sisk	Vinson
Mills	Skubitz	Watson
Morris	Smith, Calif.	Watts
Moss	Smith, Va.	Westland
Murray	Springer	Whitener
Norblad	Saebler	Whitten
Poff	Steed	Widnall
Pool	Stephens	Williams
Reid, Ill.	Stubblefield	Willis
Reifel	Talcott	Wilson, Bob
Rivers, S.C.	Taylor	Wilson, Ind.
Rogers, Fla.	Teague, Calif.	Wright
Rogers, Tex.	Teague, Tex.	Younger
Schadeberg	Thompson, Tex.	
Schenck	Thomson, Wis.	
Schneebell	Thornberry	

Montoya	Poage	Shipley
Morrison	Powell	Siler
Morton	Purcell	Snyder
Nedzi	Rains	Tupper
Nelsen	Randall	Van Pelt
Nygaard	Rhodes, Ariz.	Waggonner
O'Brien, N.Y.	Riehlman	Walter
O'Hara, Mich.	Roberts, Ala.	Weaver
O'Konski	Roberts, Tex.	Wharton
Osmer	Roush	Wilson
Ostertag	Ryan, Mich.	Charles H.
Passman	Scott	Winstead
Pilcher	Secrest	Wyman
Pillion	Shelley	

"nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 5497 and include extraneous matter.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the legislative program for the balance of the week. While I understand that we are to meet on Friday next, the day after tomorrow, if the gentleman could announce the program for next week at this time, I am sure it would be very helpful to all the Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.
 Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has correctly stated the situation. We intend to adjourn over until Friday but we have no legislative business scheduled for Friday. It is my intention to ask the House adjourn over until Friday and then to adjourn from Friday to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.
 Tuesday is Private Calendar day.
 Also on Tuesday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] advises that he will call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 5366, the 1964 appropriation bill for Treasury and Post Office Departments.

Also on Tuesday, the bill H.R. 3496, extending the Reorganization Act of 1949. That will be taken up under an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday, H.R. 6500, the military construction authorization.

Thursday and the balance of the week—the agriculture appropriation bill for 1964.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

So the bill was rejected.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Walter against.
 Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Nedzi against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Shipley against.
 Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Laird against.
 Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Siler against.
 Mr. Nygaard for, with Mr. Snyder against.
 Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. McLoskey against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Clancy against.
 Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Bow against.
 Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Ostertag against.
 Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
 Mr. Ayres for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
 Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Collier against.
 Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wyman against.
 Mr. Minshall for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Bromwell against.
 Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Goodling against.

Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mrs. Kee against.
 Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Libonati against.
 Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McClory.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bates.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Pillion.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Osmer.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Knox.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Weaver.
 Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wharton.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Keogh.
 Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Denton with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Kluczynski.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Roush.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
 Mr. Randall with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Brown of California.
 Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Flood.
 Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. DANIELS of California and Mr. GUBSER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."
 Mr. KING of California and Mr. BURKE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted

NAYS—174

Abele	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Ashley	Griffiths	Pike
Baker	Grover	Pirnie
Baring	Halpern	Price
Barrett	Hansen	Pucinski
Bass	Harsha	Quile
Becker	Hawkins	Quillen
Beckworth	Hays	Reid, N.Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Reuss
Bennett, Mich.	Hechler	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Holifield	Rich
Boland	Holland	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Horton	Robison
Oliver P.	Huddleston	Rodino
Brademas	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Bray	Jensen	Rooney
Brooks	Joelson	Roosevelt
Broomfield	Johnson, Wis.	Rosenthal
Burke	Karsten	Rostenkowski
Burkhalter	Karth	Roudebush
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Cahill	Kelly	Rumsfeld
Cameron	King, Calif.	Ryan, N.Y.
Cannon	Kunkel	St. George
Carey	Kyl	St. Germain
Celler	Lankford	St. Onge
Clark	Lesinski	Saylor
Cleveland	Lindsay	Schweiker
Cohelan	McDade	Schwengel
Conte	McDowell	Sheppard
Corbett	Maedonald	Sibal
Corman	Madden	Sickles
Cunningham	Mathias	Slack
Curtin	Matunaga	Smith, Iowa
Daddario	Miller, Calif.	Stafford
Delaney	Miller, N.Y.	Staggers
Dent	Milliken	Stinson
Derounian	Minish	Stratton
Donohue	Monagan	Sullivan
Dulski	Moore	Taft
Edwards	Moorhead	Thomas
Evins	Morgan	Thompson, La.
Fallon	Morse	Thompson, N.J.
Farbstein	Mosher	Toll
Feighan	Multer	Tollefson
Fino	Murphy, Ill.	Tuten
Fogarty	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Natcher	Vanik
Fulton, Pa.	Nix	Wallhauser
Gallagher	O'Brien, Ill.	Weltner
Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.	Whalley
Giaino	Olsen, Mont.	White
Gibbons	Olsen, Minn.	Wickersham
Gilbert	O'Neill	Wydler
Gill	Patman	Young
Glenn	Patten	Zablocki
Gonzalez	Pelly	
Grabowski	Pepper	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Goodling

NOT VOTING—100

Adair	Devine	Hosmer
Anderson	Diggs	Hutchinson
Andrews	Dingell	Ichord
Ashmore	Dowdy	Jones, Mo.
Auchincloss	Dwyer	Kee
Ayres	Edmondson	Keogh
Bates	Ellsworth	Kilburn
Battin	Everett	King, N.Y.
Blatnik	Finnegan	Kirwan
Bolling	Flood	Kluczynski
Bow	Flynt	Knox
Bromwell	Forrester	Laird
Brown, Calif.	Fulton, Tenn.	Landrum
Buckley	Goodell	Libonati
Clancy	Gray	McClory
Collier	Hanna	McIntire
Daniels	Harvey, Ind.	McLoskey
Davis, Ga.	Henderson	Martin, Mass.
Dawson	Hoffman	Michel
Denton	Horan	Minshall

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file the subcommittee's report on the investigation of the \$7½ million in securities disappearing from a San Francisco bank and also including individual supplemental and additional views.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS: AMERICA'S NO. 1 DOMESTIC ISSUE

Mr. COHELAN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the significance of Birmingham—and Greensboro, Raleigh, and others—is that gradualism as a means of eliminating segregation has failed; that moderation and accommodation by themselves are not enough.

As Max Lerner so aptly stated in a recent article appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette:

There is an authentic Negro revolution going on in America. No moderating words among the Negroes and whites and in the Government can obscure that fact. It is a revolution in the sense that forces which had for some time been operating at a more or less regular pace have now accelerated to the point of a real breakthrough.

Or as Robert Baker stated in his excellent article of May 26 in the Washington Post:

Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life.

And as the Washington Post itself stated in its lead editorial of May 26:

It is true, of course, that deprivation and denial have made the Negro imperfectly prepared for full participation in democracy. But that is not his fault and can no longer be made a pretext for more denial and deprivation. The country can choose—must choose for the choice is inescapable—between integration and enmity, between a generous giving of full equality to Negroes or a violent dispute over rights which can no longer be withheld.

Mr. Speaker, there is, in my judgment, no greater task confronting us than to insure that all Americans—regardless of their race, religion, or national origin—have equal opportunities for equal treatment.

It is obvious that despite our progress, a very real gap continues to exist between our goals and our realizations; a gap which must be closed not only because it is economically wasteful, but because it is morally wrong.

Meaningful legislation has been introduced which would enable us to close that gap. I have introduced two bills which I think are of particular importance—one to establish a Federal Commission on Equal Employment Opportunities, and a second to empower the Attorney General to initiate suits on behalf of any person who is being deprived of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, religion or national origin. Other important civil rights measures have been introduced, and I urge that we in this Congress, at this session, meet our responsibilities by passing this legislation and further safeguarding the rights of all Americans.

As the dean of American columnists, Walter Lippmann, stated so incisively in his article of May 28:

Nobody can have any doubt that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing and in public facilities * * *. The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy * * * of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

Mr. Speaker, the four articles to which I have referred, and a fifth by Ralph McGill appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette, speak pointedly to the problem we are facing, and I commend them to our colleagues' attention:

AMERICAN NEGRO IN AUTHENTIC REVOLUTION (By Max Lerner)

There is an authentic Negro revolution going on in America. No moderating words among the Negroes and whites and in the Government can obscure that fact.

It is a revolution in the sense that forces which had for some time been operating at a more or less regular pace have now accelerated to the point of a real breakthrough. That is the meaning of Birmingham.

The Supreme Court school decision and the others that have followed have been efforts to keep the torrential energy of that revolution channeled. That is what both Kennedys and the Department of Justice staff have been trying to do as well. If they

don't succeed, then things can happen at Birmingham that will be uglier than Little Rock and New Orleans and the campus of Ole Miss.

One thing we see clearly now is the perilousness of the path of peace that Martin Luther King and his fellow leaders have chosen. King has undertaken something never quite undertaken before: to use the strategy of nonviolent resistance by the whole of a minority in the midst of a hostile majority, and to do it in one of the centers of the Deep South, in a State with a violently segregationist Governor, and in a city with a tradition of police brutality.

He has undertaken, moreover, something that even Gandhi didn't dare do: to use the mass of Negro children—not only the adolescents in the high schools—but even the little children. Some have charged King with being coldly instrumental in his use of the child as shield, and one can see that the charge might have some basis if the campaign had been in more cynical hands.

PERILOUS LINE

But the whole point of civil disobedience is that you must walk a perilous line between incitement and control. This is where King has proved an impressive disciple of Gandhi. The danger of using the children was not so much that they would be used cynically as that any harm done to them might unleash potential violence and death. As it turned out, the sight of the children marching as crusaders for freedom—which for them meant freedom in the little round of their daily lives, where freedom always counts—shamed many passive and apathetic elders into joining the demonstration. And it jolted many whites, including some of the policemen into a new perspective. Both the Negroes and whites began to see the world in a new light, through the eyes of a little child.

But Dr. King also knows that every movement generates its inevitable excesses, and that so massive a movement of nonviolent resisters may well develop violent ones. That is why he has felt that the problem of controlling the movement is crucial. To have a disciplined revolution without violence is far more difficult than to have an undisciplined one without violence. It was crucial for King to keep himself and his leaders always open to negotiation for a settlement. If violence comes—and even as I write this it may still come if negotiations break down and tempers on both sides wear thin—it will not be the fault of King and the other leaders of his movement.

DEMANDS

The Negro demands are reasonable but firm: to desegregate the business places, to give Negroes a better chance at jobs they can handle, to free the thousands who have been arrested, to set up an interracial committee to prevent further trouble. Something like this has worked in Atlanta, Memphis, and Dallas. Why should it not work in Birmingham and in the remaining southern cities for whom Birmingham will be a test case to follow?

There remains the question of President Kennedy's behavior in the Birmingham crisis. If the crisis is resolved, he will apply to other situations the same tactics of quiet behind-the-scenes work in the I-am-the-leader-of-the-whole-Nation-not-a-segment spirit. If it does not work, he will be berated by those who have asked him to come out with some dramatic statement or action.

WHITE MAN NO LONGER SETTING THE RACIAL PACE (By Robert E. Baker)

Gustave de Beaumont, the traveling companion of the more renowned Alexis de Tocqueville, wrote in 1835 that the future position of the freed Negro might prove to be the "canker in American society."

"I had seen American society dominated by a prejudice which offended against my reason, my interests, and my heart," Beau-mont wrote. "Could this prejudice endure forever?"

"I could not believe it. I continued to hear each day that public opinion became more enlightened on this point."

Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life.

Since the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision in 1954, many persons have called the racial issue America's No. 1 domestic problem. But many others didn't really think so; they believed that, somehow, it would go away or be solved gently and absorbed by the passage of time.

Who can honestly say today that this "canker in American society" is not our No. 1 problem?

PATTERNED AFTER GANDHI

In Birmingham, Ala., the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has succeeded, after partial failures elsewhere, in welding together an effective nonviolent action movement that forced concessions from the white community.

Perhaps there is a similarity to the suffragettes, the militant ladies in quest of a vote who hounded President Wilson and filled the jails and refused to eat. But Dr. King and the other leaders of the Negro movement have patterned their actions after Mahatma Gandhi, whose 40 years of passive resistance gained independence for India.

The Gandhian concepts of nonviolent action and civil disobedience were, in a sense, a kind of brinkmanship; although violence was disavowed, it nevertheless was a possibility. The Gandhi movement was at times marked by violence; the Negro demonstrations in Birmingham also have had violence.

The significance of the Birmingham movement is not the small concession extracted from the white community. It is the massiveness of the Negro demonstrations that punctured the white man's comforting belief that Negroes generally are satisfied with the pace of things and that militant "outside agitators" are the only cause of unrest. Local Negroes filled the jails to overflowing.

BIRMINGHAM NOT ALONE

Birmingham, the symbol of Deep South segregation, is not alone. Perhaps more significant are the Negro demonstrations and protests in Greensboro, Raleigh, and Durham, N.C., and Nashville, Tenn., Southern cities that Negroes a few months ago had called "good cities" because white leaders had shown moderation and accommodation.

These good cities are finding out that accommodation is not enough; that a city with a good reputation in racial relations today can have trouble tomorrow.

And in the North, too, the Negro is stirring because the absence of segregation laws is not enough. Negro students in Englewood, N.J., have been crashing white schools daily to protest the northern pattern of geographical segregation that locks them in an inferior status and commits them to an inferior future as surely as southern law, policy, and resistance.

In Chicago, Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims, told a reporter who obviously represented the white man:

"You are our worst enemy. We are tired of suffering, brutality, beatings, killings, just because you don't like us, and just hate us, and absolutely knowing that we are powerless to resist because you have every odd against us."

EXTREME POINT OF VIEW

This is the extreme Negro point of view that refers to Dr. King and the demonstrators as "beggars." But a white southerner who sought out Negro intellectuals

while he was attending Harvard University recently was stunned to discover that, while they did not embrace the Black Muslim philosophy of complete separation from the enemy white man, neither would they turn their back on it.

James Baldwin was a relatively little known Negro novelist and essayist until recently when his words caught the ears of a massive white audience in a remarkable article in the New Yorker magazine and a subsequent book.

"The Negroes of this country may never be able to rise to power, but they are very well placed indeed to precipitate chaos and ring down the curtain on the American dream," he wrote. And, again:

"It must be added that the Negro himself no longer believes in the good faith of white Americans—if, indeed, he ever could have."

Perhaps Baldwin overstates the case. But his words are symptomatic of the frustration and irritation and growing determination of the Negro in America today.

FAILURE OF GRADUALISM

What do all these demonstrations and all these words mean?

They mark the failure of gradualism to solve the race issue. The Supreme Court packaged gradualism into its school cases in 1955 when it ordered desegregation with all deliberate speed.

But in the South, the white leaders in many cases have done the least they could do, rather than the most, within their set of circumstances. While progress from the white point of view may have been considered adequate or even remarkable, from the Negro point of view it has been disastrously slow. In the North, the Negro is registering his frustration with the black ghetto of the cities where the basic disease of discrimination is creating new victims faster than rehabilitation programs can treat them.

The Negro has often found that negotiations, on subjects from schools to lunch counters, have resulted in stalling or hollow victories.

MORE THAN TOLERATION

At this point, the white man is no longer setting the pace. The old approaches are no longer satisfactory. The Negro, with his growing unity and determination and demonstrations, is choosing the time and the place.

The Negro is looking for more than toleration. In Birmingham, the city's most influential and powerful executives recently issued a statement calling for an end to irresponsibility, violence and hate because it was keeping back the economic growth of the community.

In the circumstances, it was a welcomed action. Yet many Negroes assessed it as a hollow victory; the white people were not desegregating because it was right but because of their pocketbooks.

Some white people saw it that way, too. The Reverend Louis L. Mitchell, Jr., told the wealthy congregation of St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Birmingham last Sunday that settlement of the race issue for economic reasons was really Marxian in emphasis.

"We must affirm categorically a more excellent reason for solution to our crisis," he said and cited, as that reason, that segregation is immoral.

It seems apparent that Negro frustration and determination are developing into a genuine mass movement with nationwide impact. Negroes and whites have the responsibility for seeing that violence does not occur and that progress does.

Negro leaders must constantly reevaluate their tactics so that never will their sleeping giant, now awakened, get out of control. White leaders must accelerate the pace of desegregation and do the most, not the least, that is possible.

It is the responsibility of government, churches, politicians, businessmen, everyone.

A NATURAL YEARNING

Lewis W. White is a young Negro school-teacher who was reared and educated in Birmingham. After the 5 weeks of demonstrations, the truce, the bombing and the riot, he sat down and put his thoughts on paper. He wrote:

"The natural yearning to attain the full status of man, a full and deserving partner in the grand and guarded experiment called democracy, this can be said to be the real and sincere design of America's problem minority: the Negro."

He wrote that the white camp is composed of a majority that engages the enemy with delay or violence and a minority of moderates not strong enough to bring about fundamental changes. The demonstrations, he said, are resorted to by the Negro "to shame his white brethren into living true to the white man's very own concept of equality before the law, full participation commensurate with ability and desire in the democratic venture."

The young Negro then called for the emergence of "superhumans committed to design a better world."

"It is surely the influence and ideas of these men which must be hastened into action," he wrote, "or the next century will accord us the same sense of frustration and guilt that has too long been Birmingham's yoke to bear."

He was writing about Birmingham. He could have been writing about the Nation.

THE PROMISED LAND

"Patience" has become an ugly word to many Negroes. Their leaders can no longer use it. And from white leaders, it stirs only exasperation. American Negroes have been incredibly patient—waiting for the freedom promised a hundred years ago when their emancipation was proclaimed, waiting for the political enfranchisement and civil rights promised when the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were solemnly ratified, waiting for the schooling promised when the Supreme Court recognized nearly a decade back that segregation cannot be equality.

All these years Negroes have waited patiently to cross into the promised land. They are not going to wait quietly any longer. James Baldwin put it very simply: "There's a bill that's been due in this country for a long time. Now, with Birmingham, it's come in and it's got to be paid."

The question is how the bill to be paid—in rancor and bitterness or in generosity and brotherhood. It is true, of course, that deprivation and denial have made the Negro imperfectly prepared for full participation in democracy. But that is not his fault and can no longer be made a pretext for more denial and deprivation. The country can choose—must choose, for the choice is inescapable—between integration and enmity, between a generous giving of full equality to Negroes or a violent dispute over rights which can no longer be withheld.

That choice by the white community will determine the choice by Negroes between leaders who counsel rational restraint and disciplined striving and respect for the community's best values on the one hand, and leaders who preach hatred and vengefulness on the other. There are no other choices. Negroes can no longer be kept in subjugation. They have liberated themselves. They can be welcomed or rejected; but one way or the other, their bill has got to be paid.

There are ways in which integration can be eased and speeded. The country has indulged in a catastrophic lethargy about this problem over the past decade. The judicial branch of the Government has been left to take the initiative without appropriate

assertion of the moral imperatives on the part of Congress, the Executive or the State governments. Under the Kennedy administration, there have been gestures toward the recognition of Negro aspirations by the appointment of numerous exceptional Negroes to public office; and there has been energetic intervention by the Department of Justice when specific situations got out of hand, but now much more is needed.

Civil rights legislation is now under consideration, and two bills were introduced in the Senate on Thursday by Senators Cooper and Dobb empowering the Attorney General to take action in the courts in behalf of individuals subjected to discrimination in the public schools or in places of public accommodation. This legislation would be useful if it were now in force. Consideration of it at this juncture is a little like consideration of a bill to purchase a fire engine when the town hall is aflame. Nevertheless, it ought to be enacted, and promptly, as an evidence of congressional concern and to put an additional weapon in the Justice Department armory.

But the great need now, we believe, is for dynamic national leadership to tell the country of its crisis and to win public opinion to support the dramatic changes that must take place. All through the South there are men of generosity and vision ready to throw off the shackles that have held the white people as well as the colored people of the area in servitude to an outmoded social order. If it is hard to hear their voices over the raucous bellowings of the Orval Faubuses, the Ross Barnetts, the Bull Connors, the George Wallaces, they are beginning, nevertheless, to make themselves heard.

These men, the leaders of business and industry and the professions in a hundred southern cities, are the potential shapers of the South's future. In Little Rock, in Jackson, in Birmingham, in Atlanta—and even in advance of crisis in Raleigh and Charlottesville, and Salisbury and many another town—these men have recognized reality despite the posturings of political leaders clinging to an impossible past.

And in the North as well, there are enlightened business and professional men who are well aware that the ghetto slums and the school dropouts and the closed doors of opportunity are a blight upon the whole community, not upon its Negro elements alone. These men can be mobilized, must be mobilized, to meet the most crucial social challenge of the day.

The President of the United States ought to appeal to these men and women all over America for support in a great undertaking. He can enlist the upwelling sense of decency and fairness among ordinary Americans in a crusade to rid this country, once and for all, of the poison of racial discrimination. He can set an example by the use of every power and instrumentality at his command to end discrimination in schools, in housing, in employment, in the right to vote. He must summon his countrymen now, while there is yet time, to the attainment of a peaceful revolution—and the avoidance of such disgraceful disasters as Birmingham.

If all this is done, if there is set before American Negroes not a vague promise of future concessions but a specific assertion of recognized rights at the highest level of political authority, then a little more patience can be exhorted, and the River Jordan can be crossed in harmony and order. This indeed would then become a promised land for all Americans, regardless of color.

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION
(By Walter Lippmann)

Suddenly, as it were, the struggle of the Negroes toward equality of status in American society has taken a sharp turn.

The demonstrations in Birmingham have proved to be something more than the work

of outsiders playing upon the imaginary grievances of otherwise docile and contented masses. Nobody can now doubt that the grievances are genuine and are deep under the rule of such men as "Bull" Connor and Governor Wallace. And nobody can have any doubt either that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and that they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing, and in the public facilities.

For a hundred years since Lincoln freed the slaves, this country has relied upon the education of the Negroes and the persuasion of the whites to bring about that equality of status to which it is committed. We are now realizing that the present rate of change will not be fast enough. The redress of the grievances of the Negroes is for the new generation too slow in coming. History teaches us that when this point is reached in the struggle for what men regard as their just rights a revolutionary condition exists.

Then the supreme questions are posed. Will the ruling and privileged classes take command of the coming changes? Or will they cling to their privileges and become the immovable object in collision with an irresistible force?

The white people of this country, not only the white people of Alabama and Mississippi, are now at that crucial point where they must answer those questions. They must choose, on the one hand, between leading the movement toward equality of status and, on the other hand, standing aside and letting matters be decided by collisions between the Negro agitators and the "Bull" Connors.

The Negro rebellion is now led by men like Martin Luther King who preach and practice the Gandhian doctrine of nonviolence. It is a difficult doctrine in any country, and this is a rather violent country. The doctrine worked effectively in British India. But there the ruling power was under the restraint of the long British habit of constitutionalism.

We cannot count upon nonviolence persisting in the face of brutal and illiterate resistance. The outstanding danger is not that there may be rioting and brawling. For these can be suppressed. The outstanding danger is a loss of confidence by the Negro people in the good faith of the white people. This is where the turning point lies at the present time.

If confidence is lost that there is a legitimate remedy for genuine grievances, there will be lost at the same time confidence in the doctrine of nonviolence. What will come after that it is unpleasant to contemplate.

But those among us who are capable of learning from history will do well to remember what happened in Ireland and what happened in Palestine before the grievances of the Irish and of the Jews were redressed, and also to reflect on what is boiling under the surface in those parts of Africa where black inferiority is imposed.

The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy as it was laid down under Eisenhower and continued under Kennedy. This is the policy of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

I think this is the direction in which the President and his brother, the Attorney General, are now moving. They should move directly and boldly and take command of a cause which cannot now be left to irresponsible people. If it is still possible, and I think it is, to hold and even to recover the confidence of the Negroes in the good faith of the whites, then this is the basic

principle by which to do it. It is to make plain by word and deed that the Negroes are no longer a weak and isolated minority trying to push the Nation into doing what the national law and American principles require it to do.

Then, because the national power is behind the movement toward equality of status, that national power, which will be more than sufficient, can be exercised without violence, with wisdom, and with restraint. For it is the very weak rebels who feel that they must resort to the extreme measures.

AGONY CONTINUES IN SOUTH'S CHURCHES
(By Ralph McGill)

In the South the agony of the church continues.

With certain notable and magnificent exceptions, the harsh and uncomfortable fact is that a majority of the Christian churches in the South continue to constitute the single greatest roadblock, not merely to the first great commandment, but also to the necessary amelioration of the racial problem as it relates to the simple matter of attending church.

Some southern churches have made bouncers of their ushers, reminding at least some writers of letters to the editors of the barroom or nightclub bouncers who bodily carry or throw out patrons who are no longer welcome. That such examples have been largely, but not entirely, confined to the most evangelical Protestant divisions that have a really superlative record of foreign missions support, particularly in Africa, serves merely to emphasize the agony of the situation, the bewilderment and chagrin of many of the members, and the guilt-anger and resentment of those responsible for the decisions to have ushers acting as bouncers at the church door.

Probably the greater agony is experienced by at least some of the ministers involved. In the South "the preacher" occupies a position of status perhaps higher than the ministers of other regions. Many of them write well-read religious columns for newspapers. Others appear on radio and television to proclaim the compassion and love of Christ and to assert that the outspread arms and hands of the Nazarene are for all peoples.

The statement, "Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden and I will refresh you," is a part of, or implicit in, every sermon, communion, newspaper column, TV, or radio sermon. Yet, these columns and broadcasts jar harshly with church doors closed to colored visitors. The spectacle of colored visitors being dragged from churches does violence to the principles of Christianity and makes preposterous the position of missionaries in Africa. It subjects such missionaries to mocking laughter and contempt.

Perhaps most pathetic are the explanations. It is said, "They came just to test us." "They came just to cause trouble." "They came merely for publicity." Herein is exposed the enormous burden of guilt. The truth is, as even those who have resorted to the techniques of the bouncer would admit, that those who have come have done so quietly and with no visible evidence of wishing to test or cause trouble. If admitted, they would have sat quietly through the services.

And, to be honest, if visitors did come for a test, what is the church welcoming committee and ushers to do about that, except to meet the test with Christian principle? Do they or the ministers have radar eyes to see into souls and minds? How do they know whom to admit and whom to send to the basement?

It would seem that it is a very dangerous thing to claim that the visitors came to test them. Perhaps they did. Has the Negro visitor who was bodily removed or refused admission failed any test?

The most melancholy aspect of such agony of church and private school in the South is that it is unnecessary. A growing body of experience testifies that by quietly and honestly meeting the test of what is right, one may avoid the impossible task of trying to serve both God and the building committee.

IT'S KHRUSHCHEV'S MONROE DOCTRINE NOW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to adopt the reasoning and wording as my own of a recent statement made by Robert Morris, of Dallas, Tex.

Khrushchev has proclaimed his own Monroe Doctrine by telling us and everyone else to keep hands off Cuba. If we do not, he will pulverize us. That is clear enough.

Even more significant though, is his statement that the United States should adhere to its promises of last October or face a more serious crisis than that of last year.

There are Americans who still believe that the Monroe Doctrine is an instrument of our policy, not Khrushchev's. They know that we have signed a string of solemn treaties, under the OAS, whereby we pledged not to allow Soviet ideology, much less Soviet power, to be established in Cuba or anywhere else in the hemisphere.

Listening to Khrushchev, one might conclude that the United States has unilaterally repealed these treaties and the Monroe Doctrine itself and that Khrushchev, reflecting the posture of world communism, has jumped into the resulting diplomatic vacuum and converted even the Monroe Doctrine to his own use.

Are not the American people entitled to know what our policy is? Should not the correspondence between the President and Khrushchev of last October and later, be released to us? That would tell the story.

There is certainly no security involved because our enemy has the files. "Security" is often given as the pretext for withholding vital data from the American people. But here, that obviously cannot be the case.

Khrushchev has now publicly invoked the promises the United States made last October. Is not it time for the President to declare, if that is the case, that we have made no promises and release the correspondence as proof?

If we cannot do that, we will be made to look suspect in the eyes of the world, and particularly the OAS nations with whom we have solemn treaties pledging the contrary of what Khrushchev contends.

Actually, I cannot comprehend how the United States could unilaterally promise Khrushchev that we would break the treaties with the OAS nations. It would be illegal to do so. A promise,

under the circumstances, would seem to be invalid under law as we have known it.

Castro keeps telling us that he will acquire Guantanamo Naval Base through the International Court of Justice. Maybe he knows that the International Court of Justice, with two Khrushchev judges on the bench, will have different standards of right and wrong than have existed in the past. Maybe such a body would make what looks wrong today right tomorrow.

The one explanation that I have heard for withholding the correspondence is that it would make Khrushchev lose face in the eyes of the world. This seems as fantastic as the thesis of the chief policy planner of the State Department, Walt W. Rostow, that communism is mellowing and that it should be helped in this process as we are helping it in Poland, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere.

Now that Khrushchev has once again said he will pulverize us let us have a look at the correspondence. Then we can know what our policy is. Otherwise, we must remain confused.

This does not look to the past. It looks to the future. Unless we have a Caribbean policy, how can we contend with Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic who is now carrying out a nationalization policy and building up a militia in a fashion that strongly resembles Castro's buildup to power.

Those responsible statesmen and Senators who contend that we should recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, make an excellent point. If there is a Cuban government-in-exile, it could be the focus of all the moral issues that devolve about Cuba in the councils of the world and of world opinion. It could be the rallying point of all Cuban exiles who are now suspicious and crestfallen. This government-in-exile could have its own information service, its own radio station. It could tell the Cuban people the truth about Castro—and Khrushchev. Our recognizing a Cuban government-in-exile would put us back in a legal stance with respect to the Monroe Doctrine and the OAS treaties.

But all of this would not be possible if the President did make a promise to Khrushchev. Nor would it be possible if Walt Rostow's policy paper, which indicates we should give no encouragement to the captive peoples is indeed our policy.

We have a right to know. This involves our children's future.

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MEADER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development.

This Commission would study the operation of the foreign assistance program

and seek to identify impediments to investment of private capital overseas. It would recommend to the President and to the Congress, policies and programs to make our aid program more effective and facilitate an increased contribution to economic development abroad by the American business community.

Monday afternoon, I will appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee, to which I assume my bill will be referred, to give testimony on H.R. 5490. I will urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to incorporate my proposal to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development in the bill which they report to the House for continuation of the foreign aid program.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6679

A bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development

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

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress declares that a primary purpose of programs of foreign assistance is to raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free countries to develop their resources and improve their productivity. It is the purpose of this Act to discover ways to stimulate the creative energies of free peoples, including the fullest use of free private enterprise, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION; DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) COMMISSION ESTABLISHED.—There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Development (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in section 1, the Commission, after a complete study and investigation, shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies, and administrative and other reforms, calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States, and the conduct of trade and commerce in such countries, and between such countries and other free countries, including the United States. The study and investigation by the Commission shall include a study of the operation of the programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, with a view to determining the impact of such programs upon investment of private capital in other free countries. The Commission shall give particular attention to developing programs and policies calculated to eliminate or minimize the restrictions, hazards, and other impediments, foreign and domestic (including monopolistic and restrictive trade practices) which inhibit such investment, trade, and commerce, and to provide incentives for such investment, trade, and commerce.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Two Members of the Senate of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Vice President; and

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CERTAIN LAWS INAPPLICABLE TO COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

SEC. 8. The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 203, 205, or 207 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) COMMITTEES.—The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

(b) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

(d) SUBPENA POWER.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 11. The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1966.

INTERAMA WILL FOCUS WORLD ATTENTION ON AMERICAN CULTURAL STRUCTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Interama is the first international exposition which will be permanent and which will focus world attention on the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our American way of life—our progress with freedom.

It will be located in Miami, Fla., in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, and is scheduled to open in 1965.

Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments and industries of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding, and provide a center for the continuous exchange of cultures, ideas, and people.

Interama will portray the American way of life, our progress with freedom and will show, through dynamic exhibits and live performances what the Americas have achieved, without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom,

within the framework of Democratic institutions.

Interama, the popular short name which means Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, will be a showcase of life in the Americas with exhibits and events, constantly updated and revised to reflect the achievements and goals of the peoples of the Americas.

One section of Interama—the international area—will be devoted to the U.S. and foreign governments—specifically to the Latin American governments; another section—the international area—will be devoted to industry; a third, the cultural area, will be devoted to culture and educational activities; and a fourth, the festival area, will be devoted to recreation and amusement.

It is in connection with the U.S. participation in this splendid project that I address myself today.

The Members of this honorable body will be interested, I am sure, in the following public utterances in recent days by the Senate of the State of Florida, by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., and by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka:

SENATE MEMORIAL 955

A memorial to the President of the United States requesting the President of the United States to approve participation of the United States with a Federal exhibit in Interama and to assist the Latin American nations to participate in Interama

Whereas the past decade has witnessed great progress in Florida's permanent population and economic growth and in the establishment of close friendly relations with our Latin American neighbors; and

Whereas Florida is attracting many more millions of visitors from all parts of the United States and from nations throughout the world; and

Whereas the State of Florida has established an agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, to create and build Interama, the first permanent international exposition to portray the American way of life—progress with freedom—to show what the Americas have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom within the framework of democratic institutions; and

Whereas Interama will be an ever-changing showcase of life in the Americas and will reflect the accomplishments and aspirations of the peoples of the Americas through dynamic exhibits, events, and live performances that are constantly revised and updated; and

Whereas Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments and industries of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding and provide a continuous exchange of cultures, ideas, and peoples; and

Whereas Interama will be worldwide in scope with special emphasis on the exhibits and pavilions of the nations of the other Americas; and

Whereas Interama has been endorsed by the Latin American nations and the spirit and substance of Interama's goals parallel and support those of the Alliance for Progress; and

Whereas the construction and operation of Interama has been proven economically feasible based on studies made by responsible survey organizations; and

Whereas Interama will contribute substantially to the progress and the economy of the United States and the State of Florida; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That on behalf of the people of the State of Florida this legislature does commend to the President of the United

States, John F. Kennedy, to view with favor and to approve the participation of the United States with a Federal exhibit in Interama and to assist the Latin American nations to participate in Interama to make it a showplace for the people of the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the U.S. Congress.

RESOLUTION 8640

Resolution requesting the President of the United States to approve the U.S. participation in Interama by providing a Federal exhibit and by assisting in the construction of exhibits of Latin American Nations

Whereas the prosperity of the United States requires the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Latin American Republics; and

Whereas international friendship and trade are founded upon the good will and mutual respect of the people of one nation for those of others, and must be based primarily upon extensive and direct personal contact and understanding; and

Whereas the natural expansion of our trade with Latin America, without subsidy or compulsion, will sustain employment and production and improve living standards both in the United States and in Latin America, preventing the infiltration of undemocratic philosophies in Latin America while promoting mutual good will, understanding and confidence, lasting trade connections, and solidarity among all the American Republics; and

Whereas, the State of Florida has established as a State agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, to create and maintain Interama in Dade County, Fla., as the first permanent international exposition to portray the American way of life—"Progress With Freedom"—to show what the Americans have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties or individual freedom within the framework of democratic institutions; and

Whereas Interama will be a showcase of life in the Americas and will reflect the accomplishments and aspirations of the peoples of the Americas through dynamic exhibits, events, and live performances that will be constantly revised and updated; and

Whereas Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments, industries, and cultures of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding and provide a continuous exchange of ideas and peoples; and

Whereas Interama has been endorsed by the Congress of the United States and by Latin American nations and the spirit and substance of Interama's goals parallel and support those of the Alliance for Progress; and

Whereas the State of Florida, Dade County, and the city of Miami have already donated substantial moneys and contributed land which is now being developed as the Interama site, and the proposed construction and operation of Interama have been proven economically feasible based on studies made by responsible survey organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., That on behalf of the people of Dade County, this board does hereby respectfully request the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to approve the participation of the United States of America in Interama by authorizing the construction and operation of an appropriate Federal exhibit pavilion at Interama and by assisting the countries of Latin America in constructing their own national exhibits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the U.S. Congress.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE CITY OF OPA-LOCKA, FLA., ENDORSING THE INTERAMA PROJECT

Whereas it is apparent that the best interest of the citizens of this area and of our Nation will be better served by the completion of the Interama project as soon as possible, the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka does endorse this project for the following reasons:

1. The improvement of relations with the Latin American nations, with whom the Miami area is in close touch, so that the Miami area may become the true "Gateway to the Americas."

2. That it will improve our area's economy.

3. That it will boost the income in this area thereby triggering its development and expansion.

4. That it will provide necessary jobs, particularly in the construction field where most of the need now lies.

5. That this chamber is extremely optimistic about the benefits of Interama and feels that it will not only increase the prestige of this area and of our Nation in the eyes of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka, Fla., That the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka does hereby endorse the Interama project and urges such action by our Federal Government as may be necessary to implement the project.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be put over until a week from today.

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

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation offered today would grant the GI bill educational entitlement of World War II and Korean conflict veterans who were unable to use these benefits to the children of these veterans. The amount of benefits to each child would be determined by the veteran himself or, if he is deceased or incompetent, by the other parent or the guardian in a manner to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Many World War II and Korean conflict veterans have told me that one of their greatest regrets is that they were not able to take advantage of the educational opportunities afforded by the GI bill. The raising of families, the necessity of engaging in full-time work, the impossibility of relocating near educa-

tional institutions, and other valid reasons prevented numerous veterans from taking advantage of a law intended to mutually benefit them and the Nation.

It seems fitting and proper that the children of these veterans should be given the advantage their parents were not able to experience. At a time when so much attention is being focused on education as one of the most important elements in the interest of national survival, it is appropriate that Congress consider legislation which has the purpose of honoring those who served our country in the past by means of extending a helping hand to those who will serve it in the future.

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the very well reasoned thoughts of Walter Lippmann in his column, appearing in the Washington Post and Times-Herald, Tuesday, May 28, in which he states that the cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, but "must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government." Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Lippmann's column with my remarks in the RECORD:

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Suddenly, as it were, the struggle of the Negroes toward equality of status in American society has taken a sharp turn.

The demonstrations in Birmingham have proved to be something more than the work of outsiders playing upon the imaginary grievances of otherwise docile and contented masses. Nobody can now doubt that the grievances are genuine and are deep under the rule of such men as Bull Connor and Governor Wallace. And nobody can have any doubt either that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and that they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing, and in the public facilities.

For a hundred years since Lincoln freed the slaves, this country has relied upon the education of the Negroes and the persuasion of the whites to bring about that equality of status to which it is committed. We are now realizing that the present rate of change will not be fast enough. The redress of the grievances of the Negroes is for the new generation too slow in coming. History teaches us that when this point is reached in the struggle for what men regard as their just rights a revolutionary condition exists.

Then the supreme questions are posed. Will the ruling and privileged classes take command of the coming changes? Or will they cling to their privileges and become the immovable object in collision with an irresistible force?

The white people of this country, not only the white people of Alabama and Mississippi, are now at that crucial point where they must answer those questions. They must choose, on the one hand, between leading

the movement toward equality of status and, on the other hand, standing aside and letting matters be decided by collisions between the Negro agitators and the Bull Connors.

The Negro rebellion is now led by men like Martin Luther King who preach and practice the Gandhian doctrine of nonviolence. It is a difficult doctrine in any country, and this is a rather violent country. The doctrine worked effectively in British India. But there the ruling power was under the restraint of the long British habit of constitutionalism.

We cannot count upon nonviolence persisting in the face of brutal and illiterate resistance. The outstanding danger is not that there may be rioting and brawling. For these can be suppressed. The outstanding danger is a loss of confidence by the Negro people in the good faith of the white people. This is where the turning point lies at the present time.

If confidence is lost that there is a legitimate remedy for genuine grievances, there will be lost at the same time confidence in the doctrine of nonviolence. What will come after that it is unpleasant to contemplate.

But those among us who are capable of learning from history will do well to remember what happened in Ireland and what happened in Palestine before the grievances of the Irish and of the Jews were redressed, and also to reflect on what is boiling under the surface in those parts of Africa where black inferiority is imposed.

The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy as it was laid down under Eisenhower and continued under Kennedy. This is the policy of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

I think this is the direction in which the President and his brother, the Attorney General, are now moving. They should move directly and boldly and take command of a cause which cannot now be left to irresponsible people. If it is still possible, and I think it is, to hold and even to recover the confidence of the Negroes in the good faith of the whites, then this is the basic principle by which to do it. It is to make plain by word and deed that the Negroes are no longer a weak and isolated minority trying to push the Nation into doing what the national law and American principles require it to do.

Then, because the national power is behind the movement toward equality of status, that national power, which will be more than sufficient, can be exercised without violence, with wisdom, and with restraint. For it is the very weak rebels who feel that they must resort to the extreme measures.

THE NEGRO'S FUTURE IN THE SOUTH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report carries an interview with Gov. Ross

R. Barnett, of Mississippi. This article contains a great deal of factual information which should lay at rest the many unfounded rumors and downright falsehoods constantly appearing in the national press.

The real story in Mississippi today is that 2 million white and Negro citizens are working harmoniously together for the economic betterment of both races.

Mr. Speaker, this trend will continue so long as we have the right to control our own destiny; or, until we are deprived of the right to be governed with our own consent.

I commend this article to the attention of the House:

INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNOR BARNETT OF MISSISSIPPI: THE NEGRO'S FUTURE IN THE SOUTH

(NOTE.—With pressure against racial barriers growing, is the South changing in its attitude toward the Negroes? If left to themselves, what would States such as Mississippi do about the drive for mixed schools, mixed restaurants, all the other campaigns aimed against segregation? Is a real solution to the racial problem possible without conflict and violence? To get the viewpoint of a State political leader, U.S. News & World Report invited Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, to its conference room for this exclusive interview by members of the magazine's news staff.)

Question. Governor Barnett, does the Negro in Mississippi, or in any other Southern State, have much of a future?

Answer. Yes, he does. The Negro who takes advantage of his educational opportunities and otherwise prepares himself for responsibilities has every reason to look forward to a bright future and a higher standard of living in any section of the South.

Question. As good a future as in the North?

Answer. Frankly, I think he'd have a better future in the South than in the North.

Question. Why do you say that?

Answer. Take Negro schoolteachers, for example: In Mississippi we have one Negro schoolteacher to every 119 Negro citizens. In New York, I am told, there is one Negro schoolteacher to every 500 Negro citizens and in Ohio one Negro teacher to every 485 Negro citizens. So there is one example that I think is outstanding.

Question. What other opportunities do Negroes have in the South?

Answer. In Mississippi, as in other States of the South, we have many Negro professional people, such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, dentists, undertakers, ministers, social workers, nurses and many others.

In addition, we have Negroes who own their own businesses—quite a number of them, wealthy businessmen. They own real estate. In Mississippi, there are more than 27,000 Negro farmers who own title to land valued at approximately \$100 million. More than 27 percent of the privately owned homes in Mississippi are owned by Negroes.

Question. How many Negroes are there in Mississippi?

Answer. About 43 percent of the population is Negro; 57 percent is white. Two years ago it was about 45 percent Negro and 55 percent white.

Question. Then are Negroes leaving Mississippi?

Answer. Some have left, yes. But they are not leaving in great numbers.

Question. What kinds of people are leaving?

Answer. I think the better-educated Negroes are staying. Our statistics show that a higher percentage of the graduates of Jackson State College for Negroes remain in Mississippi after graduation than the graduates

of any other State-supported college for either race. We believe that the better-educated Negroes stay in Mississippi because they find it easier to secure employment in the fields for which they are qualified.

Those Negroes who leave Mississippi are usually those unskilled in any type of trade or profession.

Question. Why do they leave?

Answer. We consider the lack of farm employment as one of the principal reasons for migration of Negro laborers into other areas. Farm mechanization and Government restrictions on cotton acreage have eliminated many farm jobs. Most of these migrants from the South have gone to big cities of the North.

Question. Do you think that a wider distribution of the Negro population outside the South would be a good thing?

Answer. It would be for the South, yes. Then the North and East would better understand our problem.

Question. Do you mean you think the South would be better off with fewer Negroes?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Then would you prefer it if the Negroes left the South?

Answer. No, I'm not wanting them to leave. We value our Negro citizens. But they have the freedom of choice to remain in the South or to move elsewhere.

Question. What about schools for Negroes? Are they given an opportunity to get an education in the South?

Answer. Oh, yes, sir. As far as schools are concerned, our Negro students can receive an education just as good as any other student right up through liberal-arts degrees in colleges.

Question. Do you have colleges for Negroes?

Answer. We have three State-supported colleges for Negroes in Mississippi. At Jackson State College for Negroes, in Jackson, the State capital, they have about 1,700 Negro students. Alcorn A. & M. College at Lorman, near Utica, Miss., was the first senior land-grant college for Negroes ever built in the United States. It has about 1,450 students. Then we also have the Mississippi College for Negroes at Itta Bena, Miss., with around 1,200 students.

Question. Are these colleges accredited?

Answer. Two of them are. Jackson State College and Alcorn A. & M. are fully accredited by, and are members of, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Mississippi Vocational at Itta Bena is a new institution and has not yet attained membership in the Southern Association.

All three are accredited by the Mississippi Association of Colleges and Schools and by the accrediting commission of the State of Mississippi.

I'll show you, gentlemen, how good we are to the Negroes: Since 1952, Mississippi has spent at least \$100 million in building school facilities on a State level, \$90 million on a local level. And 63 percent of that money went into construction of Negro school facilities.

At the college level during 1960-62 the State money spent for new buildings averaged \$497 per Negro student compared with \$372 per white student. Tax money provided for general support of public higher education was \$580 per white student and \$622 per Negro student.

Question. Was that to bring Negro schools up to the standards of the schools for whites?

Answer. It's a continuing gradual improvement. You know, until the Civil War, the Negroes were slaves, illiterate. But they've come a long way since the end of the War Between the States. Proof of the increasing quality of education in our Negro schools is the increasing number of Negro teachers who qualify for higher degrees. We now have 7,382 Negro teachers with a master's degree or above.

Question. What about professional training or graduate study? Can Negroes get that in Mississippi colleges or do they have to go outside the State?

Answer. Well, in some instances they have to go to schools outside the State. A legislative grant was passed in 1948 and went into effect in 1949. The grant provides for students who want to take up medicine, law, architecture, engineering and other courses not available in our colleges for Negro students.

The amount of grant varies from \$100 to \$500 per year. We pay the difference in the amount a college out of State would charge for the course, as compared to the charge in Mississippi. Travel, tuition and living expenses are provided for in the grant. Over 5,000 Negro students have been aided by this program.

Question. The only school integration you have in Mississippi is at the University of Mississippi, isn't it?

Answer. Ole Miss is not integrated today, gentlemen.

Question. But one Negro, James Meredith, is enrolled in the university—

Answer. You know what he says, don't you—that he's the most segregated Negro in America.

Question. Has he opened the door to larger integration? Do you see the time coming when there will be integration in the University of Mississippi on a broader scale?

Answer. No. Question. People in the North usually take the position that the question of school integration, including colleges, has been settled by the U.S. Supreme Court, and the people up here keep asking: "Why don't the people of Mississippi obey the law of the land?" How would you answer that?

Answer. With all due respect to the Supreme Court—and I have the utmost respect for all courts—the 1954 decision in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* is not the law of the land. It's the law of that particular case. And I don't believe there are many lawyers in America who will disagree with me on that.

The 1954 decision applies to that case only. It does not apply to Mississippi or Alabama or Georgia or any other State. These States have their right to their day in court. All cases are just a little different—no two cases are exactly the same.

Question. Do you think that each case of a Negro seeking to enter a white school in Mississippi will have to go through a separate process in court, as James Meredith did? Or will there be a sort of mass entry of Negro students?

Answer. Nobody knows the answer to that. Question. What would happen if public schools in Mississippi were given a direct court order to desegregate? Would the schools be closed?

Answer. I just don't know. It's legal for them to be closed in Mississippi. The trustees may close the schools. The Governor may close the schools—public schools, that is. But we'll have to wait until we get to that bridge before we cross it. The order hasn't come yet.

"SEPARATION OF RACES IN EDUCATION IS BEST FOR BOTH RACES"

Question. Why is the South so strongly opposed to integration of public schools?

Answer. We believe that separation of the races in public education is the best for both races. Because of our population ratio, if we integrate our classrooms we will have some classes predominantly Negro and some classes predominantly white. We know that a student can learn and develop himself into a good citizen if he acquires his education among classmates of his own race, with a teacher of his own race. The disgraceful situation in Washington, D.C., and other big cities where desegregation has been the final result of forced integration further

proves our point that tensions exist in heavily integrated classrooms.

In the report on official investigation of the Thanksgiving Day football riot at the District of Columbia stadium, published in *U.S. News & World Report*, it was revealed that 316 whites and 30 negroes were injured. In addition, 145 persons reported being pushed, shoved and slapped. There were broken noses, broken jaws, dislocated jaws, and teeth knocked out. This was a deplorable racial outburst in our Nation's capital.

Question. Governor, can you foresee a time when there will be desegregation in Mississippi?

Answer. No, sir. I hope that it will never come. Do you want to know why? Because, gentlemen, we believe in the purity and the integrity of both races. And everywhere people have integrated long enough and extensively enough, it has absolutely ruined every civilization.

Question. Do you mean that you regard Negroes as inferior and that you feel intermarriage would dilute the quality of the white race?

Answer. That's exactly it. It has happened, gentlemen. History teaches us that it's happened many times.

Question. Do you foresee integration anywhere in the South on any extensive scale?

Answer. No.

WHERE THE PEOPLE STAND

Question. How do you size up the present sentiment of people in Mississippi? Are there more of them who believe in integration now than there were, say, a few years ago?

Answer. I doubt it. The people of our State are firm believers in separation of the races. They are firm and unwavering believers. I don't think many have weakened, though it may be that some were weaker than we thought they were before the 1954 school decision.

Question. There have been reports of a shift in attitude in the South recently—that more and more people there are deciding that integration is inevitable and taking this attitude: "I'm still against it, but it's going to come, so we'd better bring it on our terms instead of the Federal Government's." Do you sense such a shift?

Answer. No, sir, I don't. Question. You don't think many people in the South feel that way?

Answer. Some weaklings do. Some moderates do. But I think the big majority of the people are still firm in their belief that integration is wrong.

Question. And they don't see it as inevitable?

Answer. No, they don't admit it's inevitable. They think the pendulum will swing back the other way.

Question. Why do they think the pendulum will swing back?

Answer. Because the northern people don't really want integration either. They don't want it any more than we do, even though they say they do. We are honest—we admit that we don't want it. That's the main difference. In the North and in the East they say they want it. They are not honest about it and we are. Now, that's the God's truth about it, gentlemen.

Question. What kind of status does a Negro have in Mississippi? Is it comparable to that of a white person?

Answer. Comparable in what way?

JOBS FOR NEGROES

Question. Does a Negro have the same freedom of choice of work and of job opportunities, for example?

Answer. Yes, if he can qualify for jobs. Then, of course, it's up to management—if management wants to hire him. You see, we believe in freedom of choice.

By custom and tradition there are still many types of jobs, of course, which have not been filled by Negroes.

Question. What types of jobs are not given to Negroes?

Answer. Well, probably secretaries, stenographers, bank tellers, such as that. There is no law which prohibits Negroes from serving in such capacities, for the hiring of personnel is regarded as free enterprise and decisions are up to management. Whomever the manager wants to hire, he has the right to hire.

Some of these same attitudes prevail in practically every State in the Union. In other words, it's up to management. I don't believe employers ever should be forced to employ people of any race if, in the employer's opinion and judgment, such a person is not fully qualified to discharge the duties and responsibilities entrusted to the job.

Question. Are Negroes permitted to vote in Mississippi?

Answer. More than 30,000 Negroes are registered to vote in Mississippi.

Question. Isn't this a small number in relation to the number of white voters? Why are there so few Negro voters?

Answer. The primary reasons for the fewer Negro voters include illiteracy, apathy, and the law requiring payment of a poll tax. So many Negroes are not qualified to vote. You see, there are certain requirements for voting in Mississippi.

Question. What are the requirements?

Answer. You not only have to be 21 years of age. You must never have been convicted of an infamous crime or the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquors within the past 5 years. You cannot be a common gambler or a habitual drunkard. You must be of good moral character. And you have to be able to prove it.

Question. Do voters have to pass a literacy test?

Answer. They have to be able to read and understand and interpret a section of the constitution of the State of Mississippi. We don't believe in having ignorant people elect our officials.

Question. How does the poll tax requirement work?

Answer. The poll tax is \$2 a year, and, since two consecutive poll-tax receipts are required for voting in a primary, a voter pays \$4 for this privilege. The polltax receipts, incidentally, go directly into the education fund for both races.

Question. Do all whites qualify to vote in Mississippi?

Answer. No, sir. There are plenty of whites who can't qualify. You'd be surprised. We don't believe in a government of the ignorant, by the ignorant, and for the ignorant. Like the founders of our Nation, we believe that voting is a privilege and not just a right.

Question. Can Negroes go into theaters in Mississippi?

Answer. They have their own theaters. But most of the public theaters also have accommodations for Negroes. In small cities, the balconies are often reserved for Negroes.

Question. What about restaurants?

Answer. They have their own restaurants.

Question. Parks?

Answer. They have their own parks.

Question. But they cannot go into the restaurants or parks or theaters reserved for whites?

Answer. No, sir. Now, the Jackson Municipal Park has never been segregated. Negroes don't go into the lake there, but they move about freely and enjoy other facilities.

Question. How about swimming pools? Are they integrated?

Answer. I don't think Negroes have ever gone into white swimming pools.

Question. Has there been any change in recent years? Is the Negro gaining in stature? Is his position improving?

Answer. Yes, I think it has improved a great deal.

THERE WOULD BE NO TROUBLE "IF OUTSIDERS WOULD LET US ALONE"

Question. Due to the Negro's own efforts?

Answer. Yes. Those Negroes who have justified their advancement have been able to gain that advancement.

We have Negroes who own their own businesses and who serve both white and colored customers, particularly as skilled tradesmen.

If Negroes can do the same kind of work as efficiently and are on the alert like white people they can get salaries like the white people. We have Negro auto mechanics making as much as white auto mechanics. We have Negro bricklayers and painters who get paid the same wage as white bricklayers and white painters. For schoolteachers, it's the same way.

Gentlemen, in Mississippi whites and Negroes work side by side in harmony, peace, and understanding. And if the outsiders would let us alone, we wouldn't have any trouble.

Question. What do you mean by "outsiders"?

Answer. Agitators who come in and try to poison the Negroes' minds, cause confusion and turmoil. This has gotten worse in the last few years.

Question. What is the reaction of white people in the South to those "outsiders"?

Answer. Of course, they resent agitators, "freedom riders," and such people who try to bring about turmoil and strife.

PROGRESS OR TURMOIL

Question. Is this Negro protest movement pointing toward progress for the Negro—or toward more trouble?

Answer. The agitators bring on trouble. All they leave is a lot of turmoil and strife and heartaches.

Question. What is your assessment of the attitude of Negro people in Mississippi toward the kind of agitation that you are talking about?

Answer. I'd say that at least 95 percent of the Negroes in Mississippi are unalterably opposed to "do-gooders" and agitators coming in there with their marches and their sit-in strikes and such silly and undignified acts.

Question. Do the Negroes speak up against them?

Answer. They ignore them. They tell the white people they're opposed to the agitation, because the white people are good to the Negroes in the South—in Mississippi, especially. They are good to them.

Question. Is there fear among the Negroes?

Answer. Not in the slightest. That's what the agitators try—to put fear in them. They try to poison their minds. But they have no fear.

Question. Do Negroes in the South tend to have their own economy, separate from the white economy?

Answer. They have their own doctors, their own businesses, their own schools, their own churches.

Question. What would happen if a white student were to attempt to enter a Negro college in Mississippi?

Answer. The Negroes would resent it. I'll give you an example: About 3 years ago a white man tried to build a residence and grocery store in a Negro section of Jackson. The Negroes filed a petition immediately with the city council of Jackson to prohibit it—and the Negroes won. He didn't get to build in the Negro section. They just did not want him living in their section.

Negroes in Jackson, Miss., want to live to themselves.

Question. Do you mean to say that Negroes as well as whites want segregation in Mississippi?

Answer. Yes, they do. Negroes would rather associate with Negroes. Negroes don't want Negroes to marry whites, and whites feel the same way.

Question. Why, then, does racial intermarriage occur?

Answer. It doesn't occur in our State. It's against the law.

IN BUSINESS: HARMONY

Question. How strong is the influence of economic factors in persuading Southerners to accept some integration? In Birmingham and a few other cities of the South, businessmen have stepped in to urge accommodations with Negro demands. Do you feel that the South may be hurt economically unless it yields on integration?

Answer. I know that Mississippi has made greater economic progress in the last 2 or 3 years than ever before in the history of our State.

There have been 443 new and expanded industries come into Mississippi during our administration. They are creating over 33,000 new jobs in our State—new industrial jobs. Percentage-wise, Mississippi's per capita gain in income was among the highest in the Nation in 1962. During 1962, Mississippi's new and expanded plants produced capital investments of over \$105 million. Our bank deposits at the end of 1962 were \$200 million higher than in 1961.

Our State is growing. It's developing. The population, once declining, now is gaining. We've gained at least 70,000 population in the last 2 years. Our State revenue is growing, even though we have cut our income taxes.

Question. What is causing this development?

Answer. Industrial people admire the program that Mississippi has—our economic-development program. Our legislature in 1960 enacted one of the boldest and most far-reaching economic-development programs that any legislature ever enacted. We passed 41 economic-development laws, such as: putting a "right to work" law in our State constitution, giving new industry a 10-year tax exemption; creating an industrial and technological-research commission; adjusting our workmen's compensation laws; reducing income tax.

Industrial people also admire the attitudes of the people in our State. They are friendly. Labor is friendly toward capital. Negroes and whites are all friendly toward management and capital. Industrial people like the friendly spirit of harmony that exists between both races.

Question. Do you have labor unions in Mississippi?

Answer. Some, yes. We've put a "right to work" law in our State Constitution. Under this law, workers are not required to join a union in order to hold a job. They have the right of choice.

Question. Do labor unions press for racial integration in the South?

Answer. I haven't heard of any unions in Mississippi advocating integration.

"IF A NEGRO IS UNEMPLOYED, THAT'S CALLED DISCRIMINATION"

Question. Do unions there practice segregation?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. Do you think that the economic improvement in Mississippi will help solve the racial problem?

Answer. I think it will contribute a good deal toward easing it. More Mississippians are making more money today than ever before—including the Negroes.

In summing it all up, the Negroes are well cared for in the South.

Question. That phrase "well cared for"—does that imply a sort of paternalism on the part of the whites, and that Negroes are not able to make their way on their own?

Answer. Well, we can't help that, if they are unable to do it. But we help them to make their way. They have great opportunities in Mississippi. But you know how

little progress the Negroes have made in Africa.

We have a few people in both races who are having a hard time making ends meet. Some lack education or in some cases they lack the ability, or in some cases they lack the will and the energy. You have this situation all over the United States. If a white person is unemployed in Mississippi, it's just a statistic. But if a Negro is unemployed, that's called discrimination.

AS NEGROES MOVE NORTH

Question. There has been a rather large movement of Negroes out of the South. Do you think that will develop into a mass movement?

Answer. You just can't anticipate what may happen. It may and it may not. What is happening now is that, although many Negroes have gone out of Mississippi, some of them have come back. One Negro who had been to Chicago told me: "Folks told me Chicago was the end of the rainbow. But I went up there and found the whites didn't like me and neither did the Northern Negroes. So I came back down here because here I have friends in both races and I can work and make a living."

Question. Governor, it has been suggested that, unless the South begins dealing with relatively moderate Negro leaders, it may find itself having to deal with extremists, such as the white-hating Black Muslims. Do you think the Negroes are likely to follow such extremists?

Answer. Not our Negroes in Mississippi. I can't speak for those up North and in the East.

Question. As Negroes gain in purchasing power, do you think they will make increasing and effective use of the boycott to gain their demands for integration?

Answer. They've already tried to stage a few boycotts in Jackson. But every boycott has just fizzled into nothing.

Question. How about the vote? As more Negroes vote, can they elect officials favorable to integration?

Answer. A man who would advocate integration wouldn't get 2 percent of the votes in Mississippi. He'd be laughed at.

Question. Might Mississippi vote for a Republican for President?

Answer. If both candidates—Democratic and Republican—were conservative, they'd take the Democrat. If the Democrat was a liberal and the Republican was a real conservative, then they might take the Republican.

Question. How about a third slate of independent, unpledged electors for President in Mississippi?

Answer. Mississippi will be strong for that in 1964, and I think several other States will be, too. We are asking other Southern States to join us in this movement and we are getting quite a bit of favorable response. You know, Mississippi gave its presidential votes to Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia in 1960.

Question. In 1948, there was a third presidential slate in the South—

Answer. Yes. STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, was the presidential candidate, with Governor Fielding Wright, of Mississippi, for Vice President. And you'll recall that we came very close to being able to throw the election into the House of Representatives. If a couple or three States had gone as expected, the decision would have gone to the House. And last election, in 1960, it would have taken only a slight change to have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

Question. If that should happen, Governor, what would the South ask of a presidential candidate before giving him its vote?

Answer. We would ask him to let us alone—let the State alone and let us run our own affairs as the Constitution provides.

Question. Do the people in the South feel that they are violating the Constitution when they refuse to integrate?

Answer. No. They think that the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution means exactly what it says, and it plainly says that the powers not granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government or prohibited by the Constitution to the States belong to the States respectively or to the people. The people in the South know that the Supreme Court of the United States cannot amend the Constitution by decree or otherwise.

Question. Do you believe that the South can effectively maintain its attitude on segregation?

Answer. I think we can. I think a lot of people in the East and North are soon going to want the same thing that they are trying to take away from the South today. The cities in the East and North are getting darker by the month.

Our trouble in the South, gentlemen, is in getting the facts to the people. A lot of people in the North don't know what the facts are.

Now, we don't try to dabble in the affairs of other States. I wouldn't dare to go to Ohio or New York and tell the people there what they ought to do. I don't know their problems. And they don't know ours. You've got to live with those problems a long time before you can know them. You've got to live close to the Negro and work with him for many years before you'll know him. Those people up North just don't know what they're doing.

In Mississippi, we would not attempt to solve whatever problems may exist because of Asiatics on the west coast, Mexicans in the Southwest, Indians in the Midwest, Puerto Ricans on the east coast or Harlem in New York. We leave it to those people living nearest those problems to solve them in the best moral and ethical manner available. We ask the same consideration in Mississippi.

MORE PROBLEMS AHEAD

Question. Do you feel that the Supreme Court's ruling of 1954 against school segregation has helped solve the race problem?

A. It hasn't solved anything. It has caused more trouble, more turmoil, more misunderstanding, more hatred than any 100 decisions ever made by the Court before. And I'll tell you something else that's going to happen:

Now the Federal Government has invaded the neighborhood situation, trying to force housing integration. And the next thing, they are going to move against those service clubs up North that don't have Negro members.

The more people who become affected by this integration, the more there are who become sympathetic with the South. Like I said, the pendulum is going to swing back, because the South is gaining more allies all the time.

NEED TO AMEND THE TRUCK USE TAX

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer disposes of a truck and acquires another truck during the taxable period.

Under existing law, the taxpayer must pay a Federal use tax based on the gross weight of his truck. The tax is levied on the basis of a 12-month taxable period beginning on July 1 of any year and ending on June 30 of the following year. The taxpayer is liable for the tax as of the "first use" of his truck. "First use" is understood to mean the first use of the truck on the public highways of the United States. Furthermore, the tax is computed or prorated on a monthly basis. Therefore, if the taxpayer begins using a truck any time during the month of July, he must pay the use tax for the whole 12-month taxable period. If he begins using the vehicle any time during the month of August, he must pay a tax for only 11 months, and so on.

While the tax is not owing until the taxpayer makes his first use of the truck, if the vehicle is subsequently sold, destroyed, junked, or otherwise disposed of, the taxpayer receives no credit for that unused portion of the tax which he has paid. This means that while this truck is no longer in his service, the taxpayer is paying for its use on public highways. In addition, if he subsequently or simultaneously acquires a new truck, he must pay another use tax on the new vehicle beginning with the month of his first use of that truck.

My bill would allow the taxpayer a credit for the unused portion of the tax paid on the first truck and in turn would credit this unused tax to the second truck. Moreover, under my bill, if the taxpayer did not acquire a second truck prior to the end of his current taxable period, the credit would expire.

As stated above, my bill requires that the taxpayer actually dispose of the first truck before he is eligible for the credit. He might dispose of the vehicle by sale, gift, trade-in, or any other means under which he would give up title to that truck. This requirement—a disposition of the truck—would facilitate the determination by the Internal Revenue Service that the taxpayer had actually removed the truck from use.

Under existing law, we have recognized that the taxpayer does not become liable for the tax until he actually makes use of the vehicle. However, we do not recognize that later on in the taxable period he may cease to use the vehicle. My bill would correct this situation and under it the taxpayer would no longer be paying a use tax for a truck he no longer owns and, therefore, cannot use. Inasmuch as this tax is based on use, I see little reason why we should not adopt this legislation.

THE PROSPECTS BEFORE US

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an excellent speech given by my colleague, Representative FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, to the National

Federation of Republican Women at the Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, April 22, 1963, about the need for more active participation in politics and public affairs by women. I wish to commend the partial text of her remarks to the attention of my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PROSPECTS BEFORE US

(Partial text of a speech by Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, Republican, Sixth District of New Jersey, before the National Federation of Republican Women, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C., April 22, 1963)

Just the other day—last Saturday, to be exact—I talked with a group of New Jersey professional women about the need for more active participation in politics and public affairs by women. I used some figures which our Clare Williams is fond of citing, which show that there are 3,600,000 more women of voting age than there are men in the United States; that in 40 States and the District of Columbia women outnumber men of voting age; and that in the 1960 presidential election 22½ million women who could have voted failed to do so.

I suspect that Mrs. Williams has had somewhat the same reaction to these figures as I received this past weekend—a sort of stunned disbelief, amazement that women have such an impressive political potential and that so many are failing to recognize their own strength and their responsibility to devote that strength to the welfare of the country.

But there are growing indications that the situation will improve. Republican women are leading the attack on apathy and indifference. The enthusiasm and active concern expressed by our own national federation is indicative of this trend. The GROW project which, as you know, was launched by the national committee this spring for the purpose of developing a permanent program for building Republican Party support among women is, I can testify personally, a highly realistic and practical project, as one might expect from a recommendation of the 1962 Bliss Big City Report. Likewise, the 1963-64 "Win With Womanpower" campaign of the women's division of the national committee is aimed at the same target: to locate and mobilize the vast legion of so far uninterested women.

I cite this project because it is directly related to my subject tonight, "The Prospects Before Us." Make no mistake about it: Republican prospects in 1964 and the years following are significantly dependent upon the degree to which we can enlarge the present slender majority of women who support the Republican Party and vote for Republican candidates. I can speak from personal experience—the experience of a marginal congressional district divided between industrial and suburban influences—when I tell you that a well-organized, enthusiastic, informed, and convinced band of women is an almost irresistible political force. There is no question in my mind that the hundreds and hundreds of women in Union County, N.J., who signed up and contributed time, effort, and money in my campaigns of 1960 and 1962 had a decisive effect in bringing the Sixth District well above the marginal level for Republicans and keeping it there.

The success of Republican women in rounding up their unattached sisters, and of all other forms of Republican campaign activity, however, will depend on several other factors in addition to your own enthusiasm and salesmanship. It is my purpose tonight to consider a few of these factors and to relate them in an entirely personal and subjective way to what I think our Republican prospects can be. Briefly, I would say our prospects are improving. We have a long way to go, obviously, and the

threat is always present that we could lose the steam and momentum we are now generating. On the other hand, if we can sustain our drive ahead and continue to keep it well-fueled with issues and personalities and organization, then there is no limit to what we can achieve.

In the final analysis, Republican prospects will be determined by the posture and the appearance we present to the American people—as the minority party, the opposition party—and by the manner in which the Kennedy administration conducts itself and discharges its responsibilities as the party in power. In many respects, the Kennedy administration is presently the Republican Party with one of its greatest opportunities. On issue after issue—in foreign policy, the national economy, civil rights, education, and a host of others—we are being invited, in effect, to reveal administration mistakes, to exploit their weaknesses, to suggest constructive alternatives.

How do we deal with this opportunity? First of all, I believe, we have to make a fundamental distinction. We must recognize and accept the fact that President Kennedy and his family are highly attractive. There is an understandable fascination for many people in the picture of this young family who inhabit the White House—a fascination which the communication media have been quick to exploit.

Our problem, it seems to me, is to separate the human image from the political reality. We must pound into the consciousness of the voter the truth that the White House is not only a social haven, but more importantly it is a political headquarters. It is not just a rich man's home, but it is the brain center of the worldwide struggle for freedom. It is not just Caroline's playground, it is above all the focal point of all our hopes and fears.

We can join with the multitudes in warming to the human qualities of Kennedy, the man and the family, but we must insist relentlessly on the fact that it is Kennedy, the President, the politician, the world leader, who is important as the man whose actions will influence decisively the course of our country and the world.

The President is important to each of us personally, not merely as a symbol, but for what he and his administration and his party are doing to our hopes for peace and national security, to the health of our economy, to the fruits of our enterprise, to our opportunity to live the kind of life to which our talents and tastes call us, and to the basic freedoms on which we have built our Nation. In all these areas and more, the President and those he leads must be held accountable for what they do—the bad and the indifferent as well as the good. And it is up to us, the responsible opposition, to make them accountable and to open the eyes of the American people to the full truth of the Kennedy record.

What is this record? The President himself last December might well have written his own epitaph. He said, "It is much easier to make the speeches than it is to finally make the judgments." Time after time, the Kennedy speeches have been magnificent, holding forth great visions of progress and growth and opportunity and new hopes for peace and freedom. Almost as often, however the Kennedy judgments have been indecisive, inconsistent, and inadequate to the needs and the promises.

Six months after the Kennedy administration took office, there might have been reason to excuse a certain amount of confusion, a lack of preparation, and a tendency to rely upon temporary expedients. But 27 months after the President's ringing inaugural address, we have no right to permit such excuses.

Look at our national economy for example. There are more unemployed people in America today than there were this time

a year ago. Even the most dedicated Kennedy partisan cannot claim that the country is moving again. We are drifting along on a plateau of missed opportunities and makeshift remedies. A tax cut which the economy needed in 1961 and which both business and labor wanted is still very much in doubt—doubt created by Presidential hesitation, by delay, and by the inability to rally his own party to a timely decision. Even today, on the strength of a single month's improvement in the economic indicators, Democratic leaders are indicating there will be a further delay in determining what, if any, kind of tax bill we will have this year.

In the field of foreign policy, we have been treated to a succession of crises to which our response has too often been a shooting from the hip, a dramatic declaration which later we have been unwilling or unable to pursue. Whatever our individual views may be on the Cuban situation, how can we reconcile the unrestrained pledge of American purpose in driving the Communists out of Cuba, which the President strongly implied when he welcomed the Cuban prisoners to Miami, with the subsequent restraints we have placed on any action by the refugees themselves? A case might be made for either one, but not for both.

Civil rights is another case in point. Here, again, we have heard glowing rhetoric about equal opportunity for all our people, about the obligation to make the American promise of personal freedom a reality for all without regard to color or creed. But the actions have not been suited to the words. The administration's legislative program in civil rights is completely inadequate, much inferior to the reasonable and realistic Republican proposals. In the face of the crisis in Mississippi, the President is reduced to explaining why he cannot implement the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, a group of eminently moderate men. In the midst of the violence and intimidation of Negroes in Birmingham, Ala., the administration is watching the situation, and the President telephones Mrs. Martin Luther King. And who is it who has defined orderly government in Birmingham and is the chief intimidator of them all but Police Commissioner "Bull" Connor, an arch segregationist and the Democratic national committeeman from Alabama.

In education, the administration has chosen the easy way out. Instead of analyzing the Nation's needs and determining what the Federal Government can and should do as a matter of priority importance, the President has sent to Congress recommendations covering no less than 24 separate areas of education. He has said, in effect, that since he cannot make up his own mind he is asking for all or nothing at all. This is not leadership. This is the abdication of leadership.

The reason for all of this, I suggest, is not hard to find. The Democratic Party, over which the President presides, is not truly a national party. It is a coalition of the left-wing and the right-wing in American politics, further confused by the presence of the big city political machines. With such an amalgam of contradictory forces, a consensus within the party is almost impossible to achieve on many of the great national issues. There are unbridgeable gaps which separate Democrats. They are fundamentally unable to agree on many basic issues and thus, despite their large majorities in the House and the Senate, and despite their control of the executive branch, it is often impossible for them to obtain a working majority, to govern in an orderly fashion, or to provide consistent leadership.

Only at election time does the Democratic Party come together. While this kind of practical coalition is often effective enough to win elections, we Republicans have got to show the country that what looks like political strength is, in fact, acute governmental weakness.

How, therefore, should we meet this problem? Let me suggest a few guidelines which, from my own experience, I have found to be effective.

Above all, let us be positive and constructive. Opposition does not consist solely in being negative. It is not enough simply to say that the Democratic Party has the sole responsibility for the National Government and then to oppose them on every proposal they make. The country has a right to expect more from a Republican Party which rightfully claims to be the responsible party.

By all means, let us oppose vigorously when the national welfare requires. But in doing so, we should be mindful of the fact that the party of Lincoln was created to deal with a great national crisis and that we have never ceased to be responsible for contributing our minds and talents to the solution of every succeeding problem facing our country.

Where we oppose the administration, we must explain why our opposition is necessary. We oppose excessive government spending not because we are penny-pinchers but because we know the hardships which inflation brings and because we understand that first things must come first or else we risk doing many things poorly and not enough things well.

Where there are legitimate national needs to be met, we must offer our own constructive alternatives and prove that our proposals can do a better job of serving the American people.

Second, let us be more selective in choosing issues on which to oppose the administration. Unfortunately, for the country, there is no shortage of such issues. To be effective, however, we should concentrate our attention on the issues of prime importance—foreign policy, the economy, and civil rights, for example. We can dissipate our strength and confuse the people by attacking the administration indiscriminately and on all fronts. Conversely, we can maximize our influence by emphasizing the issues most meaningful to people and through persistent and imaginative public relations make certain that people understand the factual basis of our opposition.

Third, let us not be reluctant to claim credit for our accomplishments. We can be certain that the Democratic Congress and the administration will try to place a Democratic label on any and all achievements. I see no reason, however, for conceding them this victory.

Despite our minority position, we have in the past and we will in the future force the majority in many instances to respond to our demands for greater responsibility in key areas of Government. When we trim the fat from appropriation bills, when we put foreign aid on a more manageable basis, when we strengthen a weak civil rights bill, or when we improve any of the often hastily drawn legislative proposals of the administration, let us tell the people what we have accomplished.

Since we do not control the machinery of legislation, we cannot afford to wait for total success. We can, however, make our opposition felt constructively and we can inform the people of our success.

Fourth, let us criticize the Kennedy administration not only for going too far but for not going far enough. Civil rights is not the only instance where the administration has stopped far short of its own expressed ideals and those of the American people. The President earlier this year argued persuasively that the best way to stimulate the economy would be to provide greater incentives to the private sector of the economy in the form of tax reduction. Yet, he has jeopardized this sound objective by failing to control Federal spending and by attaching to tax reduction his extraneous and highly debatable tax reform proposals.

Last year, he proposed that a pool of carefully planned public works projects be prepared which could be put into effect when unemployment had reached a dangerous level. Under pressure from his own party, he soon compromised and substituted for this sound proposal a wide-open grab-bag known as the accelerated public works program—without the careful planning and the determination of priorities, which alone can make public works an effective tool.

Finally, I would urge our party to make unity a working objective rather than the casual slogan it has often seemed to be. Unity in the Republican Party is not only necessary but it is reasonable. Certainly, there are many differences among us but within our party structure we have the room and the freedom for expressing these differences and the machinery for permitting decisions to be made from time to time as to which view will be dominant.

Ours, I believe, is the truly national party in the United States. It is the party of the center, the party best able to represent the broad consensus of our people on the great national issues. As the mood of the times and the needs of the country shift, so will the tone and the substance of our party's response. This is the responsible way. From its position in the center, the Republican Party is best able to represent the vast majority of Americans. Consequently, the place for Republicans to debate our differences and to decide our policies, to make the necessary compromises and accommodations, is inside our party—in our party conventions and party primaries.

I am led to make this observation by a letter I received from an outraged Republican who reflects, I believe, the frustrations of a small but potentially important minority of our party. My constituent delivered an ultimatum. Unless Republican officeholders, he said, started voting just the way he wanted us to, he was going to vote and work for Democratic candidates in the next election, even though he had nothing in common with them. This man happened to be a very strong conservative. His attitude is sometimes shared by strong liberals. In either case, I believe, it is an unrealistic and irresponsible attitude.

Any Republican who cannot accommodate himself to the majority decision of his fellow Republicans—as expressed in conventions and in primaries—had better look at the realities of party politics. The essence of membership in any organization, political or otherwise, is a willingness to accept at least in general that organization's principles and objectives and to abide by the freely determined policies and decisions of the organization, in which he himself has equal voice and opportunity.

Compromise and accommodation should be easier and more logical for us than for Democrats. We do not have to strain our consciences or convictions, or stretch the people's capacity to believe, in order to accept our party's decisions.

Let me illustrate this point by referring to the case of Governor Rockefeller and Senator GOLDWATER, the two men most prominently mentioned as Republican candidates in 1964. It is commonly accepted that these men represent the two dominant wings in the Republican Party. In spite of their differences—and neither Senator GOLDWATER nor Governor Rockefeller is trying to hide these differences—both men are currently emphasizing the areas of agreement which unite them as Republican leaders. Their differences are admittedly important, but the issues on which they agree are even more important, and each man is big enough and realistic enough and sufficiently dedicated to the party's welfare to recognize that their own disagreements pale in comparison with the rockbottom barriers that separate the wings of the Democratic Party.

This is a healthy development in our party's life. The Governor and the Senator are contributing to the political dialog within the Republican Party which will provide a sound basis for a Republican decision in 1964 as to which direction and with which candidate it should move ahead. This dialog is good not only for the party but for the country, for the net result will be an honest airing of issues and the formation of a balanced Republican position which our party can take to the country. The country will be the winner and, let us hope, the Republican Party will share that victory.

I would, therefore, say to all my fellow Republicans, at every level of party activity; go thou and do likewise.

STRIP MINING STUDY BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ABELE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, for many years the people of southeastern Ohio and in several other States have manifested great interest in strip mining—its economic implications, its effect on water resources, utility of the soil, and the general appearance of the countryside.

Presently many questions have been raised relative to the adequacy of State laws to regulate surface mining, and the extent of the authority of the Federal Government in this field. In order to provide the necessary information as a background for a more constructive approach by Congress to this problem, I am proposing a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal and State officials, to make a thorough study of all aspects of strip mining in the United States.

This bill is as follows:

H.R. 6693

A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—

- (1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;
- (2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;
- (3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;

(4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;

(5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;

(6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;

(7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and

(8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

COMPULSORY LICENSING AND THE PATENT SYSTEM

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, a patent by its very nature provides an incentive for research and development by granting an exclusive right to the inventor for the production and sale of his conception for a limited period of time. In return for this right, he discloses the results of his inventive efforts for the use of everyone after the patent has expired.

Unlike a monopoly of an existing product, a patent merely provides incentives so that developments may be undertaken and financed, which add to our common stock of knowledge.

The inadequacies of compulsory licensing or Government ownership of patents have been reaffirmed by the fact that NASA is now seeking approval of the Congress to permit patent ownership by contractors on development projects which it has financed. This was a suggestion which I made during the last session of the Congress.

Now that we are confronted with intense competition with the Communist nations, it is particularly important that the inherent and valuable protections in the patent system which encourage inventors to undertake the more difficult tasks are not in any way blunted.

Experience has now indicated that, even when such activities are financed with public funds, the patent incentive can become a means of securing a more effective and rapid rate of scientific development at a lower cost to the public than under a system where no private inherent rights accrue to those who provide the inventive spark of genius to meet the needs of Government programs.

Mr. Speaker, in the private sector of our economy where our concern is entirely with the development of new products and processes for commercial use, there can be little question but that compulsory licensing would reduce our rate of economic growth and limit the flow of new products to the market, which are needed to provide job opportunities for those whose skills have been displaced.

Compulsory licensing has been advocated as a means of increasing competition—thus providing consumers with products at lower prices. Unfortunately, those who in good faith advance this view fail to recognize that without a constant flow of new products, which compete for the consumer's dollar, competition would be lessened rather than increased.

Mr. Herschel F. Clesner, Patent Coordinator for the U.S. Public Health Service, published a paper entitled, "Innovator's Payment Determination in the U.S.S.R." He shows that encouragement of inventive talents has been a major feature of Soviet economic policy. He says and I quote:

Lacking market incentives, the Soviet system has attempted to employ capitalistic stimuli that appeal to the self-interest of the individual, to the technocrat, and the manager. These are designed as alternatives or supplements to the political and social pressures used by the regime to achieve increasing labor productivity. Yet, prior to 1959 these stimuli were obviously ineffectual, indicating that the system did not use the available material incentives adequately, that it did not stimulate basic and primary inventions or the rapid adaptation of such inventions. The system, until then, was geared primarily to the achievement of greater volume output, along established technological lines, rather than to major innovation and its introduction into use.

Since 1959, however, the party leadership has been pressing forward vigorously, ruthlessly, with single-minded determination and with increasing exploitation of every possible channel, has attempted to accelerate the advance in production techniques and the utilization of new technology. As part of this drive, the revision of the "Statute on Discoveries, Inventions, and Suggestions for Rationalization of Procedures" and the instructions relative to payment and computation of the payment for inventions and efficiency suggestions were revised. Clearly, the main objective of these revisions is to reward more effectively, and give greater incentive to, those immediately concerned with innovation, with a special emphasis on the decision-makers who assume the risk of introduction. This reexamination will undoubtedly lead to the strengthening of personal material rewards for the introduction of new products and technology. It will also advance the cause of new technology by the immediate guarantee of the payment award if the innovation was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, certainly it would be folly for us to weaken the incentive now afforded under our patent system at a time when nations with a completely different concept of economics are attempting to find a way to accomplish the results which we have attained by our continued adherence to the traditional concepts of the patent system as developed by the Founding Fathers.

The keynote address to the annual conference of the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation in Washington, D.C., in 1962, was presented by Prof.

S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. Under unanimous consent I insert a portion of this address at this point in the RECORD:

In this balancing of national and international economic interests, let us not bargain away the hard core of American public policies which reinforce our leadership in industrial productivity and technological development. Economic international interdependence and a sense of self-restraint in unilateral exercise of sovereign power, to which I have previously alluded, do not mean we should not hold fast to domestic ideologies we deem distinctive American means of fostering motivations for a vigorous competitive process which preserves the independence of decisionmaking by private business enterprise.

One example is found in the public policy of our patent and antitrust laws. In 1955 I published a paper in which I took the position that patents and antitrust can peacefully coexist. My thesis still is that there is no inherent conflict in the exclusivity of patent rights and the kind and quality of competition our antitrust laws seek to preserve. Both public policies are complementary parts of the paramount goals of a competitive economy. Decrees against patent misuse in violation of either the U.S. Patent Code or U.S. antitrust laws are proving to be ample safeguards in judicial decisions based upon findings that such transgressions have occurred. There nevertheless is persistence of a minority view that the exclusivity of patent rights is by nature antithetical to competitive principles. The danger is that this ideological variance from our constitutional and statutory sanctions of patent exclusivity has already found its way into the Halls of Congress where some Members have taken their cue from this reformist minority group.

Fortunately, Congress in the Patent Code of 1952 reaffirmed and strengthened hard core protection of domestic patent rights. In the past Congress has also wisely rejected proposals for extensive compulsory licensing of patented inventions. This harsh remedy is sanctioned by the Supreme Court only to correct past and prevent future patent-antitrust violations found to exist. In my view, this remedy should not be extended to royalty-free compulsory licensing.

In our society, economic growth is basically the result of technological development, and a patent is an intangible property right. It represents the basis for capitalizing on years of effort, research, the use of expensive facilities, and the employment of many scientists whose collaborative efforts finally result in a useful invention.

Mr. Speaker, because the Government has acquired title to a significant number of patents under existing policies, it is possible to appraise the effectiveness of Government ownership and compulsory licensing in fostering the commercial development of new inventions. Again, this conference provided an opportunity to review the administration of the approximately 12,000 patents which have been assigned to the U.S. Government. Miss Mary A. Holman, who is the first recipient of the Thomas A. Edison Fellowship, has examined the utilization of this large bloc of patents in connection with her doctoral dissertation in economics. It is significant that the U.S. Government now owns more patents than any private corporation. Yet, Miss Holman finds that, and I quote:

Commercial use has been reported on about 15 percent of the sampled patented inven-

tions. For purposes of this study, commercial use was limited to mean producing the patented invention or using it in the production of goods and services.

This 15-percent rate of utilization is considerably less than the estimated 50- to 60-percent rate of utilization for patents assigned to private firms and individuals. Further, there is preliminary evidence from both licensees and inventors that there are additional patented inventions owned by the Government that would be put into commercial use had these individuals and firms had title to the patent or an exclusive license to use it.

Preliminary findings also seem to support the contention that those Government-owned patented inventions which are put into commercial use are those which require little or no further development. This is important when patent rights are judged to be an essential element for a managerial decision deciding whether or not costly and risky investment in plant and equipment should be undertaken.

About 70 percent of the patents that were reported to have been commercialized by private firms and individuals did not need any further development.

If the purpose of the patent system is to provide the public with the disclosure of scientific knowledge and information and to encourage its utilization to enhance our living standards, our security, and our well-being, then the evidence gathered by Miss Holman does not support the view that Government ownership of patents or any form of compulsory licensing is the best means of securing a rapid rate of technological development, which is the basic requirement for economic growth, about which the administration is constantly theorizing.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Holman's conclusions are reinforced by a report to a recent meeting of the American Society for Metals by Mr. Edwin Mansfield, director of the Carnegie Research Project on Technological Change and Economic Growth. He said:

How large is the payoff for a successful innovation? To find out, we determined which firms were first to introduce about 100 new processes and products regarded by trade journals and engineering associations as being the most important that occurred in the iron and steel and the petroleum industries since World War I. We then compared the growth rates of these innovators with those of other comparable firms. The results show that the successful innovator grew much more rapidly than the other firms, their average growth rate being in some cases more than twice that of the others. According to our best estimates, the average effect of a successful innovation was to raise a firm's percentage annual growth rate by 4 to 13 percentage points, depending on the time interval and the industry. And, as one would expect, a successful innovation had a much greater impact on a small firm than on a large one.

It is significant to note that a single innovation may have a very large impact on a small firm whereas a larger firm with a diversified product line may not be so drastically affected. Again, the devastating effect of compulsory licensing on small firms has been set forth by Mr. Albert S. Davis, Jr., an authority on the American patent system.

In an article entitled "The Patent Brouhaha," in *International Science and Technology* of May 1962, he said:

All of these raises the question whether any substitute for the monopoly patent is

equally inviting to industry and the solo inventor. To the industrial supporter of research, a first-in-the-field position is no real substitute for a monopoly patent. With a monopoly position, he can either sit on top of the heap until new invention circumstances his position, or he can license his patents for a royalty which will yield a substantial commercial advantage. First in the field gives the solo inventor no bargaining position whatever, unless he keeps his invention secret and peddles it in confidence. And if the company to which he makes his disclosure is not in a strong industry position, first in the field is of little value.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis reviews some of the arguments that have been advanced over the years for compulsory licensing—among them a mistaken concept that many inventions are patented with the direct intent of preventing the use of an invention rather than to encourage economic growth and development. The studies which have been made clearly show that patents which are not used are those which are not as effective as other patented inventions to accomplish a desired end in the competition which exists in commercial markets. Mr. Davis has made an analytical review of the problems with respect to compulsory licensing of pharmaceutical patents that were advanced by Senator KEFAUVER in S. 1552, 87th Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD a portion of Mr. Davis' article "The Patent Brouhaha," dealing with compulsory licensing:

Since we deal with policy, we must put aside at once any argument that a patent is unique property, or that the nonuse of a patent is unique property, which cannot be compensated for. (For instance, where the nonuse of patent A enhances the value of patent B). We must also assume that there must be a reason for invoking compulsory licensing in particular cases, rather than have it apply to all patents, no matter how thoroughly they are worked in the public interest by their owners. If we do not, then the essential nature of the patent disappears; compulsory licensing carries with it at least a mild flavor of disapproval of the patent-owner. Having done this, unless we are to do violence to rather basic concepts of justice or flatly acknowledge that compulsory licensing is a penalty, we must arrange to compensate fairly and adequately the patentee or assignee whose monopoly right is broken. We must also assume that the use of the patent by a stranger to it possesses value for the public, either because the public actually needs the product or the product of the process it covers, or because the public actually needs the increased production, purchasing, employment, and profits which practicing the invention will hopefully produce. Finally, we should have a stranger to the patent who has both the wish and the full ability to make a good job of working it.

The chief argument against compulsory licensing is not the neatness required in setting fair compensation, but the genuine difficulty of determining when the public interest is adversely affected by failure to use the patent. Senator KEFAUVER's proposal for compulsory licensing of pharmaceutical patents to all comers after 3 years is a negation of patent principles, for it ignores the crisis of a small company, owning a valuable patent, producing a product at entirely reasonable prices and in entirely satisfactory quantities, and opens the field to the kind of competition in which the biggest company wins. The maximum 8-percent royalty which can be charged is sorry compensation if that competition destroys the originator's business.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have shown that the initial investment to secure a patent is only the first part of the difficult task of developing a commercial product. In many cases a considerable portion of the 17-year life of the patent is employed in developing the commercial adaptation of the product. The number of years that the patent provides protection in terms of competition in real markets is quite limited. We are paying a very small price for the scientific benefits our society has derived from the mobilization of its inventive talents.

Since so large a portion of the protected period is normally used to perfect and market a product, compulsory licensing after a period of 3 years would virtually destroy any incentive to undertake the task of marketing and manufacturing new products with the knowledge that when the market had been developed by paying a royalty, others would then be free to benefit without having made any outlays for the inventor's efforts prior to the granting of the patent, or the development expenditures by the inventor or the assignee for a period of many years after the patent has been granted.

The headstart in a market, which a patent confers, does not last very long at best, and any reduction in existing protection could have but one effect: namely, to deter any extensive research and development program. It would be a disservice to our economy and would place us in the position of being a second best nation in all fields of scientific endeavor were such a step seriously undertaken.

Mr. Robert B. Semple, chairman of the board, Manufacturing Chemists Association, and president of the Wyandotte Chemical Co., appeared before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1961. His statement clearly shows the devastating effect that compulsory licensing would create. Under unanimous consent I insert excerpts from his statement at this point in the RECORD:

It would decidedly reduce the attractiveness of acquiring a patent. This will certainly have the effect of either materially curtailing research, or of driving much of it underground. This would be particularly true in the case of a small company, because the compulsory licensing requirement of this bill would give to the larger companies early access to the new developments of the smaller companies and I know this was quite thoroughly covered by Dr. Cavallito in the preceding testimony.

In the highly competitive drug and chemical industries, the larger companies, with their greater manpower, greater financial resources for development, and greater recognition in the marketplace, could effectively preempt markets for the newly developed products of a small company which chose to follow the patent route.

I use the words "early access" advisedly. Although the bill provides for an exclusive patent grant for a maximum of 3 years, I believe that in most instances in practical effect the period of exclusive coverage will be considerably less, and that in many cases there will be no period of exclusive coverage at all. But even if the exclusive coverage were to last 3 years, that is an extremely short time, in my experience, to bring a new chemical development to commercial fruition. Most chemical developments that are good enough to achieve

patent protection take substantially longer than 3 years to reach any degree of profitability. From my experience, I would say that from 5 to 10 years has been the usual period.

In the most important new field that we have been able to commercialize in my time at Wyandotte, only now, 7 years after the initial patent was issued, and almost 12 or 13 years after we started researching, are we about to recover our research and development outlay and to begin to make a reasonable profit on our substantial investment in plant facilities.

Thus, the compulsory licensing requirement of the bill would make patents far less attractive to the small companies. For a number of reasons, it will also, in many instances, make them far less attractive to the larger companies as well. For example, the compulsory licensing requirement will make it possible for companies which have not spent a single dollar on research of any kind to market a product on the heels of, or at the same time as, the patent owner who will have spent considerable sums for the research and development of the particular product.

Any form of compulsory licensing is comparable to eliminating patents altogether or establishing Government title to all inventions. It destroys the incentive for disclosure of new developments which the patent system has so wisely provided.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on September 22, 1961, when designating American Patent System Week said:

I invite the people during that week to commemorate the American patent system, which by affording protection and encouragement to inventors as envisaged and authorized by the Constitution, contributes so greatly to the encouragement of inventive genius.

Time-tested results derived from the American patent system, which stems from the founding of our country, support the view that modifications limiting the protection now provided would not be in the public interest. They would deter the disclosure of new developments, erect a wall of secrecy around research activities, and would adversely affect the national security and economic growth of our country. These views, too, are well set forth by Mr. Franz O. Ohlson, Jr., chairman of the Patent Committee, Aerospace Industries Association of America, who said:

President Kennedy has said many times that one of his principal concerns is the expansion of the economy. The President seeks to increase the gross national product, obtain full employment, and achieve greater prosperity. To reach these goals, the President is relying heavily on the stimulation of private business. It is apparent that among the important existing stimulations to the expansion and modernization of private business are the incentives and protection available in the patent system. The exclusivity afforded to the owner of a patent is the bulwark upon which he can risk existing capital and attract new capital for development of markets for products, marketable products, the construction of plants, the employment of labor, and increasing the gross national product. Without the protection of private ownership of patents . . . an important stimulus will have been lost, and the very objectives so strongly sought by the President will be defeated.

In our technological race with communism, no action should be taken to reduce our incentives to seek new and better developments and products. Additionally,

both industry and the Government today are seriously limited by their own budgets to find needed funds for the support of promising research and development programs.

Any legislation or administrative act which prevents or reduces the investment of private funds in research and development programs adversely affects the general welfare of the United States.

I commend the statements by these distinguished authorities to my colleagues, as a bill providing compulsory licensing of patents for prescription drugs has again been introduced in the other body. In this instance, it is proposed that a compulsory license must be granted if the price of the patented drug is more than 500 percent of the cost of production of such drug. It is imperative that no ill-advised action be taken that will limit the effectiveness of the patent system by attempting to impose an arbitrary ceiling of a fair price as a prerequisite to maintaining the sole rights during the life of the patent under existing law.

COMMUNISTS ON CAMPUS

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed this body concerning the vital issue of Communist speakers on American campuses. From the viewpoint of sound education, it has been said that students will learn more of the truth about communism in 1 hour from a competent teacher or a good book than they can from many hours of listening to the speeches of Communists.

On this point, I heartily agree. The University of Washington formerly permitted Communist Party members and leaders to address students on its campus. This policy was reversed a short time ago. In denying permission for Communist Party leader, Benjamin J. Davis, to debate a member of the University Young Socialists on the campus, President Odegaard, according to the University of Washington Daily, took the following position:

At this time Odegaard also reaffirmed a policy analogous to learning about leprosy by consulting authoritative textbooks on the subject rather than associating with lepers. He asserted that communism could be fully understood by discussion with academic authorities on the subject rather than associating with Communists by providing them with a speaking platform.

The American Bar Association standing committee on the Bill of Rights issued the following resolution in August 1962:

BILL OF RIGHTS AS BEING INVOLVED WHERE OFFICERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A. HAVE OR SEEK SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS AT STATE-SUPPORTED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The question embraced in the foregoing title has been raised with the committee.

The committee is of the opinion that no question of the Bill of Rights is involved in these campus appearances, whatever may be one's notion about academic freedom.

The Communist Party has been declared by Congress to be "in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States". The Subversive Activities Control Board has found as a fact

that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is foreign controlled and "operates primarily to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement", which is to "endeavor to bring about the overthrow of existing governments." All of these findings were accepted by the Supreme Court in *Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1 (June 5, 1961; rehearing denied Oct. 9, 1961), and the registration requirements of the act were sustained in the aspect there involved.

The Bill of Rights, including the right of free speech, is a series of legal rights against the State and Federal Governments. A legal right is one that may be enforced or protected in the courts. It is a mistaken notion to discuss in terms of the Bill of Rights a situation in which the right cannot be enforced in court, because the Bill of Rights is in no way involved.

The committee does not believe that the officers of the Communist Party U.S.A., still fully dedicated to advance the objectives of communism, which includes the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, have a legally enforceable right in court to speak on the campus of a State-supported institution, nor, in the opinion of the committee, have the students or faculty members of such an institution a legally enforceable right to require that such Communist officers be allowed to speak on such campuses.

The above is written as if a possible Bill of Rights question, in the legal sense, were involved. We leave out of account that at least some of these institutions have complete control over their properties and may lawfully deny use of campus facilities to any persons not connected with the institution.

The committee is aware, as a matter of fact, that practices have varied among educational institutions, both public and private, in granting platforms on the campus to officers of the Communist Party U.S.A.; but the committee does not concern itself with notions of academic freedom not connected with the Bill of Rights in the legal sense.

In the annual report to Congress in 1962, Director J. Edgar Hoover made the following very cogent remarks regarding this invasion of the campus:

THE THREAT FROM WITHIN

Probably more Americans saw and heard a self-avowed member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in fiscal year 1962 than in the preceding 10 years. Unquestionably, the party unleashed one of the most intensive propaganda campaigns in its history.

Cause of the sudden torrent of Communist lies was the Supreme Court's ruling in June, 1961, upholding the decision of the Subversive Activities Control Board to the effect that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. The party was ordered to register its members, account for its finances and identify its propaganda in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950.

With typical arrogance and disrespect for constitutional law, party leaders voiced defiance. They loudly proclaimed the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Supreme Court were instruments through which all Americans would be cheated out of their basic rights. Self-righteously, they claimed to be defenders of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Tons of printed propaganda were distributed throughout the Nation; new front groups were organized; and Communist leaders began issuing public statements, appearing on radio and television programs and making speeches. The central theme of the aggressive campaign was the fraudulent claim that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was bearing the brunt of the assault on American rights.

Most successful of all its efforts was its speaking campaign, especially before college

groups. From late October 1961, through May 1962, leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., made 48 speeches before groups of college students all across the Nation. Approximately 43,000 persons heard these talks.

Encouraged by the early success of college appearances, the party established a Lecture and Information Bureau and early in 1962 sent a letter to college newspaper editors offering speakers on communism. Near the end of the 1962 fiscal year, the party already was lining up speeches for the coming academic year.

The prime objective of all the public activity on the part of the Communist leaders was to create a new image for the party—an image which connotes respectability, legitimacy as a liberal political faction and freedom from foreign dictates. Their denial of subservience to the Soviet Union, however, was clearly branded as ridiculous by the fact that several party officials were delegates to the 22d Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, in October 1961. Heading the delegation was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, national chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who, in a speech before the Congress, brazenly predicted the United States would be in the Communist orbit by 1980.

I have always wondered why so many so-called liberals practice gross discrimination in favor of Communists. Thieves, murders, tax evaders, and other criminals are not given the opportunity to present their views or their case on college campuses. Why the Communists? Even the Supreme Court, not known for being conservative, has rejected the specious claim that the Communists are members of a political party. This has also been rejected by the legislative and executive branches of our Government. Yet certain educators and public officials cling to the argument that these people should have the right to present their views at a campus forum.

The recent history of the Communist Party before our highest courts of the land is the best answer to these claims:

Behind the facade of public activity, the Communist Party, U.S.A., remained a sinister evil constantly striving to advance the cause of communism. While the leaders raised a great public clamor and attracted the spotlight to themselves, lesser officials and rank-and-file members drew further into their shell of anonymity. Secret orders went out to tighten the structure and security of the party all along the line. Titles were dropped, committees dissolved, the size of meetings drastically cut. Added emphasis was placed on protecting party records. These actions clearly revealed the party, as its leaders had proclaimed, intended to defy the order to register.

The order for the party to register with the Attorney General became final on October 20, 1961. The deadline of November 20, 1961, passed without compliance, and the obligation then fell upon certain designated party officers. The second deadline of November 30, 1961, passed, and each member of the party then became obligated to register himself by December 20, 1961. No registration was filed.

A Federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1961, returned a 12-count indictment charging the Communist Party, U.S.A., with wilfully and unlawfully failing to register. A motion to dismiss the indictment was filed.

Individual six-count indictments against Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., national secretary, were returned on March 15, 1962. Motions to dismiss these indictments were pending at the end of the 1962 fiscal year.

The Attorney General on May 31, 1962, petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order 10 members of the National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., to register as party members. These individuals will be afforded a hearing before the Board to determine if their registration should be ordered.

Mr. Speaker, the old bromide "My mind's made up—do not confuse me with the facts" seems to apply here. The facts are clear: the Communists have no legal or ethical right to appear on campus. To maintain that there is a violation of their civil liberties is indeed a farce. Is it not about time that some of our educators wake up to the true nature of this conspiratorial party which by no stretch of the imagination is a political party but rather an illegal band of agents of a foreign power?

THE CARIBBEAN IS ABLAZE WITH COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few minutes to discuss the subject which I believe to be of paramount importance, and to include in the RECORD certain information concerning it.

There is no question in my mind, from information made available from numerous reliable sources, that the Caribbean is ablaze with Communist-led activities; that the Communist threat in the Caribbean is far more than limited to the country of Cuba; that there is a lack on the part of the United States of adequate action in forestalling continued subversion in many countries in the Caribbean area to prevent subversion and infiltration, to prevent arms drops which are taking place constantly, that there is a lack of policy on the part of the administration to implement the Monroe Doctrine. But instead that in effect the Khrushchev doctrine of co-existence is being condoned and being accepted by the administration. This is of great concern to many. I am sure it is of great concern to all people in this country.

The Communist buildup in the Caribbean is not only limited to the takeover in Cuba. I have stated before that in my opinion the country of Haiti, unless the United States takes firm leadership of the Organization of American States in preventing the takeover by the Communists of the country of Haiti, that eventually and not in the too distant future, as soon as an adequate vacuum occurs, that that will be the successful objective of the Communists in Haiti. And, as a matter of fact, they are tooled up, they are armed, and they are preparing to accomplish that task.

I have stated before that it was my opinion from irrefutable information that had come to my attention that in Haiti there were numerous Haitian sugarcane cutters from Cuba who had been trained in Cuban subversive schools; had been infiltrated back into Haiti; are there now, and are willing to do the bidding of the Communist dictator Castro and the Kremlin as it re-

lates to Haiti and the eventual Communist takeover.

I have stated further that it is my opinion—and it has been confirmed by numerous sources—that Africans have been infiltrated into Haiti. There has just come to my attention some additional specific information that I believe necessitates being checked out through every possible means by the United States and by the Organization of American States relating to overt, planned Communist infiltration in Haiti. This is the information:

During the last few months, groups of Africans have been transferred from various parts of Cuba to the camps in Minas del Frio, Oriente Province. Some of these groups traveled in trucks from Pinar del Rio Province to the camps. Minas del Frio is being utilized as a training camp, where not only Africans, but also many Latin Americans, are subject to indoctrination.

After completing the training, some of the Africans were transported to a farm located near the Port of Imias, on the south coast of eastern Cuba. From this farm, small groups made up of 10 to 30 men have been and are still being shipped to the Republic of Haiti. The Communists have been using Africans for this job because the language spoken in Haiti, a mixture of French and African dialects, called Creole, is very similar to that used in some countries in Africa.

Up to the present time, a total of eight groups has been infiltrated into Haiti. They are to carry out sabotage, terrorism in the cities, as well as organizing guerrilla warfare, in this Republic neighboring Cuba.

A total of 168 Africans had arrived in Haiti up to the month of April. Infiltrations into Haitian territory, from the Port of Imias, took place on the following dates: September 21, 1962, 23 men; January 9, 1963, 14 men; January 25, 1963, 28 men; February 9, 1963, 9 men; February 19, 1963, 24 men; March 4, 1963, 32 men; March 21, 1963, 29 men; April 10, 1963, 9 men.

Further information concerning this matter is available, and I am hopeful that the Organization of American States and this Government will seek out, gather, and confirm all possible information and take necessary action in order to prevent continuing infiltration not only into Haiti by Communist means but many other countries in Latin America.

Let me cite another example, and that is the Dominican Republic. It has been stated by some of the Cuban refugee groups that it was their opinion that there was a considerable Communist buildup taking place in the Dominican Republic. One refugee group stated some time ago, on April 30, as a matter of fact, that Sacha Vollman, Russo-Rumanian, naturalized American, was the power behind Bosch's throne, and that his political sympathies lay with the Reds. This was confirmed just recently, on May 21, when Hal Hendrix, Pulitzer Prize winning newsmen of the Miami News, newly arrived from the Dominican Republic, reported that:

Subtle and peaceful Communist penetration of the Dominican Republic is progressing with incredible speed and efficiency.

Hendrix states further:

There is ample evidence that Communist forces closely allied with Cuba and the Kremlin, aided by native supporting leftist elements are working openly and covertly to turn this country—

Meaning the Dominican Republic—into a second Communist-dominated bastion in the Caribbean.

Let me go on to another Caribbean area and further quote proof of the fact that Communist subversion—the Communist plan and program in the Caribbean—is becoming more and more obvious and that they are succeeding at an alarming rate. I said some time ago that there was Communist infiltration and activities in some of the Leeward and Windward Islands.

Madam Speaker, I have before me a report of Don Bonafede of the Miami Herald who went to the Islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe, which are French islands, who went to Port au Prince and other cities on those islands. This report resulted from that visit, and I quote:

FORT DE FRANCE, MARTINIQUE.—A Communist stronghold, older than Cuba's Red menace, thrives on this French island and its sister province, Guadeloupe, unnoticed by the rest of the hemisphere.

French officials concede that evidence has been uncovered of a working agreement between followers of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro and the Red Frenchman of the West Indies.

Actual card-carrying Communists are pegged at 2,000 on the 2 islands, each of which has about 300,000 inhabitants. But the party's following far surpasses its paper membership.

Communism's appeal is gaged at almost 40 percent of the Guadeloupe electorate and 15 percent in Martinique. In no other area of the hemisphere can the Communists boast a bigger electoral popularity.

Recently, 12 members of a radical youth movement with the initials OJAM were arrested and jailed on charges of "plotting against the state." Authorities appear reluctant to bring the 13 to trial in fear of making martyrs of them.

The Communist Party wields powerful influence over the agricultural unions, thereby placing it in a strategic position since the island's economy is dominated by the production of sugar and bananas.

Although Catholicism is the prevailing religion, many of its members are outright Communists or fellow travelers. The current secretary general of the Communist Party Secretariat, Armand Nicholas, was as an example, formerly active in Catholic groups.

COMMUNIST OFFICIALS

Several of the islands' mayors are known Communists, including those from three cities in Martinique and the two largest cities in Guadeloupe.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in total at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1963]

RED OUTPOST THRIVES IN FRENCH WEST INDIES (By Don Bonafede)

FORT DE FRANCE, MARTINIQUE.—A Communist stronghold, older than Cuba's Red men-

ace, thrives on this French island and its sister province, Guadeloupe, unnoticed by the rest of the hemisphere.

French officials concede that evidence has been uncovered of a "working agreement" between followers of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro and the Red Frenchman of the West Indies.

Actual card-carrying Communists are pegged at 2,000 on the 2 islands, each of which has about 300,000 inhabitants. But the party's following far surpasses its paper membership.

Communism's appeal is gaged at almost 40 percent of the Guadeloupe electorate and 15 percent in Martinique. In no other area of the hemisphere can the Communists boast a bigger electoral popularity.

Recently, 13 members of a radical youth movement with the initials OJAM were arrested and jailed on charges of "plotting against the state." Authorities appear reluctant to bring the 13 to trial in fear of making martyrs of them.

The Communist Party wields powerful influence over the agricultural unions, thereby placing it in a strategic position since the island's economy is dominated by the production of sugar and bananas.

Although Catholicism is the prevailing religion, many of its members are outright Communists or fellow travelers. The current secretary general of the Communist Party Secretariat, Armand Nicolas, was, as an example, formerly active in Catholic groups.

As 2 of the 94 departments (states) of France, Martinique and Guadeloupe are an integral part of the nation, somewhat similar to Hawaii and Alaska to the United States. Hence, they follow the French governmental system in which the centralized power of Paris is transmitted throughout the provinces by appointed prefects. Residual powers are vested in the cities.

"The important thing here is to own city hall," remarked a resident.

COMMUNIST OFFICIALS

Several of the islands' mayors are known Communists, including those from three cities in Martinique and the two largest cities in Guadeloupe.

The mayor of Fort de France, Aime Cesaire, poet, writer and intellectual, is a former Communist who broke with the party 7 years ago. One of the most popular figures in Martinique's political history, he took a large segment of his following with him, thus depriving the Reds of some of their strength.

Cesaire, however, spends almost all his time in Paris, where he also serves in the French Parliament. This absenteeism has cut into his popularity.

The danger here is that the Communists will gain in power as moderates like Cesaire whittle away their influence.

ANTIQUATED SOCIAL SYSTEM

A strong stimulant to Communist agitation is the islands' antiquated social system. A "white planter" society with its unwritten social code per still reigns, although the great majority of the population is colored.

"The French aristocracy, called beke, will go to cocktail parties with Negroes, eat in restaurants with them, have affairs with their women and do business with them—but they will not invite them to their homes and sit down at dinner with them," remarked a resident.

Mixed tennis clubs are condoned but beach parties are segregated.

Another irritant is that the great distance from Paris makes the islanders feel like distant cousins, an attitude unwittingly fostered by the French Government.

For instance, parents in Martinique and Guadeloupe receive a 25 cent daily government subsidy for each child—less than the amount given in continental France.

Also the government-appointed representative who acts as the liaison with Paris has

powers far broader than his counterparts in France, and the islanders are beholden to Paris for minor favors.

The Communists seize on these inequities to promote discontent.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, these are clear-cut examples which are ever mounting of the actual overt, purposeful, intentional subversive activities by the Communists in the Caribbean—which, when added to known activities in other Latin American countries give cause for alarm.

Madam Speaker, I think the time has come, it is past, as a matter of fact, for the United States to take leadership action through the Organization of American States in carving out a meaningful program to implement the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, with the ultimate objective of ousting Castro and communism from the hemisphere.

Madam Speaker, it is proven in the past when the OAS was effective, it was effective because it had purposeful, effective leadership from the United States. The lack of that leadership was obvious in Haiti in the recent uprising that took place and the unsettled stalemate that presently exists.

Therefore, I call upon the United States to call a meeting of the Organization of American States for the purpose of carving out such a meaningful program in order to combat subversion in this hemisphere, to provide for adequate patrols of the Caribbean in order to prevent continuing and constant arms drops that are now and have been taking place, a number of them taking place on the northern coast and some on the southern coast of the Hispanola peninsula in particular, relating to two of the countries which were just mentioned, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, to provide an economic and political quarantine of Cuba, to isolate communism in Cuba and eventually to force the downfall of the Cuban Communist dictatorship, to end the flow of subversives to and from Cuba, to get all OAS countries to withdraw recognition from and to stop doing business with Cuba just to mention a few steps.

We cannot afford to wait; we cannot afford to just hope; we cannot afford to sit idly by with the do-nothing aspiration that something might go wrong in Cuba and in the Communist drive in this hemisphere because, if we wait, we will find that we will have in this hemisphere many more Communist-dominated countries in addition to Cuba.

This is a challenge which this country must accept and meet. There are many steps that have been pointed out previously that can be taken. I have mentioned previously on the floor of this House a number of them myself. Senator KEATING has proposed a number and many others have proposed measures. The Stennis committee report had a number of proposals. The Selden committee report contained a number of proposals. I am concerned about the fact that there seems to be no effort to implement any of these proposals at the present time. We cannot afford to wait until it is too late.

Mr. MOSHER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSHER. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on the very specific nature of the important information he has called to the attention of the House this afternoon. Too often we talk here only in general terms concerning the Caribbean. I think it is good to have this detailed information from a source that I consider very authentic in the gentleman from Florida. I agree with him that neither can we stand by idly and wait for events nor can the Organization of American States sit by idly and wait for events to take care of themselves.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate what the gentleman says very much. I feel it is my duty to make information that I believe to be reliable available to the proper authorities and to this Congress. I do not think it is justified to downgrade, to discount, to ignore specific information that is credible, but rather it is the duty of our country in preserving the security of the free nations in this hemisphere and in upholding the Monroe Doctrine to check out every single piece of information that would indicate that the Communists are succeeding in their efforts in this hemisphere and to act to rid the hemisphere of communism. And there is not any question concerning the degree of their success as is reported in these two committee reports of the Congress—those of the Selden committee and the Stennis committee. I would recommend to everyone that they read and digest them, because certainly they are eye openers—proving that a clear and present challenge to the peace and security of this hemisphere does exist.

AFRICA ON WAY TO BECOMING WORLD POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANSEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, what recently happened in Africa was an event in history. I am confident that when time has brought a proper evaluation of the world-reshaping movements and decisions of the period in which we live, the conference at Addis Ababa will hold a high place in historical significance. It will mark the emergence of the continent of Africa as a world power, somewhat to be compared to the Articles of Confederation that loosely bound our States together during the Revolutionary War and the critical period which led to the adoption of the Constitution that perfected our Union.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and speaking, I am sure, for all its members, I warmly congratulate the participants in this historic conference, commend them for their dedication to their task and their statesmanlike restraint in avoiding temporary matters of controversial differences while mapping the blueprint of the common interests and endeavors of all the peoples and nations of the mighty continent of Africa.

In the Charter of African Unity, signed by the leaders of Africa during the

early morning hours of May 26 at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Africa has given today's world a glimpse of tomorrow's Africa.

In this charter the nations of Africa have established an Organization of African Unity.

By this charter they have laid the cornerstone for a strong, free, democratic and unified continent composed of nations that have pledged to respect the rights of one another, while accepting their responsibility to one another and toward other nations.

The signing of the Charter of African Unity brought to a close one of the most important meetings ever assembled in modern times. After several years of hard preparation by themselves and their officials at bilateral, multilateral, and regional meetings, an Emperor, a Crown Prince, 19 Presidents, 6 Premiers, and 3 Foreign Ministers—the leaders of 30 African States containing nearly a quarter of a billion people—gathered together in Addis Ababa.

At this conference, Africa's leaders succeeded in reconciling the views of the bold and the timid to arrive at a common ground for mutual cooperation and lay the foundation for a democratic, progressive and unified Africa by establishing the Organization of African Unity.

The leaders of Africa have said this is but the first step toward a unified Africa. But, it is a giant step—one deserving our applause, support and understanding.

AFRICA'S POLITICAL MATURITY

In creating the Organization of African Unity, Africa's leaders have demonstrated a political maturity of the highest order. It is an answer most convincing to those who tend to regard the nations of Africa as less politically mature, less possessed of the experience necessary to effective international cooperation than the more sophisticated developed countries who too seek political, economic and social progress through one form of unity or another.

Those who gathered at Addis Ababa were able to set aside the dramatic rhetoric which creates headlines, but often little else, to reject the use of the conference as a platform from which to advance special interests in favor of addressing themselves to the needs and interests of all of the peoples of Africa. They have declined to place emphasis on oratory as an instrument to influence other peoples of the world and instead demonstrated an understanding of the problems of others.

They have pledged their allegiance to certain basic principles but publicly acknowledged their own failure always to live up to these principles. They have rededicated themselves to helping in the achievement of independence for all who would be independent, but have recognized that independence is no end in itself; that without economic and social development there can be no lasting political independence and that this independence will only be achieved through joint action and mutual cooperation of a kind that accepts a self-responsibility for its achievement.

All of this is reflected in the charter signed at Addis Ababa. This document

is significant because it embodies the desires and the efforts of Africans to meet Africa's needs and aspirations. It is an example of truly independent action, formulated independently of the influence of this Nation—or any non-African nation—and subscribed to without promise of aid or assistance except that which the signees have pledged toward their common cause. It reflects Africa's determination to rally its own resources behind its own efforts.

CHARTER THE CREATION OF MANY MINDS

The Charter of African Unity is the joint creation of many African leaders of fine ability. It is not the creation of any one person. It represents the meeting of the minds of the able statesmen of many African nations, as our own Articles of Confederation and our own Constitution represented the thinking, not of one or two, but of the many.

The participants in the Conference joined in giving special notice to Emperor Haile Selassie in his role as host of the African Summit Conference.

His approach to African unity, his refusal to accept the preconference recommendation of the Foreign Ministers of the participating states that the drafting of the charter be postponed until a later date, and his successful insistence from the day of the Conference's commencement that the chiefs-of-state not leave his capitol until the document be approved, has been hailed by African and non-African alike.

Emperor Haile Selassie's visit to the United States in October is looked forward to as affording an opportunity for the American people to become more familiar with the blueprint for African unity, the blueprint for tomorrow's Africa, that was drawn at the Conference hosted by the Emperor. He is the head of the oldest independent nation in Africa, indeed the oldest government in the world. He was our stout ally in World War II.

Madam Speaker, I have said many times that as Africa goes so will go the world. What happened at Addis Ababa strengthened that faith. I regret that while the American press gave liberal coverage to the conference, and printed brief summaries of the African Charter, space did not permit the printing of the charter in full. I regard the All-African Charter of Unity of such importance as a statement of the common objectives of the African nations and the methods agreed upon for the advancement of the interest of an entire continent that I am extending my remarks to include the complete text:

ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

We, the heads of African States and governments assembled in the city of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, convinced that it is the inalienable right of all people to control their own destiny, conscious of the fact that freedom, equality, justice, and dignity are essential objectives for achieving the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples, conscious of our responsibility to harness the natural and human resources of our continent for the total advancement of our peoples in the spheres of human endeavor, inspired by a common determination to promote understanding among our people and collaboration among our states in response to the aspirations of our peoples for strengthening our

brotherhood and creating solidarity in a larger unity transcending ethnic and national differences, convinced that, in order to translate this determination into a dynamic force in the cause of human progress conditions for peace and security must be established and maintained, determined to safeguard and consolidate the hard-won independence as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our states and to fight neocolonialism in all its forms, dedicated to the general progress of Africa, persuaded that the U.N. Charter and the universal declaration of human rights—to the principles of which we reaffirm our adherence—provide a solid foundation for peaceful and productive cooperation among states, desirous that all African and Malagasy States should henceforth unite so that the welfare and well-being of their peoples can be assured. Resolved to (preserve) the links among our states by establishing and strengthening common institutions, have agreed to create the Organization of African Unity.

A. ESTABLISHMENT

Article I: The high contracting parties do by the present charter establish an organization to be known as the "Organization of African Unity." This organization consists of the continental states, Madagascar, and neighboring islands.

B. PURPOSES

Article II: The organization shall have the following purposes:

1. To promote the unity and solidarity of the African States.
2. To coordinate and intensify their collaboration and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa.
3. To defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence.
4. To eradicate all forms of colonialism from the continent of Africa.
5. To promote international cooperation, with due regard for the U.N. Charter and the universal declaration of human rights.

To these ends, the member states shall coordinate and harmonize their general policies, especially in the following fields: (1) political and diplomatic cooperation, (2) economic cooperation, including transport and communications, (3) educational and cultural cooperation, (4) health, sanitation, and nutritional cooperation, (5) scientific and technical cooperation, and (6) cooperation in defense and security.

C. PRINCIPLES

Article III: The member states, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article I, solemnly affirm and declare their adherence to the following principles:

1. The sovereign equality of all African States.
2. Noninterference in the internal affairs of states.
3. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for its inalienable right to independent existence.
4. Peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration.
5. Unreserved condemnation of political assassination in all its forms as well as of subversive activities on the part of neighboring states or any other states.
6. Absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent.
7. Affirmation of the policy of nonalignment with regard to all blocs.

D. MEMBERSHIP

Article IV: Each independent, sovereign African State shall be entitled to become a member of the organization.

E. RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF MEMBER STATES

Article V: All member states shall enjoy equal rights and have equal duties.

Article VI: The member states pledge themselves to observe scrupulously the prin-

ciples enumerated in article III of the present charter.

F. INSTITUTIONS

Article VII: The organization shall accomplish its purpose through the following principal institutions: (1) the assembly of heads of state and government, (2) the Council of Ministers, (3) the General Secretariat, and (4) the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration.

Article VIII: The assembly of heads of state and government shall be the supreme organ of the organization. It shall, subject to the provisions of this charter, discuss matters of common concern for Africa with a view to coordinating and harmonizing the general policy of the organization. It may, in addition, review the structure, functions, and acts of the organization and any specialized agencies which may be created in accordance with the present charter.

Article IX: The assembly shall be composed of heads of state and government or their duly accredited representatives, and shall meet at least once a year.

At the request of any member states, approved by the majority of the member states, the assembly shall meet in extraordinary session.

Article X: (1) Each member state shall have one vote, (2) all resolutions shall be determined by a two-thirds majority, (3) questions of procedure shall require a simple majority; whether or not a question is one of procedure shall be determined by a simple majority of all member states present and voting, and (4) two-thirds of the total membership of the organization shall form a quorum at any meeting of the assembly.

Article XI: The assembly shall have the power to determine its own rules of procedure.

Article XII: The Council of Ministers shall consist of foreign ministers or such other ministers as are designated by governments of member states. The Council of Ministers shall meet at least twice a year. When requested by any member state and approved by two-thirds of all member states, it shall meet in extra session.

Article XIII: The Council of Ministers shall be responsible to the assembly of the heads of state and government. It shall be entrusted with the responsibility of preparing conference of the assembly. It shall take cognizance of any matter referred to it by the assembly. It shall be entrusted with implementing the decision of the assembly of heads of state. It shall coordinate inter-African cooperation in accordance with the instructions of the assembly and in conformity with article II of the present charter.

Article XIV: (1) Each member state shall have one vote, (2) resolutions shall be determined by a simple majority of the members of the Council of Ministers, and (3) two-thirds of the total members of the Council shall (constitute a) quorum for any meeting of the Council.

Article XV: The Council shall have the power to determine its own rules of procedure.

Article XVI: There shall be an administrative Secretary General of the Organization who shall be appointed by the assembly of heads of state and government. The administrative Secretary General shall direct the affairs of the secretariat.

Article XVII: There shall be one or more assistant Secretaries General of the Organization who shall be appointed by the assembly of heads of state and government.

Article XVIII: The functions and conditions of services of the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries, and other employees of the secretariat shall be governed by the provisions of this charter and the regulations approved by the assembly of heads of state and government.

Article XIX: Member states pledge to settle all disputes among themselves by peaceful

means, and to this end there is created a Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration, whose composition and working conditions will be defined by a separate protocol approved by the assembly of heads of state and governments. This protocol shall be regarded as forming an integral part of this present charter.

Article XX: The assembly shall establish such specialized commissions as it may deem necessary, including: (1) Economic and social commission, (2) educational and cultural commission, (3) health, sanitation and nutrition commission, (4) defense commission, and (5) scientific, technical, and research commission.

Article XXI: Each specialized commission referred to in Article XX shall be composed of ministers concerned or other ministers of plenipotentiaries designated by the governments of the member states.

Article XXII: The functions of the specialized commissions shall be arrived at in accordance with the provisions of the present charter and of the regulations approved by the Council of Ministers.

G. THE BUDGET

Article XXIII: The budget of the organization prepared by the Secretary General shall be approved by the Council of Ministers. The budget shall be financed through contributions from member states in accordance with the scale of assessment of the United Nations, provided, however, that no member state shall be assessed an amount exceeding 20 percent of the yearly regular budget of the organization. The member states agree to pay their respective contributions regularly.

H. SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF CHARTER

Article XXIV:

1. This charter shall be open for signature to all independent, sovereign African and Malagasy States and shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The original instrument, done in the African languages if possible and in English and French, all texts being equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Government of Ethiopia which shall transmit certified copies thereof to all independent sovereign African and Malagasy States.

3. Instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of Ethiopia, which shall notify all signatories of each deposit.

I. ENTRY INTO FORCE

Article XXV: This charter shall enter into force immediately upon receipt by the Government of Ethiopia of the instruments of ratification from two-thirds of the signatory states as soon as possible.

J. REGISTRATION OF THE CHARTER

Article XXVI: This charter shall, after the ratification, be registered with the U.N. secretariat through the Government of Ethiopia in conformity with article 102 of the U.N. Charter.

K. INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARTER

Article XXVII: Any question which may arise concerning the interpretation of this charter shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds of the heads of state and government members of the organization.

L. ADHESION AND ACCESSION

Article XXVIII:

1. Any independent, sovereign African state may at any time notify the administrative Secretary General of its intention to adhere or accede to this charter.

2. The administrative Secretary General shall, on receipt of such notification, communicate a copy of it to all the member states. Admission shall be decided by a simple majority of the member states. The decision of each member state shall be transmitted to the administrative Secretary Gen-

eral, who shall, upon receipt of the required number of votes, communicate the decision to the state concerned.

M. MISCELLANEOUS

Article XXIX: The working languages of the organization and all its institutions shall be the African languages, English, and French.

Article XXX: The administrative Secretary General may accept, on behalf of the organization, gifts, bequests, and other donations made to the organization, provided that this is approved by the Council of Ministers.

Article XXXI: The Council of Ministers shall decide on the privileges and immunities to be accorded the personnel of the secretariat in the respective territories of the member states.

N. CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP

Article XXXII: Any state which desires to renounce its membership shall forward a written notification to the administrative Secretary General. At the end of 1 year from the date of such notification, the charter shall cease to apply with respect to the renouncing state, which shall thereby cease to belong to the organization.

O. AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER

Article XXXIII: This charter may be amended or revised if any member state makes a written request to the administrative Secretary General to that effect, provided, however, that the proposed amendment is not submitted to the Assembly for consideration until all the member states have been duly notified of it and a period of 1 year has elapsed. Such an amendment shall not be effective unless approved by at least two-thirds of all the member states.

In faith whereof, we, the heads of African and Malagasy states and governments, have signed this charter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) on account of death in the family.

Mr. LIBONATI for Wednesday, May 29, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. FINNEGAN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) for Wednesday, May 29, 1963, on account of illness.

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. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, on Friday next, May 31, 1963; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JARMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 5.

Mr. MATHIAS, on Friday next, for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on Thursday, June 6.

Mr. GAIOMO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on June 3.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on June 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. STAEBLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter and a series of tables.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. WHITE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 384. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 449. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 583. An act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 978. An act to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western river rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963,

temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, May 31, 1963, 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:

864. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1963, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

865. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to transfer a 50-foot LCM fitted as a fireboat (hull No. C-49098) to the Paid Firemen's Association, Inc., Mount Vernon Fire Department, Mount Vernon, Wash., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

866. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

867. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

868. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration,

transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) (ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

870. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report concerning certain significant problems that are being encountered by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and the State highway departments in administering the program for design and construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System; to the Committee on Government Operations.

871. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend and clarify existing inspection and investigative powers, require a premarketing showing of the safety of cosmetics, assure the safety, efficacy, and reliability of therapeutic, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices, improve the statutory coordination between that act and the biological drug provisions of the Public Health Service Act, provide for cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. Report on the mysterious disappearance of \$7.5 million of U.S. securities from the vault of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Calif. (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 6668. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6669. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6670. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6671. A bill to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate

school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6672. A bill to amend Public Law 87-276, so as to extend its provisions for 3 additional years, to expand the program under that act to provide for the training of teachers of all exceptional children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 6673. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6674. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6675. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses paid or incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 6677. A bill to provide maternity benefits for the spouses of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 6678. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain unneeded Federal lands of the Fort Miles Reservation, Del., to the State of Delaware for public educational and park purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 6679. A bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6680. A bill for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: H.R. 6681. A bill to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6682. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 6683. A bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer, during the taxable period, disposes of a truck and acquires another truck; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 6684. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make urban planning grants thereunder for the provision of planning assistance to Indian reservations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6685. A bill to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6686. A bill to amend paragraph 1537 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 6687. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located in San Marcos, Tex., and administered by the Secretary of Interior as part of the San Marcos National Fish Hatchery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6688. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the actuarial status of the trust funds, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to increase the annual earnings includible in determining benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6689. A bill to extend the principles of equitable adjudication to sales under the Alaska Public Sale Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6690. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1(a) and chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to education under such provisions of law who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 6691. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 6692. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABELE:

H.R. 6693. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6694. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956, relating to vocational training for Indians, to include nurses' training; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6695. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6696. A bill to amend section 351 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of specially adapted housing and automobiles to certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 6697. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from assessing

fees or charges for services, publications, or instruments, unless specifically permitted by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of the 150th year of peace between Canada and the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 458. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H. Res. 375. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 376. Resolution pertaining to investigations, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, travel authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 377. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation to determine whether a Reserve commission is incompatible with the holding of a seat in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 378. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 379. Resolution creating a Select Committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H. Res. 380. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the ringing of bells on the 4th day of July of each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. Res. 381. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the State of Maine Legislature recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper St. John River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting action to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Memorial No. 756, relating to citrus mortgages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6698. A bill for the relief of Jenta Burak Falshpan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6699. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jeannie Chien nee Wu Ching-Nee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6700. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo C. Kaguyutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 6701. A bill for the relief of Rasalina Sousa Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6702. A bill for the relief of Adolf and Irena Hasenryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6703. A bill for the relief of Luther D. Stull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6704. A bill for the relief of Jamil Hanna Yousef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6705. A bill for the relief of Shirley D. Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6706. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo Puruganan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6707. A bill for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 6708. A bill for the relief of Carmelita Anciano Liaguano; 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 1962 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) \$74. E. (9) \$288.19.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$17,456.29. E. (9) \$17,456.29.

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) \$17,456.29. E. (9) \$17,456.29.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$112.75. E. (9) \$8,748.74.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$637.21.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,892.21. E. (9) \$5,892.21.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$122.77.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,056. E. (9) \$8,673.56.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$13,150.06.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$751.77.

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. John Arens, 500 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$51.11.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$10,000. E. (9) \$73.75.

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) \$1,120. E. (9) \$33.22.

A. Association of Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$250.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$25.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,107.37.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$16,303.23. E. (9) \$16,303.23.

A. J. A. Ayares, Mountain Avenue, Murray Hill, N.J.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$54.40.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & 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) \$874.99.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, 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) \$1,745.89.

A. C. Morgan Bissette, 3200 34th Street, South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$293.44.

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) \$3,097.74.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) \$160.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft für Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescharge 46, Germany.
E. (9) \$250.

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. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,432.73.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$1,853.16. E. (9) \$1,853.16.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$562.50.

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) \$937.50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$17.55.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$94.83.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$319.29.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$833.33. E. (9) \$7.78.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,895.69. E. (9) \$289.56.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,669.29.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) \$1,575.42. E. (9) \$1,824.34.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$47.60.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Casey, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Jerry Malatico, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$65,000.

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. Charles Patrick Clark, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, 328 Long Beach Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif.

A. Charles Patrick Clark.

B. B. Rapaport and Son, Inc., Central Street Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$220. E. (9) \$28.55.

A. Paul G. Collins, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$125.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 307 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$110. E. (9) \$170.74.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Don Costa, 3527 Brandon Avenue, Roanoke, Va.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$243.19.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

E. (9) \$45.10.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

E. (9) \$15.98.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$555.50. E. (9) \$555.50.

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) \$100.

A. Abraham A. Dash, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$555.50. E. (9) \$55.50.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$731.25. E. (9) \$13.74.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

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) \$188.46.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$8,495.66.

A. Ben DuBois.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. J. D. Durand, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$520. E. (9) \$100.14.

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. Samuel W. Earnshaw, 983 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Members of Charter Oak Shippers Cooperative Association, Inc., Milford, Conn., and members of Progressive Shippers Cooperative Association, Shrewsbury, Mass.

D. (6) \$750.

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. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$587.01. E. (9) \$11.20.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$250.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,137.50. E. (9) \$15.56.

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) \$8.89.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,437.31.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

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) \$70.90.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$15.50.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,290.35. E. (9) \$234.90.

A. Goodson & Hannam, 6399 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Rossmoor Corp., Seal Beach, Calif.

- A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,833.34.
- A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,418.64. E. (9) \$441.86.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) \$11.50.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilson Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) \$10.50.
- A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 704 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$564.03. E. (9) \$555.50.
- 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.
- A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$37.90.
- 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. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50.
- A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Joe L. Howell, Jr., 3800 U.S. Highway 51 North, Jackson, Miss.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hays-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$48.97.
- A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$587.01. E. (9) \$9.60.
- 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. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$22,480.66.
- A. Chester W. Jackson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,300.
- A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnson Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$2,150. E. (9) \$187.
- A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.
- 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) \$3,125.
- A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$16.24.
- A. Kennon, White & Odom, 233 St. Ferdinand Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$210.14.
- A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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) \$198.56.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$14,888. E. (9) \$568.72.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wall Street Traders, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Ronald Korsan, 5343 Main Street, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$149.59.
- 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. 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. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$205.62. E. (9) \$5.40.
- A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 918 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,970.23. E. (9) \$1,611.
- A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard International, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$185.62.
- A. Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$8,000.
- A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
E. (9) \$192.12.
- 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) \$430.03.
- A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,040.62. E. (9) \$284.77.
- A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,312.50. E. (9) \$6.50.
- A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,340.
- A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
- 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) \$2,860.50. E. (9) \$261.40.
- A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$0.60.
- 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) \$1,140.66. E. (9) \$324.89.
- A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$75.59.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$77.12.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959 Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$649.61.

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) \$27.05.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of N.A., 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,490. E. (9) \$273.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 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.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 9 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$58.02.

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) \$316.50.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$491.90.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$2,095.02.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Undergraduate & Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250.

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.

E. (9) \$154.57.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. John T. Murphy, 808 North Third Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$122.30.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. 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., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$155.90. E. (9) \$202.61.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees, Jasper, Fla.

D. (6) \$18,469.04. E. (9) \$2,475.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$11,410.60. E. (9) \$13,469.24.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$64,790.50. E. (9) \$11,898.45.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$41,797. E. (9) \$1,710.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Service Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,980.75. E. (9) \$2,433.60.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$7,922.16.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$450.

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) \$490. E. (9) \$1,999.18.

A. National Bureau for Lathing & Plastering, Inc., 755 NADA Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,198.90.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$5,598.52.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$39,050. E. (9) \$42,169.18

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York City, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York Inc.; Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association, Tokyo; Japan General Merchandise Exporter's Association, Tokyo, Japan.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$50.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$168.40.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

E. (9) \$37.24.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$60,527.25. E. (9) \$2,805.97.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$90,165.75. E. (9) \$11,768.38.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$9,150.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20,124.47. E. (9) \$20,322.62.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,823.85. E. (9) \$840.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,386.38. E. (9) \$12,323.74.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,683.83. E. (9) \$4,306.97.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$650. E. (9) \$42.41.

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. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$758.52.

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. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (9) \$5,393.60.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,681.93. E. (9) \$835.90.

A. Vaux Owen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,307.38. E. (9) \$12.50.

A. Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rufus W. Peckham, Jr., 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$491.90.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$491.90.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sanford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$4.75.

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) \$23.40.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$10.50.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grant S. Ray, 114 Huron Drive, Forest Heights, Washington, D.C.

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. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$800.06.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Kollsman Industries Inc., 2005 North Hawthorne Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,000.

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) \$1,598.55. E. (9) \$103.75.

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. E. (9) \$220.

A. Rossmoor Corp., Post Office Box 125, Seal Beach, Calif.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Edward C. Rustigan, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United Air Lines, Inc., Box 8800, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; et al.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$350.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

E. (9) \$513.48.

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) \$1,398.68. E. (9) \$332.15.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$228.29.

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) \$2,288.50. E. (9) \$270.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,292.37. E. (9) \$542.26.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Garvey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$220.02.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) \$577.98. E. (9) \$629.33.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$50.30.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Royal Globe Insurance Cos., 150 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.

E. (9) \$100.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, Tokyo.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, No. 11, 3-chome, Denma-cho, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc.

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.; Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$10.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$225.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$909.63. E. (9) \$909.63.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$958.33. E. (9) \$5.64.

A. J. B. Thayne, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,406.24. E. (9) \$21.60.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

E. (9) \$60.40.

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. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,034.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$24.50.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$200.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$636.35. E. (9) \$636.35.

A. Arvin E. Upton and Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee on Radiation Protection & Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$11.12.

A. Veterans of 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.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, ORC & B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$4,841.73.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) \$4,514.15. E. (9) \$1,644.77.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$233.68.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federation Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,323.73. E. (9) \$3,323.73.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,464.25. E. (9) \$99.62.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

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) \$8,063.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1963:

(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.

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

Year: 19-----

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 of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(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. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$17.50.
- A. V. J. Adduci, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,284. E. (9) \$659.23.
- A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$9,876.22. E. (9) \$9,876.22.
- A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
- A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$903.
- A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,911.25. E. (9) \$2,911.25.
- A. George Venable Allen, 4370 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., and 22 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Edwin N. Altman.
 B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$699.99.
- A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$67.75.
- 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) \$7,295.73.
- A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$25,384. E. (9) \$25,348.
- A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations.
 E. (9) \$29,393.03.
- A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$15,562.50. E. (9) \$19,010.89.
- A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$187,039.90. E. (9) \$7,334.
- A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$365.37. E. (9) \$425.05.
- A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
 D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$2.
- A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 D. (6) \$74,108.83. E. (9) \$33,299.22.
- A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$293.86. E. (9) \$10.90.
- A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,399.98. E. (9) \$73.10.
- A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$9,519.25.
- A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
 D. (6) \$6,074.88. E. (9) \$6,074.88.
- A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$522.20. E. (9) \$522.20.
- 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) \$2,589.37. E. (9) \$2,141.35.
- A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$33,652. E. (9) \$11,691.
- A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,606.17. E. (9) \$3,606.17.
- A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Certain cement companies.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$20.25.
- A. American Textile Machinery Association, Westfield, Mass.
 D. (6) \$216.61.
- A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
 D. (6) \$9,750.50. E. (9) \$9,750.50.
- A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$72,308.50. E. (9) \$400.
- A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
- 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. Larry Andrews, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Trade Relations Council of the U.S., Inc.
- A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
 B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
 B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
 D. (6) \$24.80. E. (9) \$446.65.
- A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,750. E. (9) \$2,059.74.
- A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$1,178.24.
- A. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Association of American Physicians & 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) \$8,691.60. E. (9) \$8,691.60.
- A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,544.16. E. (9) \$2,544.16.
- A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Association of Oil Pipelines, 1725 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 E. (9) \$200.
- A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.
- A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$84.
- A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
 D. (6) \$2,457.75. E. (9) \$497.06.
- A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$208.80.
- A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
 B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$960.
- A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
 D. (6) \$244. E. (9) \$65.35.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$119.32.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Osmero L. Bartelli, 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. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$374. E. (9) \$92.50.

A. William B. Barton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

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) \$781.59.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & 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) \$874.99.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,569. E. (9) \$779.22.

A. John H. Beidler, 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) \$168.07.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Muncey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$9.75.

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) \$5,250.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 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) \$4,680. E. (9) \$297.92.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes 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, et al.
E. (9) \$179.22.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$150.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$17.91.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$385.

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, 1025 Connecticut Avenue 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. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

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) \$7,262.50. E. (9) \$354.75.

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.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Benjamin W. Boley, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$164.35.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$247.55.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1209 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$712.50. E. (9) \$45.56.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

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. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) \$618.34.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

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) \$500 E. (9) \$100.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$481.58.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,526.12. E. (9) \$2,526.12.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50.

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) \$250. E. (9) \$23.46.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,452.66.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$522. E. (9) \$501.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$8.65.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Roselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$128.15.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$203.55.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$79.73.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$5,286.32. E. (9) \$349.35.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,300. E. (9) \$4.38.

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) \$190. E. (9) \$190.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

E. (9) \$91.95.

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, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$52.50.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$863. E. (9) \$1,541.45.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$100.03.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$760.20. E. (9) \$60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$304.88.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$304.88.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Roselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) \$3,461.15. E. (9) \$5,752.72.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C.3.

A. John T. Carlton.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,400. E. (9) \$228.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 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) \$125.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corp., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$3,235.28.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. 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) \$20.

A. Francis E. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$560. E. (9) \$92.35.

A. Armand Chankallian, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. United Builders Association of New York, Inc., 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C., and 118 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$4.50.

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 & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$2.50.

A. Chapman & 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.

E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Jeppesen & Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

E. (9) \$527.27.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Strohmeier & Arpe Co., 139-141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$6.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$49.61.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Baldoras No. 36-Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) \$8,750. E. (9) \$13.20.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

D. (6) \$2,550. E. (9) \$700.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

E. (9) \$37.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$2,618.45. E. (9) \$2,618.45.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,800. E. (9) \$6,535.72.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$954. E. (9) \$90.25.

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. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,321.80.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

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) \$781.25. E. (9) \$213.34.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building Service Employees International Union, 316 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$261.54. E. (9) \$11.15.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$18,650.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$198.99.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, Reading, Pa.

E. (9) \$228.55.

A. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$753.75. E. (9) \$753.75.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$21,768.79. E. (9) \$9,057.41.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Cooley, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M 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) \$852. E. (9) \$1,701.24.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 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) \$3,331.30.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,962.53. E. (9) \$7,962.53.

A. Donald M. Coughlin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Coughlin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

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) \$38.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Fourteen cement companies.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$880.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ten Canadian investment companies.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$735.02.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Dyestuffs & Chemicals, Inc., 2307 North 11th Street, St. Louis, Mo.

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. 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. The North American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass., and The British Cycle & Motor Cycle Industries Association, Ltd., Eaton Road, Coventry, England.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
- A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
 B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 200 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$1.15.
- A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
 B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$470.65.
- A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
- 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) \$3,682. E. (9) \$703.25.
- A. Bryce Curry, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,400.
- 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.
 E. (9) \$67.75.
- 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, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
 B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
 D. (6) \$1,411.12. E. (9) \$3,053.50.
- A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$764.58. E. (9) \$27.14.
- A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$35,005. E. (9) \$1,025.62.
- A. Clarence A. Davis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.
 D. (6) \$625.
- A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
 D. (6) \$89. E. (9) \$89.
- 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) \$15,966.
- A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Committee of Consumer Finance Companies, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of the District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.
- A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$601.12.
- A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$472.50.
- A. Tony T. Dechant.
 B. The Farmers' Educational & 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. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$35.39.
- A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$420.
- 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.
 D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$15.
- A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,687.50. E. (9) \$279.03.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
 D. (6) \$2,314.55. E. (9) \$89.55.
- 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. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
 D. (6) \$1,107.92. E. (9) \$207.92.
- A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
 D. (6) \$1,915.73. E. (9) \$115.73.
- A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 E. (9) \$4,693.28.
- A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$6.80.
- A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$23,551.24. E. (9) \$23,120.95.
- A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes 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 Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$285. E. (9) \$111.26.
- A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$441.
- A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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.
- A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
 D. (6) \$900.
- A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$150.
- A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$609.25.
- 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) \$1,874.11. E. (9) \$197.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,160. E. (9) \$1,527.27.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office 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. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1.88. E. (9) \$26.63.

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.

A. Walter A. Edward, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$100.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) \$3,125.04. E. (9) \$328.52.

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) \$52.15.

A. D. Howard Elliott, 207 Darlington Road, Beaver Falls, Pa.

E. (9) \$80.

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.

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) \$63.75. E. (9) \$5.29.

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) \$48.

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) \$20. E. (9) \$2.40.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$468.

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. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,600.

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) \$3,030.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$615.39. E. (9) \$58.40.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$15.70.

A. Clint Fair, 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) \$115.82.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$5,850. E. (9) \$1,200.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$87,823.51. E. (9) \$28,857.57.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Republic of China, Chinese Government Procurement & Services Mission, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Federation of Regular Taxpayers, Route 4, Box 58, Hastings, Mich.

D. (6) \$117.50. E. (9) \$103.03.

A. Joseph G. Fenney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$300.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,415.94.

A. Edward O'Brien Fennell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Air Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 6800, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$75.55.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$367.96.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 700 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 700 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Employment Association, 260 Southfield Road, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,920. E. (9) \$122.

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, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,187.50. E. (9) \$9.63.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,800.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,553.55.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,425. E. (9) \$172.72.

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) \$170.

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) \$478.
- A. George R. Frankovich.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207-11 Sheraton-Biltmore, Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$591.88.
- 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.
- 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) \$22,490.22. E. (9) \$6,575.15.
- 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. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.
- A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
- A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$500.
- A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) \$7.32.
- A. Marion E. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$2.40.
- 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.
- A. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
- A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's 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 Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association & American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$1,211.
- A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- A. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$3,000.
- A. Philip Goldstein, 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) \$10,608.84. E. (9) \$6,953.97.
- A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$77.27.
- A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$8,649.24. E. (9) \$8,649.24.
- A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$15.14.
- 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 R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$23.22.
- 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) \$120. E. (9) \$11.18.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) \$23.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilson Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) \$17.35.
- A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., American Mining Congress, and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$2,650.
- A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,131.65.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$954. E. (9) \$29.65.
- A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. J. G. Hall, 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. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$13,800. E. (9) \$117.11.
- 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., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$125.
- A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$720. E. (9) \$363.84.

- A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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) \$4,666.68. E. (9) \$478.32.
- A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,541.67. E. (9) \$28.33.
- A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$2,481. E. (9) \$619.82.
- 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) \$156.25. E. (9) \$12.04.
- 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. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$11.30.
- A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$50.25.
- A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,427.75. E. (9) \$1,427.75.
- 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) \$28.66.
- A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) \$18.53.
- A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$700.
- A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cannerns Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$806.12.
- A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- 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) \$2,097.16. E. (9) \$972.16.
- 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) \$1,725.03.
- 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) \$282.76. E. (9) \$282.76.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$39.60.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) \$17.35.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) 75.54.
- 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) \$496.25.
- 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.
E. (9) \$50.
- A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,166.67. E. (9) \$52.10.
- 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) \$340.
- A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$35.00.
- 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. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$4,693.28.
- A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.
E. (9) \$30.08.
- A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.
- A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. M. Berlin, Washington, D.C., et al.
D. (6) \$1. E. (9) \$336.
- A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5.
- A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
- A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
- A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,905.10. E. (9) \$9,905.10.
- A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$10,583.99.
- A. International Economic Policy Association, Legislative Committee, 1625 I Street, Washington, D.C.
- A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$2,750.
- A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$2,762.50. E. (9) \$4.20.
- A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$730. E. (9) \$985.35.
- 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 Jaspán, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
- B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,725.01. E. (9) \$63.50.
- A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 737 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$5,981.48.
- 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, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$250.64. E. (9) \$7.04.
- A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkeley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkeley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Reuben L. Johnson.
- 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) \$3,200.19. E. (9) \$137.25.
- 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.
D. (6) \$216. E. (9) \$381.45.
- 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) \$35.75.
- A. Edwin W. Kaler, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) \$50.
- 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) \$2,187.50. E. (9) \$852.69.
- A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.
- A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$116.77.
- A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$300.
- A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 9864 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E. (9) \$275.
- A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$82.27.
- A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.
- A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. John T. Kelly, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.
- 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. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) \$210.55.
- 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) \$1,482.45. E. (9) \$2,164.71.
- 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) \$1,581.78. E. (9) \$1,457.25.
- A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$12.50.
- A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$246.25.
- A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$114.75. E. (9) \$3.15.
- 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 LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$725.
- A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) \$1,775. E. (9) \$1,775.
- A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
- B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$630. E. (9) \$72.32.
- 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. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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) \$25.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. Wall Street Traders, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
- B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$3,526.64.
- A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,648. E. (9) \$508.14.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,667.68. E. (9) \$6,034.67.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Employer National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$2,999.96.

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. 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) \$195.12. E. (9) \$4.20.

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) \$98.25.

A. Phillip S. Leahy, 1334 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) \$88.13. E. (9) \$200.04.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$38.00.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$110. E. (9) \$102.24.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,175. E. (9) \$62.56.

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) \$1,354.34.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$6. E. (9) \$18.30.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$10,767.87. E. (9) \$10,767.87.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$10.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 55 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$574.18.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,184.09.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$510. E. (9) \$59.65.

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. Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport 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 & Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.

D. (6) \$1,300.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue and 82d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$79.19.

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. Western Medical Corp., 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Milton F. Lurch, 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, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,395.83. E. (9) \$52.60.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,884.56.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 745 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

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) \$2,846.08. E. (9) \$245.40.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$23.11. E. (9) \$7.75.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,208.30. E. (9) \$42.23.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Fur Manufacturers, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$222.75. E. (9) \$3.34.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$91.71.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$940.50. E. (9) \$174.96.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$339.34.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Peanut Butter Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$100.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,412.85.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$171.50.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$537.51.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207-211 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.

D. (6) \$18,120. E. (9) \$2,195.83.

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) \$4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$187.89.

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, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$2.60.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$389.71. E. (9) \$246.20.

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 & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$463.50.

A. Lawrence S. Martin, 919 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers.

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) \$1,342.73. E. (9) \$217.73.

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. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building & Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,492.52.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

E. (9) \$294.76.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$558.56. E. (9) \$377.71.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$243.75. E. (9) \$42.14.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,136.40. E. (9) \$43.45.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$2,802.60. E. (9) \$10.50.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations.

D. (6) \$3,419.

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) \$2,450. E. (9) \$3,675.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) \$1,508.45.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

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, 912 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$60.

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. 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) \$3,090.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Textile Association, Abitibi Power & Paper Co., and Theisen-Clemens Co.

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) \$429.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive, St. Louis, Mo.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Bachelor, La.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$52.60. E. (9) \$110.48.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) \$1,820. E. (9) \$52.18.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$1,450. E. (9) \$385.

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) \$420.19.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

- A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$699.99.
- A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$900.
- A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$2,203.20. E. (9) \$67.90.
- 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. 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 Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$493.50. E. (9) \$641.12.
- A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Direct Selling Co., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$13,750. E. (9) \$15.78.
- A. National Association of Electric Co., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$62,339.36. E. (9) \$9,163.33.
- A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$267.50. E. (9) \$17.50.
- A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$35,048.99. E. (9) \$1,500.
- A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$8,776.11.
- A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,287.82. E. (9) \$2,287.82.
- A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling 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) \$7,559.51.
- A. National Association of Postmasters of the U.S., 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$124,752. E. (9) \$1,710.
- A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,423.10. E. (9) \$2,497.60.
- A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
- A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$25,899.80. E. (9) \$682.50.
- 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) \$5,094.50. E. (9) \$327.18.
- A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,297.37. E. (9) \$7,297.37.
- A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$340,749.80. E. (9) \$5,324.96.
- A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$4,000.
- A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$5,929.17.
- A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$7,259.72. E. (9) \$7,259.72.
- A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,188. E. (9) \$5,800.
- 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 Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,823.55. E. (9) \$1,783.12.
- A. National League of Insured Savings Association, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Member associations of the league.
D. (6) \$400,455.08. E. (9) \$2,937.16.
- A. National Life & Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$56.56.
- A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,832. E. (9) \$1,832.
- A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$3,455. E. (9) \$3,455.
- A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,811.97. E. (9) \$10,354.60.
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,274.65. E. (9) \$4,274.65.
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$785.49.
- A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$42,570. E. (9) \$18,000.
- A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,825. E. (9) \$13,640.51.
- 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.
E. (9) \$4,696.96.
- A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$30,780. E. (9) \$12,697.62.
- A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$680.10.
- A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$230,482. E. (9) \$1,988.67.
- A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$20.
- A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,115.94. E. (9) \$3,679.42.
- A. Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,100. E. (9) \$10,091.50.
- A. Robert E. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$168.75. E. (9) \$42.41.
- A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$475.55. E. (9) \$475.55.
- 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 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) \$1,599.77. E. (9) \$1,732.47.
- A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$574.50.
- A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$915.84. E. (9) \$598.70.
- 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) \$1,500. 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) \$437.50. E. (9) \$90.66.
- A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) \$446.37.
- A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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. E. (9) \$66.38.
- 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.
D. (6) \$3,724.98. E. (9) \$298.37.
- A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- 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) \$28,188.70.
- A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$424.12.
- 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) \$173.40.
- 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. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$38.52. E. (9) \$2.
- A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$3,726. E. (9) \$192.88.
- A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$22.
- A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon 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.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$923.10.
- A. William Edison Owen, 215 C Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manning Clagget, Robert Smith, John Underwood, all of Accokeek, Md.
- A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.
- 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.
D. (6) \$205.62. E. (9) \$106.14.
- A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$9,750.
- A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
- A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.
- 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) \$143.50.
- A. James G. Patton.
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) \$1,650. E. (9) \$1,423.87.
- A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) \$700.
- A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$54.52.
- A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) \$1,900. E. (9) \$40.64.
- A. Hart Perry, 57 East 74th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$6.05.
- A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$43.50.
- A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$21.
- A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$9.90.
- A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$326.67.
- A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$268.13. E. (9) \$50.30.
- 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) \$2,955.
- A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) \$1,940.64.
- A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) \$196,696.82. E. (9) \$1,350.
- A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- 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.
- A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$23.90.
- 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) \$2,125. E. (9) \$300.
- 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) \$6,500.
- A. William R. Pringle, 23640 Bryden Road, Cleveland, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$1.95.
- A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) \$57.15.
- A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,375. E. (9) \$429.05
- A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) \$12,249.97. E. (9) \$7,523.07.
- A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$114.24.
- 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) \$176.15. E. (9) \$125.95.
- 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. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.
- A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- 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. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,300.01. E. (9) \$3,618.04.
- A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$205.70.
- A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- 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) \$91,902.25.
- A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,284. E. (9) \$7,695.26.
- A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.
- A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Ind.), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,133.34. E. (9) \$15.
- A. Harry R. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) \$32.25. E. (9) \$105.39.
- 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. Committee of Consumer Finance Co., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
- 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.
- A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,124.98. E. (9) \$228.81.
- 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) \$146.75.
- A. Eugene Ritzner, 2400 Benedict Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.
- 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. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
- 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) \$175.
- A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 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) \$526.
- A. T. J. Ross & Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$6,075.49.
- A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1123 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. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port au Prince, Haiti.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$102. E. (9) \$110.64.
- A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$23.05.
- 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, et al.
- A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,500. E. (9) \$146.96.
- A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$54.15.
- 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. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$4,300.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., 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, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$140.79. E. (9) \$248.

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) \$147.45.

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) \$1,065.63. E. (9) \$112.90.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$451.27.

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 Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$968.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$249.99.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, 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.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$25.

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) \$94.95.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 508 International Trade Mart, 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) \$1,750. E. (9) \$100.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) \$3,030.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

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) \$71.03.

A. Stephen Slipper, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,812.50. E. (9) \$13.80.

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. E. (9) \$182.

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 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,609.19. E. (9) \$1,579.15.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$798. E. (9) \$187.89.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.01. E. (9) \$200.20.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$74.35.

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) \$1,557.68.

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) \$5,458.52. E. (9) \$3,768.14.

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 Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$868.90.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$45,961.17. E. (9) \$4,335.52.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$729.17. E. (9) \$8.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$127.80.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$260.

A. Frank S. Steele, Post Office Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

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. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$21,791.47. E. (9) \$5,052.65.

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) \$262.60.

A. O. R. Strackbeln, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglalla Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewis-ton, N.Y.

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. 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) \$1,272.97. E. (9) \$1,215.95.

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) \$216.84.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$22.92. E. (9) \$15.96.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,437.50. E. (9) \$46.13.

A. Mrs. 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, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,447.91. E. (9) \$24.04.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$169.58.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

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) \$345. E. (9) \$7.20.

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) \$151.77.

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) \$314.41.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,357.58. E. (9) \$1,404.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$80.05.

A. Trade Relations Council of the U.S. Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,816.67. E. (9) \$61.55.

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) \$1,812.50. E. (9) \$78.70.

A. Alben W. Barkley Truitt.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$692.35. E. (9) \$25.33.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$850.

A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., 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. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$12.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) \$915.13.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,309.14.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$410,281.68. E. (9) \$46,114.57.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$32,045.17.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 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) \$2,249.91. E. (9) \$15.

A. W. M. Vaughey, Box 4268, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venn, Cole & Associates, Inc., Dupont Plaza Center, Miami, Fla.

B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street 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) \$43.22. E. (9) \$3.86.

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) \$200. E. (9) \$100.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.

B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) \$519.40. E. (9) \$565.59.

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) \$552.50. E. (9) \$13.91.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$298.75. E. (9) \$20.83.

A. William A. Walton, room 309, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. Kansas Railroad Committee, room 309, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,400.77. E. (9) \$2,163.11.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$216.35.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,190. E. (9) \$10,106.61.

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 City.

B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$603.15.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$200.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$3.13.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$16.87.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. City of Redondo Beach, Municipal Building, Redondo Beach, Calif.
D. (6) \$250.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,689.98. E. (9) \$440.30.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$3,865.06.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$78.60.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$99,517.92. E. (9) \$10.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) \$4,625.01. E. (9) \$2,428.70.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$203.97.

A. John C. White, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$1,024.05.

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) \$3.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) \$1.86.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) \$2.12.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinalet Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) \$1.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) \$1.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sugar Producers Association of El Salvador, San Salvador.

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. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,666. E. (9) \$70.42.

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) \$475. E. (9) \$144.35.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$311.28.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$308.60.

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) \$1,600.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$51.85.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$35.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$315.13.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$350.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

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) \$0.75.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$1,440. E. (9) \$144.52.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

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) \$4,760.75.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

ATTENTIVE

Printed in printing

PAGE 14

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1963:

(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	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
 - (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
- (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.
2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of 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. Ablard & Harrison, 930 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Basilio King, Natividad Building, Manila, Philippines.

A. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Beacon Agency, Inc., Broad & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Bergman, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. William S. Bergman, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Garvey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sam Boyce, 414 Second Street, Newport, Ark.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and National Association of Taxicab Owners, 803 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Douglas Burke, 3336 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick P. Burns, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C.3.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Strohmeier & Arpe Co., 139-141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Toni-Michelle Chapman, 1081 Irving Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gwendolyn Clayton, 3574 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cold War Council, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Mayers Co., Inc., 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William K. Condrell, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gary Edward Crom, 45 Madison Lane, South, Newport News, Va.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mahogany Associates, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickins & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Merritt S. Deitz, Jr., 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Duane G. Derrick, Jr., 1615 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Harry J. Donohue, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ariel Dougherty, 3317 Que Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mike Ferri, 3720 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Employment Association, 260 Southfield Road, Detroit, Mich.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Unitarian Universalist Women, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Fisher, Sharlitt, Hydeman & Gelband, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation & Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claudia M. Frazee, 3030 Macomb Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. I. C. Glendenning, 401 Thomas Avenue, Riverton, N.J.

B. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Taxation Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Haley, Bader & Potts, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Harris, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Holton, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Home Owners of America, Inc., 144 East 24th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Marion L. Horn, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Aaron L. Jayson, 623 Central Avenue, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.

B. National Council of Yacht Clubs, Box 125, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Edwin L. Kahn, 1000 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. League of New York Theatres, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Leary, 18 Bell's Mill Road, Erdenheim, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leslie Lincoln, 2932 Upton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James C. Lucas, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stanley J. McCutcheon, 315 Fourth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Marathon Oil Co.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. National and California League of Senior Citizens.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fur Manufacturers Association, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mary McWhirter, 737 Sixth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Peanut Butter Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

A. Mahogany Association, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry Mayers, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Mayers Co., Inc., 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theaters, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 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 J. Murphy, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

B. National Customs Service Association, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

A. National Association of Government Employees, 10 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Council of Yacht Clubs, Box 125, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Neale, Newman, Bradshaw, Freeman & Neale, 705 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo.

B. Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc.

A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Noland, 1100 Circle Tower, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Southern Railway System, 15th and K Streets, Washington, D.C.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.

B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William R. Pringle, 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.

B. Western Cotton Growers, Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Scott, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ben Seaver, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian H. Singman, 1832 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Forest Industries Association, 2319 Lloyd Center, Portland, Oreg.

A. John T. Skelly, 161 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee to Promote American-Made Motion Pictures, 6721 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Coffee Agreement, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Menahem Stim, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Rifkin Textile Corp., 566 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Irving S. Cohen, Inc., 257 West 39th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick N. Suttle, Jr., 411 Hiden Boulevard, Newport News, Va.

A. Alben W. Barkley Truitt, 1404 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. William M. Vaughey, Box 4268, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Venn, Cole & Associates, Inc., Dupont Plaza Center, Miami, Fla.

B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. City of Redondo Beach, Municipal Building, Redondo Beach, Calif.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.

A. Linda Bell Zimmer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Burma, Nationalist China, Hong Kong, and Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the normal, human urge to gamble can be found in almost every country around the world—in Europe, in Africa, in Latin America, in the Middle East, and in the Far East. In 77 countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the Members of this House to the Far East and talk about the government-run lotteries in Burma, in Nationalist China, in Hong Kong, and in Indonesia.

Burma began its lottery operations in 1938 when the British ruled and has continued ever since. The total gross receipts for 1962 were almost \$7 million. The net income to the Government came to over \$2½ million. While there is no actual earmarking of the profits, lottery proceeds have been used for social welfare, housing, and similar governmental activities.

Nationalist China has only one state-operated lottery which is called the liberty lottery. In 1962, the gross annual receipts came to \$3,689,000. The total income to the Government was \$1,916,000 which was used for general fiscal purposes.

Hong Kong has only recently gone into the lottery business. Its first lottery was held July 7, 1962. Yet, the results of the two lotteries held in 1962 showed gross receipts of over \$1 million. The total net income to the Hong Kong government was almost one-half million dollars which was allocated to expenditures for the purpose of social welfare. The fascinating part is that there was considerable interest in the lottery, and the ticket sales and profit to the government went well above its expectations—so

much so that the Hong Kong lottery is firmly established as the new form of painless taxation.

Indonesia is another Far East country which sensibly and realistically recognizes that the urge to gamble is a universal, instinctive human trait which should be controlled and regulated with a national lottery. The total gross annual receipts for 1962 came to \$8 million. After payment of prizes, the total net revenue to the Government came to \$2 million. This revenue is paid into a special fund which finances various social welfare projects.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as smart as these governments? Why can we not be as logical and as sensible in our treatment of our own people? Yes, why can we not follow the example of New Hampshire? A national lottery in the United States can easily produce over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue which can help cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Civil Defense Officials Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the day-to-day rush of our duties, seldom do we in the Congress have occasion to take note of the quiet, dedicated work being carried on by our civil defense officials.

Though their numbers are few, these men and women constitute a devoted and conscientious group of public servants. Their work seldom hits the headlines, but they daily do battle with public apathy in an effort to build our preparedness against a day we pray will never come.

The work of these people was brought home to me a few weeks ago when I was privileged to take part in a ceremony marking a fallout shelter in the Fort Worth National Bank Building.

It was the first fallout shelter officially marked in Office of Civil Defense Region 5, which is under the direction of William C. Parker in Denton, Tex.

Since that time I have been informed that Noble Shepherd and the staff of the Fort Worth civil defense office have carried out a 3-day shelter stocking program called "Operation Big Lift." A total of 478,194 pounds of survival items for 47,084 shelter spaces were placed in 33 Fort Worth buildings licensed as public fallout shelters.

Forty-one truck lines, coordinated by the Fort Worth chapter of the NDTA, donated an estimated \$10,000 in equipment and personnel to handle the movement. In addition, 89 volunteers assisted in the loading and unloading operations at the depot and shelter points throughout the city.

To Mr. Parker, Mr. Shepherd and the staff and volunteers devoting themselves to these efforts, I would like to extend my personal thanks and congratulations.

Results of the 1963 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listed below are the results of the questionnaire I mailed out to my district in Nebraska during the last week in March. Approximately 45,000 were mailed out and returns totaled almost 20 percent.

It is interesting to note that the people of the Third District in Nebraska want less Federal Government rather than more; that they still believe strongly in the principles of free enterprise and getting ahead through the efforts of individual initiative.

Replies, as you will note, are overwhelmingly in opposition to some of the major proposals before the 88th Congress.

There has been absolutely no demand, according to my mail, for programs such as the National Youth Opportunities Act or the Domestic Peace Corps. There is strong opposition to both of these proposals. The demand seems to come from the minds of a few social do-gooders here in Washington who would like to experiment along these lines at the taxpayers' expense to the tune of a good many millions of dollars.

One of the two most significant results of this questionnaire is question 10, which asks, "Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?" Ninety-one percent replied favorably, with only 4.5 percent in the negative.

Polls by other members on this question have brought overwhelming "yes" votes.

Another answer which is particularly significant is question 13(c), which asks if they favor "taking whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime in Cuba." Sixty-eight and two-tenths percent, or over two-thirds, replied favorably and only 14 percent voted "no," with 17.8 percent "not sure."

I trust that the Members will study the results of this poll, as I believe that it is indicative of a majority of our citizens' thinking throughout the country. The recent wheat referendum was a manifesto that our citizens want less, rather than more, Government control and want a cutback in our spending program.

The questionnaire follows:

Results of the 1963 questionnaire

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a \$12,000,000,000 deficit budget. Should Congress—			
a. cut taxes regardless of deficit?	10.2	86.7	3.6
b. cut taxes only if spending is reduced?	72.8	22.1	5.1
c. reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?	92.7	4.3	3.0
2. Do you favor the present feed grain program for agriculture?	14.7	56.5	28.8
3. Do you favor the present wheat program for agriculture?	13.0	60.6	26.4
4. Should the Federal Government provide funds for—			
a. public school construction?	13.6	81.3	5.1
b. public school teachers' salaries?	4.8	93.3	1.9
c. loans and scholarships for college students?	34.1	55.1	10.8
d. grants for outstanding elementary and secondary school level teachers to attend universities for further study on subjects they teach?	23.9	67.3	8.8
e. should the full responsibility for primary and secondary education be left to State and local communities?	89.6	7.2	3.2
5. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC of the thirties at a cost of \$100,000,000 the 1st year?	10.6	78.6	10.8
6. Do you favor establishment of a "domestic" Peace Corps?	14.4	68.9	16.7
7. Should Congress pass my bill to increase the duties on both live animals and dressed meat imported into the United States?	86.3	6.7	7.7
8. Do you feel that the United Nations is an effective force for world peace?	26.3	52.8	20.9
9. Do you favor—			
a. The King-Anderson medicare bill which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security?	8.4	85.4	6.2
b. Federal legislation which would allow an income-tax deduction for senior citizens to reimburse them for the cost of a health and hospitalization insurance policy taken out with a private insurance company?	57.5	27.7	14.8
10. Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?	91.0	4.5	4.5
11. Do you think that Congress should appropriate \$460,000,000 in Federal funds for the construction of public fallout shelters?	7.1	79.6	13.3
12. We are spending \$4,200,000,000 on foreign aid this year. Do you feel that this program should be—			
a. continued at present levels?	3.7	93.2	3.1
b. continued, but cut?	63.0	30.8	6.2
c. gradually reduced until terminated?	80.3	15.2	4.5
d. immediately terminated?	35.8	53.2	11.0
13. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should—			
a. continue its present policies?	14.1	71.1	14.8
b. impose a strict embargo to prevent any additional war materials from reaching Cuba until all Communist arms and men are withdrawn?	85.7	7.2	7.1
c. Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?	68.2	14.0	17.8

The Fort Michilimackinac Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call attention to an historic observance which will take place beginning Thursday, May 30, 1963, for 4 days, at Mackinaw City, Cheboygan, Petoskey, and Harbor Springs.

I refer to the Lacrosse-Fort Michilimackinac bicentennial celebration to commemorate the massacre of June 3, 1763, at the Straits of Mackinac.

The people of the richly historic Mackinac Straits area, where Michigan's two beautiful peninsulas are tied together by the magnificent Mackinac Bridge, have arranged these activities to mark this event in the history of the settlement of the Northwest.

A dramatic reenactment of the massacre professionally produced with a cast of hundreds will take place at Fort Michilimackinac on the actual spot where the original massacre occurred. During the 4-day commemorative, beginning on Memorial Day, there will be additional activities characteristic of the period in which the original events took place. This will include tomahawk and knife throwing, muzzle-loader shoots, archery, and canoe handling. There also will be three modern games of lacrosse between

two of the Nation's foremost lacrosse teams. This one concession to modernity arises out of the fact that the game from which lacrosse has been developed—the Indian game of bagaway—was the ruse by means of which the Indians were successful in achieving their goal of eliminating the garrison.

Let me tell you the story of this American Trojan horse in the very words of Capt. George Etherington, commandant of Fort Michilimackinac on that fateful day written 9 days later on June 12, 1763, to Major Gladwin, commandant of the British fort at Detroit, which itself was besieged by the Indian nations under the great Chief Pontiac. This is a direct transcript from Captain Etherington's letter:

MICHLIMACKINAC,

June 12, 1763.

SIR: Notwithstanding what I wrot you in my last that all the Savages were amical and that everything seem'd in perfect tranquillity—yet on the second instant the Chipaways who live in aplain near this Fort appointed to play ball, as they had done almost every day since their arrival. They play'd from morning till noon then throwing their ball close to the Gate and observing Lieut. Lesley and me afew paces out of it, they came behind us, seiz'd and carried us in to the Woods.

In the mean time the rest rush'd into the Fort, where they found their squas whom they had previously planted there with their hatchets hid under Blankets which they took and in an instant kild Lieut. James and fifteen rank & file and a Trader named Tracy, they wounded two and took the rest of the Garrison prisoners five of which they have since kild.

The massacre was part of the conspiracy of Chief Pontiac and developed in the backwash of the Seven Years' War between the French and British. At the conclusion of the Seven Years' War the British and French signed a peace treaty but the British either forgot to sign a treaty with the Algonquins or chose to simply ignore them.

This meant that as far as the Indians were concerned they were still at war with the British. To them the "French Father," was merely asleep and would one day awaken and regain his former eminence in the New World.

Chief Pontiac, who was shrewd and intelligent and who would have been a great general in any army, was, for the moment, however, ready to concede that the British were dominant and he is reported to have approached them with a request for a commission—the rank of general—in the British army. He was turned down. It was, in part, this slight as well as the Algonquin conviction that they were still at war with the redcoats that led Pontiac to plot a campaign which he believed would drive the British out of the Northwest forever.

His plot was simplicity itself. The British had a number of outposts around the Great Lakes which they had either won from the French or had founded themselves. Among these outposts and forts were Fort Michilimackinac, St. Joseph, Green Bay, Fort Pitt, Niagara, Sandusky. Pontiac's plan was to mount Indian attacks against all these posts simultaneously. And his plan worked,

and all up and down the frontier the British outposts were falling to the Algonquins. Nine posts in all were captured at about the same time. And though Pontiac had won the day, he eventually lost his war as the British juggernaut continued to roll through the wilderness, reclaiming the outposts from the Indians.

There is much for the student, tourist, and sightseer to enjoy at the Straits of Mackinac. The old fort has been restored to its original 18th century condition through the combined efforts of Michigan State University and the Mackinac Island State Park Commission. The fort looks now just as it did on the eve of that fateful lacrosse game.

On behalf of the bicentennial committee, may I extend to all of you a cordial invitation to visit the straits area, particularly the restored forts at Mackinaw City and Mackinac Island.

1963 Armed Forces Day Celebration at Fort Devens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a speech that I recently made on the occasion of Armed Forces Day at Fort Devens, Mass., in my district:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN ON ARMED FORCES DAY, FORT DEVENS, MASS.

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to join with you today at Fort Devens in your inspiring Armed Forces Day celebration.

I am very thankful to General Verbeck for his considerate invitation, and for the fine, outstanding record which he, his able staff, and all the officers and enlisted men of this great command have made for the Army and the national defense.

In community and district, we have always been most fortunate in having notable, splendid commanding officers and other officers and enlisted personnel at Fort Devens. Let me assure you that we have been very proud of the magnificent services this command has rendered to the Nation and the world throughout the years.

Fort Devens is one of our great Army posts and we have every reason always to be proud of its marked contributions to the security of the Nation.

If I may strike a personal note today, I don't suppose that Fort Devens or any other military post has ever had a finer, more capable, efficient, dedicated commanding officer than Gen. William J. Verbeck.

I know he is a man of great modesty and humility but I think it must be said here today that we consider General Verbeck as one of the outstanding commanders of our Armed Forces. A general officer of great ability and humane spirit, considerate of all the personnel of his command and most gracious and helpful in his public and community relations. I am very happy to hail and salute him as a truly great military leader and great American, and I wish for

him and Mrs. Verbeck and their lovely family, continued success, good health and all choicest blessings in the future. We will long remember his fine work at Fort Devens and I will ever be grateful for his cooperation and help in behalf of our people.

Fortunately for us, for our Nation and the world, on this Armed Forces Day, we are in a position to make a high and confident appraisal of the state of readiness, efficiency and power of our armed services.

We are faced with an insidious Communist conspiracy which seeks to dominate the world and suppress the liberties of freemen and women. The one great deterrent that is effectively preventing world communism from spreading its influence and control and imposing the evils of tyranny and oppression upon the world has been, is and will continue to be, the strength, power and readiness of our armed services, our great free enterprise system which backs them up, and the will and determination of the American people to preserve our blessed heritage, come what may.

Let us ever be mindful of the great debt we owe to those in every generation who have protected our great land, and those who will continue in the years to come, as long as it may be necessary, to deter the potential enemies of this Nation and the free world, whoever they may be.

Let us today take example from the struggles and sacrifices that so many have made, and are making, to keep this Nation free and safe and inspired by our spiritual ideals, political truths and the promise and faith of our great free destiny.

On this Armed Forces Day and always, let us continue to strive harder than ever through strength, wisdom and justice for lasting freedom and enduring peace in the world.

The International Game of Russian Roulette Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Sudeten German Day will be observed in Stuttgart, Germany, on June 1 through 3, 1963. This is an annual observance which attracts between 300,000 and 500,000 German people. This year sessions of the assembly will be addressed by the President of the German Republic, Federal Minister Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, the Prime Minister of Baden-Wurtemberg and leading members of the Bundestag.

The motto of this year's assembly is "Free Homeland—United Europe."

Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the message which I sent to this important European meeting:

THE INTERNATIONAL GAME OF RUSSIAN ROULETTE MUST BE STOPPED

I am pleased to send warm greetings and best wishes to all taking part in the annual Sudeten German Day. The theme you have selected for your annual meeting "Free Homeland—United Europe" is most fitting. It expresses the basic political principles which bind together in common cause civilized people on all the continents. But it has

special application to Europe, the historic seat of Western civilization, and the well-spring of the great moral and political values which undergird the foundations of free institutions in the New World.

For centuries imperial Russia, the historic seat of despotism and reactionary thought, has reaped a rich harvest from a divided Europe. It was the practice of the autocratic czars to spread the seeds of discord among the civilized European nations and to drive their leaders into conflict with one another. Every conflict between the advanced European nations increased the imperial power of Moscow. This is a fact of history we must face with reality.

The present Russian dictators are carrying on the predatory traditions of the czars. They have split Europe by the force of arms and they maintain that unnatural and dangerous partition by military occupation and government by terror. An iron curtain has been erected by imperial Russia to mark this dangerous division of civilized Europe. Behind that iron curtain are many once free and independent nations such as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Armenia, Georgia, among others. The peoples of all those captive nations have strong, historic attachments to the culture and ideals of free Europe. All of them are non-Russians who, in this century, have enjoyed the blessings of self-government. The continuing demand of these captive peoples for governments of their own free choice and their aspirations for freedom and national independence have served as a powerful brake on the aggressive and imperial ambitions of Moscow. Continued Russian resistance against the legitimate aspirations of these highly civilized peoples has made Central-East Europe into a volatile, political tinderbox. The growing aspirations of these captive peoples for freedom and national independence and the continuing efforts of imperial Russia to impose upon them a feudal and primitive way of life has created a serious threat of bloody revolutions and war.

That threat must be removed. Peaceful arbitration of that conflict is imperative. Universal application of the principle of national self-determination, under United Nations supervision, must be applied to that vast area of conflict without delay. The self-evident alternative is bloody revolutions and wars of liberation into freedom which could escalate into a thermonuclear holocaust. To delay action on the peaceful resolution of this volatile political conflict is to court disaster.

Part of this explosive political problem is the partition of Germany by imperial Russia. The people of now free Germany have established a government of their own choice, are masters of their destiny and enjoy the blessings of self-government. In fulfilling their aspirations the people of Germany have had the full support and encouragement of the Western nations. But the Russians have pursued a contrary course with respect to the German territories they occupied at the close of World War II. There a rump government of Moscow stooges has been imposed upon the people. All basic liberties and freedoms are denied the people. The feudal and primitive system of imperial Russia is being forced upon the people. Eighteen years after the close of hostilities the Russians continue a full-scale occupation of a large part of Germany. To emphasize the intention of imperial Russia to make this unnatural partition of Germany a permanent feature of European life, the Russians undertook the highly provocative action of erecting the Berlin wall. That wall stands as a testament to Russian inhumanity—an admission that only the exercise of brute force can prevent the German

people from fulfilling their aspirations for a free and united Germany, under a government of their own free choice and through a system which guarantees popular consent by the governed.

President Kennedy has warned the Russian leaders that a continuation of their false partition of Germany is fraught with dangerous consequences. In his memorable reply to the most recent Russian ultimatum on Berlin and Germany, President Kennedy underscored that danger and proposed a peaceful settlement based upon the freely expressed wishes of the people directly concerned. I quote the most pertinent part of his peaceful proposal:

"The U.S. Government continues to believe that there will be no real solution of the German problem, nor any real tranquillity in central Europe, until the German people are reunited in peace and freedom on the basis of the universally recognized principle of self-determination."

President Kennedy made that proposal in July 1961, now almost 2 years ago. The Russians refused to consider it and have continued along their dangerous path of provocations and wholesale denials of basic human rights. Thus, the Muscovites are playing a game of Russian roulette with the pent-up and explosive aspirations of all the non-Russian peoples imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. We must stop that game of Russian roulette before the human explosion which is sure to result plunges the world into another war.

I know you join with me in looking forward to the early and universal application of the principle of national self-determination as the only practical means of preventing war. All people who sincerely want peace will call out for this remedy. All who believe in human freedom and justice are working toward this peaceful settlement. All of Europe must be reunited in peace and freedom. Attainment of that objective binds all civilized people in a common cause.

Commemoration of the Brave Japanese-American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there will be a poignant moment in a commemorative program on June 2, 1963, at Arlington National Cemetery when every citizen of the United States should pause to remember with remorse that Americans of Japanese ancestry were misjudged and mistreated at the beginning of World War II; that their subsequent history shows brilliant military achievement; and that they are paying respect to all American war dead and to their own sons who made the supreme sacrifice. In the war hysteria after the attack on Pearl Harbor, these people, of whom there were about 110,000 residing on the Pacific coast, had their patriotism impugned, their property confiscated, and their liberties restrained. They were taken into custody and transported to inland internment camps and the young people denied entry into military service.

The occasion for the gesture of tribute will be at services on Sunday, sponsored by the Japanese American League during which a wreath will be laid at the Tomb of the Unknowns in tribute to all war dead. The services also include commemoration of the Nisei dead in Arlington National Cemetery of whom there are 21, 4 from Idaho.

After 2 years of internment, there was a change of heart on the part of the Government and President Roosevelt declared the Nisei were eligible for military service. More than 33,000 were inducted into the Army and formed into 2 special units, the 442d Regimental Combat Team and the 101st Battalion. Their achievements in the field of battle were spectacular, gallant, and courageous.

The 101st was named "The Purple Heart Battalion" because of the tremendous casualties. The 442d became the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service. Seven unit citations were awarded and for seven major campaigns in Italy and France.

Among the 18,143 individual decorations for bravery were one Congressional Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, one Distinguished Service Medal, 28 oak leaf clusters to the Silver Star, 560 Silver Stars, 22 Legions of Merit, 15 Soldiers Medals, approximately 1,200 oak leaf clusters to the Bronze Star Medals, approximately 4,000 Bronze Star medals, 12 French Croix de Guerre, 2 palms to the French Croix de Guerre, 2 Italian Medals for military service.

President Truman declared—

The record is documented by episodes of highest valor. Yet the noblest evidence of their devotion to America is that in fighting for their own country, those assigned to the Pacific theater had to fight their own race. This they did, knowing that in victory for the American cause was victory for all mankind.

Coming from Idaho to take part in the commemorative services are Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima of Pocatello, who have two sons in Arlington National Cemetery, and Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakami, of Pocatello, who have one son interred in the hallowed ground there. Another Idaho soldier interred there is the son of Mr. H. Nagano, Blackfoot.

As my tribute to the brave Nisei, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of their names and their parents so that the roster may become a permanent part of the archives of Congress:

NISEI INTERRED AT ARLINGTON

1. Hada, Pfc. Victor K., parents, the Hada family, Nixon, Tex.
2. Ishida, Sgt. Haruo, mother, Mrs. A. Ishida, Milwaukee, Wis.
3. Kokubu, Cpl. Jimmie T., sister, Mrs. Charles Fujisaki, Brighton, Colo.
4. Kuge, Pfc. Tamotsu Thomas, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Kuge, Chicago, Ill.
5. Masaoka, Pvt. Ben Frank, mother, Mrs. H. Masaoka, Los Angeles, Calif.
6. Matsumoto T3g. Hisao, wife, Mrs. Tayeko Matsumoto, Springfield, Va.
7. Morihiro, Pfc. Roy T., parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Morihiro, Los Angeles, Calif.

8. Murakami, Pfc. Kiyoshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakami, Pocatello, Idaho.

9. Nagano, Pvt. Hiroshi, mother, Mrs. H. Nagano, Blackfoot, Idaho.

10. Nagato, Pfc. Fumitake, parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. Nagato, Los Angeles, Calif.

11. Nakamura, Pfc. John M., mother, Mrs. William Nakamura, Flint, Mich.

12. Nakashima, Pvt. Raito, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.

13. Nakashima, Sgt. Wataru, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.

14. Oba, Pvt. Stanley Takeshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. Y. Oba, Portland, Oreg.

15. Onoye, Pfc. Lloyd Mitsuru, sister, Mrs. Ira Shimasaki, Bethesda, Md.

16. Shimizu, T. Sgt. Jimmy T., sister, Miss Mary Shimizu, Seattle, Wash.

17. Shiozawa, Pvt. Roy R., father, Heijiro Shiozawa, Clearfield, Utah.

18. Tanaka, Pfc. John, mother, Mrs. T. Tanaka, Denver, Colo.

19. Tanamachi, Pfc. Saburo, mother, Mrs. K. Tanamachi, San Benito, Tex.

20. Toyota, Pfc. Shichizo, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Toyota, Wickliffe, Ohio.

21. Yamaguchi, T4g. George T., mother, Mrs. Masaye Yamaguchi, Chicago, Ill.

And, as a tribute to the parents of all Nisei military dead and in appreciation of the living and their fine example of citizenship, I offer the closing paragraph of their touching creed:

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places, to support her Constitution, to obey her laws, to respect her flag, to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

The creed was written by Mike Mat-saoka.

Let's Not Sell Ourselves Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the Henry and Stanley Cichon Post, the American Legion; the Cespino-Russo Post, the American Legion; and the Staten Island Memorial Day Service sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County, at Hero Park, Staten Island, N.Y.:

LET'S NOT SELL OURSELVES SHORT

Gentlemen and ladies, to those of us who have seen service in our country's wars this day holds a particular and cherished significance. It is a day the years roll away, a day when we see ourselves once again in Korea, on the beaches of Normandy or Okinawa, or perhaps in the Meuse-Argonne, or to a few in the fast-thinning ranks of 1898, on San Juan Hill. Whatever our war—and wars haven't changed basically since Caesar's time—our remembrances are much the same. We recall the comradeship, the mounting tenseness and excitement as our

ships or planes neared a foreign shore, and the satisfaction of meeting hardship and hazard steadfastly and proudly. Most of the bitterness, the fear and the grief has been washed away by the healing process of time. In your reminiscences with old comrades, you dwell largely on the humorous aspects of service life—or those that seem humorous now but might have been grim indeed at the time. Such as the conversation overheard by one of my friends, whose squad was under fire from a Japanese machinegun on the island of Saipan. One of the riflemen, apropos of nothing at all, remarked to his buddy: "I wish I was a civilian." Whereupon the other, with a wondering look, replied: "Where? Here?"

Those are the bits and pieces of war that remain green and fresh in the memory. But there are other, more important memories that must be kept green and fresh if we are to be worthy of those who shared the experience of war with us but who did not live to share our reminiscences. Each of us who saw combat can recall the sudden, crushing finality of a friend's death in action.

Let us call a muster roll of those who gave their lives in order that we might be free—and bear in mind that these few figures I give you are only those who were killed in action—in the Revolution, 4,435; in the War of 1812, 2,260; in the Mexican War, 1,733; in the Civil War, 140,414 of the Blue and 74,524 of the Gray; in the Spanish-American War, 385; in World War I, 53,402; in World War II, 291,557; and, in the Korean War, 33,629. Those totals are the cost of freedom. It is a somber balance sheet and, to those of us who were spared to carry on, it must remain a debt of honor that can be paid only if we maintain the resolute faith in ourselves and in our cause that we once so stoutly shared with those who, in Lincoln's immortal words, gave the last full measure of devotion.

We are in a period of unsurpassed material prosperity. Our standard of living has risen beyond the wildest dreams of even the most optimistic economist of two decades ago. Our industry turns out a seemingly inexhaustible array of goods that is the marvel and the envy of the world. Our political system, though it has its imperfections, is generally conceded to be the most equitable thus far devised by man. We are, on balance, the preeminent power in the world.

Yet with all this we, as a nation, seem to be in a period of self-doubt, irresolution, timidity, and even fearfulness. It is very likely that our development of the atomic bomb and our subsequent decision to end the Pacific war with it sowed the seed of guilt in some who today argue that we should strip ourselves of such weapons and entrust ourselves to the dubious mercies of the Kremlin. That the bomb saved hundreds of thousands of lives—Japanese as well as our own—by making an invasion of Japan unnecessary is seldom pointed out.

On every side we see ban-the-bomb groups, composed, I am sure, mainly of sincere, well-meaning people, advocating unilateral disarmament—on our part, of course—if that is the only means of banning the bomb. Their cry is the familiar, "Better Red than dead," and they imply that those who wish to keep our atomic defensive arsenal—on the ground of commonsense—are in some way advocating a nuclear holocaust. To me, this is akin to disarming a policeman on the ground that a hoodlum might be provoked into violence by the sight of the officer's weapon. Unfortunately, these groups create an impression out of all proportion to their numbers and through emotionalism attract many who do not take the time to think the matter out. No one in his right mind advocates a nuclear war; but neither does anyone in his right mind advocate laying down his weapons in the face of an armed enemy.

There are those, too, who are quick to seize upon any internal difficulty in the United States and, with much hand wringing, see in it the signs of decay in our democracy. The civil rights crisis in Birmingham is a case in point. Naturally, the Kremlin has wrung every ounce of anti-American propaganda out of this distressing situation. But our own Cassandras are almost as bad. Conveniently overlooking the great strides the Negro has made in the past decades, they wait that Southern opposition to integration is destroying our "democratic image" and giving aid and comfort to our enemies. To hear them talk, you would think prejudice and bigotry were American inventions. Yet how many of them do you hear condemning anti-Semitism in Russia, a country whose record of Jewish oppression is second only to that of Germany under Hitler? Examined objectively, the claims of these doomsayers that the American way is decaying are, of course, utter nonsense.

Integration is becoming a fact in the South, and peacefully for the most part. But those who take alarm at this struggle, and in the other conflicts that are part and parcel of a dynamic democracy, are persuasive, they have access to the press and the airwaves, and they succeed in sowing a certain amount of doubt in ourselves. The other side of the story is told so seldom that we tend to forget there is another side. And so we wonder * * * are we slipping as a nation? Are we becoming decadent?

When our faith in ourselves begins to weaken, we tend to endow our enemies with far more strength than they possess. It is historically true that we, as a nation, either underestimate or overestimate our foes. In the 1930's, we dismissed the Japanese threat quite airily; our Navy could sink theirs in a day; their Army was primitive; they had no industrial capacity, and so on. Then came Pearl Harbor. Overnight, the Japanese became supermen. When a lone Japanese submarine lobbed a few ineffective shells at an oil refinery on the California coast, the fainthearts spoke wildly of retiring behind the Rocky Mountains to carry on the war from there. Ultimately, of course, we realized what had been true along—though tenacious fighters, the Japanese had no chance from the start in a war with a highly developed industrial nation like the United States. But I detect signs that this lesson is being forgotten, that the doom-sayers and the propagandists have created in us a feeling that the Russians are supermen and their leader, Khrushchev, is a man of consummate cunning whose thought processes are as infallible as the reckoning of a computer. Think back to the day a few years ago when the Reds launched their Sputnik.

From the ensuing uproar you could have been led to believe that the United States had no space program. We became intently self-critical—not that I am against self-criticism, which, in moderate doses can be constructive—and began to question our educational system, our industrial know-how, and the skills of our scientists. Of course, there was nothing seriously wrong in any of those areas. Yet, today, with the cheers for Gordon Cooper still ringing in our ears, there are those who will tell you—on scanty evidence—that the Russians are far, far ahead of us in the race to the moon. In certain aspects of rocketry, perhaps they are ahead of us slightly. But a good deal of what the Russians claim must be accepted on faith. I want to remind you that nobody, but nobody, in the free world has ever witnessed a Russian space shot. Contrast this strange secretiveness with our launchings—conducted openly with the whole world invited to watch. Yet too many of us feel, in a vague sort of way, that we are behind the Russians in the space race.

This tendency to overestimate the Russians is encroaching into another area, also—the field of history. As World War II recedes down the corridor of time, you hear and read more and more that "Russia won the war in Europe." And you hear it from those who should know better. This, of course, is what Russia wants the world to believe—the Russians also teach that they won the Pacific war singlehanded—and more and more people have been lulled into believing it. But here the Russians cannot hide behind their curtain of secrecy; there are facts and figures, long since swept under the rug, that paint an entirely different picture. Before we buy this myth of the super-Russians, let's, as Al Smith used to say, look at the record.

First, let's examine the Russians' vaunted political acumen and their so-called unrivaled intelligence system. The late tyrant, Stalin, as we know, had a reputation for perceptiveness and guile in his dealings with foreign nations. Yet how many of you know that this same, all-wise Stalin actually believed that Adolf Hitler would honor his non-aggression pact with Russia? And that despite their boasted spy network, the Russians had no inkling of the German attack until one of their division commanders noticed a cloud of dust mounting over the Polish frontier one morning in 1941? Under that cloud of dust were the Nazi armored columns.

It is known now that the Germans were vastly outnumbered in Russia; so much so that most of the general staff corps felt they were courting disaster in challenging the overwhelming and—theoretically—highly skilled Soviet army. We know what happened. The Russian troops disintegrated before the advancing Germans; thousands upon thousands of Russian soldiers simply threw down their arms and surrendered. Others joined the Germans against their own country. The Russians fell back almost to the gates of Moscow. And then, surprisingly, the tide began to turn. The Russians gave it out that their heroic troops and their mighty industry, single-handedly threw back the foe. But what actually happened? Well, we were in the war by that time, and the answer is provided in an official Army history—widely unread, I am unhappy to say—that was published some 10 years ago. It has to do with a dry subject—lend-lease aid—but in this book are facts and figures that every American should know. They will enable us to refute those who would distort history and undermine our faith in ourselves.

This history, written by T. H. Vall Motter, tells us that American deliveries through the Persian corridor to the U.S.S.R. were sufficient, by the standards of our own Army, to maintain 60—and I emphasize that figure, 60—Russian combat divisions in the line. Now, remember that the Persian Gulf corridor was only one of five routes by which we supplied the Soviets. And this corridor carried only 28.8 percent of the grand total of 17,499,861 tons of cargo shipped to Russia from the Western Hemisphere between June 22, 1941, and September 20, 1945.

Mr. Motter points out that almost half of these Russian-aid supplies reached the Soviet Union via a sealane which extended from American Pacific ports around to the north of Honshu. Because of the peculiar situation by which Japan winked at the traffic to her ally's enemy, only supplies classified as nonmilitary were carried. But the rest of these supplies were military. More than 8,500,000 tons of strictly military materiel—enough to maintain from 150 to 200 Russian divisions—were sent to the Soviet from the United States, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of tons contributed by our Allies. Now, consider this item: we shipped to Russia 14,834 military aircraft, a total that was very likely larger than the entire Soviet World War II air

force. And consider this item: we shipped to Russia 409,526 trucks—a truly staggering number and a total that represented 7½ months of our output at peak war production and was the equivalent of 2 years and 7 months of the prewar capacity of the vaunted Soviet industrial machine. What this effort cost in money will be forever unknown; we wrote off the military supplies as a part of the war effort and have been negotiating, unsuccessfully, of course, with the Soviets for the balance ever since the end of World War II.

In effect, we underwrote the Russian Army—not only in tanks, planes, arms, and ammunition, but even to the point of preparing a special Red army ration in this country to be canned and shipped to the Soviets. Out of some 250 to 350 Russian divisions in the line against the Germans, we maintained at least half of them. Now the historians say that our aid was a major contribution to the Russian victory. I will go a great deal further than that. I say that the Russian victory over the Germans was "made in the U.S.A." I say further that not only did the Russians not defeat the Germans singlehandedly, as they boast, that they would have damned well lost their war if it had not been for our help. And there is something else we should remember. We accomplished this stupendous feat while raising and magnificently equipping an armed force of 10 million men; while building the greatest Air Force and Navy the world had ever seen; while simultaneously fighting two wars in two hemispheres, and while maintaining an adequate if not luxurious civilian economy at home. If the label of "supermen" is to be handed out, it should be handed out to ourselves, not to the Russians. Remember this when the subtle propagandists and the doubters and the handwringers contrive to weaken your faith in yourself and in your country. Tell them of the long muster roll of the dead—those men whom we honor today—whose willingness to sacrifice their lives has proved again and again down the years that our moral fiber is as strong now as it was at Bunker Hill and at Gettysburg. When you are told that Americans are too preoccupied with material gain to fight for a cause, too lacking in stamina and spirit to fight gallantly against hopeless odds, remind them of the Alamo, of the Little Big Horn, where Custer and his troopers died to the last man, of Wake Island, and of Bastogne.

And above all, let us remind ourselves of our obligation to those to whom we do honor today. That obligation is to keep brightly burning the faith in ourselves and in our institutions that is the United States. Perhaps we are too prone to measure the caliber of our Nation in terms of its gross national product, its image abroad, and currently its posture in the space race. The greatness of a people lies in their faith, not in their production. No armed enemy will conquer this country. It can only succumb through default, and where there is faith there can be no default.

In closing, I should like to leave you with what, to me, is one of the most inspiring credos I have ever heard. It was written by Mr. Dean Alfange, who calls it, and I quote, "My Creed." It is also mine, and I hope it will be yours. I quote.

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon, if I can. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the state calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor

my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and to say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Thank you.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before the Subcommittee on Poultry of the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman appeared before the Poultry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I felt that Secretary Freeman's remarks were so important that they should be brought to the attention of every member of this body:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POULTRY, OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MAY 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this subcommittee and discuss developments in export markets for U.S. poultry, particularly in the European Common Market. I think this group knows that poultry probably represents our outstanding success story in developing a new market abroad. I can say without hesitation that I have spent as much time, as much energy, in trying to maintain and improve the channels of commerce for poultry as I have on any other product in the foreign trade field.

The history of U.S. poultry shipments to the Common Market—primarily to West Germany—is relatively recent. By this time it is fairly well known history. But it adds up to an outstanding market development effort and will bear repeating.

The export program got underway in 1956, when members of the poultry industry and officials of the Department of Agriculture concluded that West Germany could be an excellent market for U.S. frozen poultry. This feeling persisted despite the skepticism of most German food importers, who seriously doubted that they could sell frozen, yellow-skinned, ready-to-cook birds. Germans preferred, so the argument went, fresh-killed, white-skinned, unfrozen poultry. The United States nevertheless went ahead with plans to give German consumers a chance to try our product. In 1956 the Department of Agriculture provided financial assistance for the first shipment of 4 million pounds of poultry to West Germany so as to keep the price of those first samples at a reasonable level.

The German poultry trade was astounded at the reception U.S. frozen birds got. I rather suspect that the German enthusiasm surprised even the most optimistic American suppliers. At any rate, German consumers turned out to be eager buyers. Poultry stocks were soon exhausted. (At about the

same time, a comparably successful sales effort was made in Switzerland, but without any Government assistance.) Exports of poultry continued to increase. From virtually nothing in 1955, poultry sales to West Germany in 1962 reached the high total of 152 million pounds.

But let me make one point right here. German consumers were enthusiastic about U.S. poultry, but the West German Government was not. Despite the fact that their duty was bound under the GATT as 15 percent they were most reluctant to remove quantitative restrictions against poultry imports. As the result of strong pressure by our Government, these restrictions were relaxed in a piecemeal fashion and finally were ended only 2 years ago. When these were removed our exports shot up dramatically. For the first 12 months after liberalization our poultry exports doubled to West Germany.

While this is an outstanding example of market development, there have been many other remarkable achievements by our agricultural groups cooperating with the Department in our market development effort. I was heartened the other day to note that our agricultural exports during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year—through April—were \$4,175 million, practically as large as the \$4,197 million exported through April of last year. And you will recall that last year's exports of \$5.1 billion were at record high. I consider this year's performance, in the face of record competitive crops abroad, particularly of cotton and grains, and our shipping strike last December, a tribute to the merchandising efforts of our agricultural exporters and the ingenuity of our cooperators in developing and maintaining new foreign outlets for their products.

Last year we were confronted with a new situation, far more complex and difficult than the German import restrictions. I refer to the poultry regulation of the EEC Commission in Brussels—which was and is the series of rules regulating both internal and external trade of the Community.

The Common Market's protective system is not a single levy. It is a complex of levies and charges.

First of all, the EEC has established what it calls a gate price, which is simply a minimum import price. We had been told on more than one occasion that this gate price was being established to prevent dumping by state-trading countries, such as those in Eastern Europe. By the time the regulation appeared, however, the intent and purpose of the gate price had been altered drastically. The purpose of the gate price came to be a protective wall. It presumably was based upon production costs in third countries, such as Denmark and the United States, but we found no relationship between the gate price and our own costs. The gate price was established at a landed price of about 33 cents a pound for ready-to-cook broilers, and it has been a long time since our domestic prices for broilers have reflected a landed price as high as this figure.

In addition to the gate price, the EEC Commission established what they called the poultry levy. For outside countries, such as the United States, this levy consists of three parts: (1) the old ad valorem tariff existing prior to the issuance of the poultry regulation, but with a slight downward adjustment; (2) the difference in value of feed grains need to produce a pound of broilers inside and outside of the Community; and (3) a 2-percent ad valorem duty, to give a preference to producers within the Community.

I realize that these are complex details. I'll try to clarify them. They mean simply this: A few years ago German consumers were able to buy U.S. poultry by paying a 5-cent-

a-pound import duty. At that rate, U.S. producers could compete with other suppliers. Today, the total import fees have been jumped to 13 cents a pound. Because our exporters can land broiler chickens at Hamburg for roughly 30 to 31 cents a pound, these levies figure out at about 43 percent ad valorem, a most highly restrictive—in fact, I should say—highly excessive rate.

I might say at this point that many months before the new poultry regulation became effective we had stressed to EEC officials that a marked, sudden increase in the 5-cent-a-pound duty could severely damage our export trade. Despite our representations, the change in duties became effective overnight. On July 29 the duty was 5 cents per pound. The next day it jumped to about 10 cents a pound, and shortly thereafter to 13 cents a pound on broilers. And of course this group knows of the harmful effects that this high protective rate had on our exports.

Only part of the problem is with broilers. West Germany used to buy millions of pounds of backs and necks from our broiler industry because of the great popularity of soups and stew in West Germany. Before EEC, these backs and necks used to be landed in Germany for about one-third of the price of whole broilers—or about 10 cents a pound. However, because backs and necks were competing with European-produced stewing hens, the EEC decided to step up the tariff on these parts to extremely high rates. And how they stepped them up. EEC set the gate price and poultry levy for backs and necks at 125 percent of that imposed on whole birds—the same percentage adopted for other poultry parts, such as breasts.

What have been the effects of this complicated system on trade?

First of all, this system has really worked to limit imports from "outside countries" to the markets of the Community, particularly West Germany. Our trade has suffered the most. For the first 9 months of the new system, West German imports of poultry from all sources have dropped to 70 percent of the previous year's comparable 9-month period.

Sharp gains have been achieved by Belgium and France, and the Netherlands has about held its own. So the drop in trade has been at the expense of outside countries—particularly the United States. Imports of U.S. poultry were only about 40 percent of the 1961-62 level and only about 75 percent of the 1960-61 level. U.S. shipments of broilers and stewing hens have been hit especially hard—in contrast to turkeys where, despite the higher levies, we have almost held our own.

But there are problems within the Community as well. The poultry regulation permits heavy subsidies—which they term "restitution"—to be made. This has permitted one Common Market country to cut its export price on shipments to West Germany over 10 cents a pound as compared with its internal prices. The use of these subsidies is being contested strongly by other member countries. As a result, the poultry market in West Germany has suffered considerable disruption. This internal squabble over conditions of fair competition is being hotly debated in Brussels, and is a matter which must be resolved by the member countries. But it certainly is adding complications to our problem.

Nor are problems created by the poultry import system of the Community ending at its borders. Spillover effects have been created. Another "outside" exporting country, whose market in the Community has been curtailed, has responded by aggressively expanding its exports to Switzerland, our second most important export outlet. It has done so, by selling poultry in the Swiss market—as best we can tell—at a price about

15 cents per pound lower than in its home market. As a result, our share of the Swiss market has been cut in half.

These in brief are the problems. What has been done about them?

We have taken vigorous steps to protect our rights. The President has taken a strong personal hand in this matter, and has urged Common Market officials to modify the protective elements of the system to improve access for our poultry. U.S. Ambassadors, our agricultural attachés, have joined in this process. I can state unequivocally that we have had the wholehearted cooperation, at both the technical and policy level, of the whole machinery of our Government in trying to achieve a reasonable solution to this problem. On all my trips to Europe, and in my conversations with Common Market officials visiting here in Washington, I have hammered away at this issue. Nor should we forget that we have had the full cooperation of the U.S. poultry industry in this effort. In this connection, I particularly want to compliment the American Institute of Poultry Industries, which has done so much to help build this market.

We've kept the poultry problem alive on the negotiating table. We haven't let it be swept under the rug.

In a sense, we feel that as poultry goes, so go our overall trade prospects. We believe we must meet the challenge to our poultry trade, not only because of the merits of the product itself, but because of the symbolic importance it has to all our agricultural trade.

What we are seeking, and what we think it is reasonable for us to obtain, according to any reasonable interpretation of international trade rules and policies, is fair access to the European market for our poultry. And we would define fair access to mean modifications in the EEC poultry system to permit us to maintain the same share of the market that we had attained prior to the start of the common agricultural policy. After all, we are providing access, in our own market, to a wide range of EEC products, including many agricultural products. I could mention a few—wines, ham, cheese, fruit and vegetable products, and even a certain amount of poultry products.

In our efforts to obtain relief, we have urged modifications of the existing system. This does not mean that we have accepted in principle the equity of the various elements of the system.

For example, we have insisted that it is unfair to impose the gate price against products received from countries—such as our own—which do not subsidize poultry exports. We have argued the inequity of applying, arbitrarily, high levies on poultry parts—such as backs and necks. We have urged reductions in the grain component of the poultry levy, because we believe that it over compensates for the costs added to poultry by the higher grain prices in the Common Market system.

Despite all our efforts, I can only list two instances where the poultry system has been liberalized. The first of these occurred late last fall when the EEC Commission decided to impose a uniform supplemental levy to replace the individual invoice method of enforcing the gate price. For a while, it appeared that the West German Government was trying to collect two gate price charges—the one under the old as well as the one in the new system. At that time I was in Europe, and protested this case of apparent double jeopardy to Commissioner Mansholt. He assured me that this threat of dual charges was a mistake, and would be corrected. It was.

Also, we had been seeking a more equitable application of the gate price and levy on poultry parts—particularly backs and necks. As I mentioned earlier, these charges origi-

nally were set at 125 percent of those imposed on whole birds. Here again, strong representations were made to Community officials. And about a month ago, the Commission lowered the protective level to 60 percent. So now the total charges collected for backs and necks are around 18 cents per pound—7 cents less than before. We still think that this level is overly protective, but it should give some measure of relief to this area of our trade.

One of the things that we have been pounding away at is the feed conversion factor used in the gate price-levy system. From the start, we have been convinced that it was set too high. In order to convince the Commission that this element of the system should be modified, we sent a team of competent poultry experts to the Community last January. I think they did an outstanding job. As a result of their efforts, and, I am sure, independent studies by Commission experts, the EEC Commission proposed in late March, a lowering of the gate price and levy—based on reduced feed conversion factors. The total amount of the reduction proposed was 1.83 cents per pound. This would mean a reduction in the total charge against imports of U.S. broilers into West Germany from just under 13 to a little over 11 cents per pound. Although we believe that the feed conversion factors are still higher than they should be, the Commission proposal is a step in the right direction.

This proposal has not yet been acted upon by the EEC Council of Ministers. It must be approved unanimously by them before it can become effective. We have, of course, lent our strongest support to the Commission proposal in representations made at the capitols of the six countries. We have made it clear that in our view we cannot wait for a resolution of this matter beyond the meeting of this Council which will take place on May 30 or 31.

We are, of course, hopeful that the decision will be favorable. But if the meeting does not bring results, I think that we will have to take an entirely different approach.

We have been patient, perhaps overly patient, in seeking a solution within the existing system. We have demonstrated to Community officials that our trade has been damaged by the new system. And the Commission has acknowledged that remedial action is called for.

The next step in the process would be to invoke our negotiating rights under the so-called standstill agreement concluded as part of the settlement in the last round of tariff negotiations with the Community. Under this agreement, the Community is committed to negotiate with us regarding access to its market for our poultry products. You remember that before the close of the Dillon round of tariff negotiations there was a great urgency to complete the tariff bargain, but we were loathe to close the book on a system such as this which could seriously hurt our trade. Finally, at our insistence, this agreement was concluded with the Community.

We would, of course, carry to the negotiating table the rights we held with respect to poultry as of September 1, 1960. We regard these as extremely valuable rights. They encompassed a large and growing volume of trade at a fixed, reasonable rate of duty.

I would hasten to explain that although the Community is required to negotiate with us, we must come to a mutual agreement as to what constitutes reasonable access for our poultry products based on our negotiating rights.

Should we fail to agree—and, of course, our aim first and foremost is to protect our poultry trade—our only recourse would be to redress the tariff bargain—which is what the Community did when we raised our duties last year on imports of carpets and glass.

Finally, let me say a few words about the implications of the recently concluded GATT ministerial meeting. At that session, the U.S. delegate, Gov. Christian Herter, said that agriculture must be included in the negotiations. He said that the United States could not agree to the closing of negotiations until satisfactory terms of access were developed for agricultural products. The Ministers accepted the recommendation of the United States that agriculture be included in the negotiations. I am greatly encouraged by this decision. Despite all the problems that remain to be worked out, the Ministers have accepted the principle that agricultural negotiations must be worked out side by side with industry.

For the first time, agriculture no longer will be sitting in the corner at these negotiations. Under this administration, agriculture will be sitting as an equal partner at the bargaining table. We're no longer Peck's bad boy. In this negotiation we will be examining, jointly with other countries, the fundamentals of our production and price policies—in other words, the elements of our different systems which affect trade. We welcome this kind of examination on a truly reciprocal basis, since for many commodities there is such widespread governmental influence on both the level of trade and the prices at which commodities are traded. I am convinced that this examination will indicate the relatively liberal access that foreign suppliers enjoy in the U.S. market for a wide range of agricultural products. On the basis of true reciprocity, I think we can expect and demand more liberal access for our exports to foreign countries.

The road ahead will be difficult, but there can be no misunderstanding of the firm intention of our Government to resolve trade problems of the kind we've been talking about today in a fair and equitable manner. Without such solutions, trade negotiations will not be concluded.

Part I. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read with grave concern the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions by Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, discussing the former herein.

Senator FULBRIGHT spoke on the subject "Is Government by the People Possible?" and answers the question in the first sentence of his article, thus:

The question before us can be answered simply: Government by the people is possible but highly improbable.

This statement and conclusion in itself is alarming enough, but when coupled with other observations, gives cause for real concern as to the outspoken critics of the traditional American concept of "Government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Senator FULBRIGHT, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded that "we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs" and surprisingly reaches that conclusion on the basis of two premises which he feels dictates the downgrading of congressional constitutional functions in foreign policy. The premises he uses are, first, that the foreign policy difficulties of the Kennedy administration are to be blamed on "diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches" and second, that "the foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's policy, but not itself to initiate or shape policy."

Senator FULBRIGHT suggests that the President become endowed with greater power and authority, resulting obviously in the diminution of congressional powers by acquiescence, because "the Presidential Office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale." In support of this he quotes Walter Lippmann who makes an amazing and almost unbelievably broad indictment of representative government in stating "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the government" has developed and that "the people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern." He follows this with a general downgrading of the Congressman's will or ability to make basic decisions in the interests of the Nation.

The article follows verbatim, with an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 28, 1963, commenting thereon entitled: "A Proposal To Junk the Republic."

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1963]

A PROPOSAL TO JUNK THE REPUBLIC

Never before in our history would a politician in the position of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, have dared suggest, as the Senator has, that we scrap our constitutional system of checks and balances and make it impossible for Congress to "thwart" the President's plans. He would have been instantly, almost universally, and justifiably denounced as a traitor to the principles upon which this Republic was founded.

Yet such is precisely the proposal now made by Mr. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and another Democrat, Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in a pamphlet issued by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions under the suggestive title, "The Elite and the Electorate."

"The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution," Mr. FULBRIGHT complains, "enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals. * * * The

defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought."

Defects? Maybe there are defects in Congress, but where have the most dangerous mistakes been made? Who fumbled the Bay of Pigs invasion by pulling off air cover? Who tells us that we must allow the Government to manage our news? Certainly not Congress; these mistakes can be blamed solely on the executive branch of the Government, whose powers Mr. FULBRIGHT would increase.

Indeed Mr. FULBRIGHT himself is for managed news. "Public opinion," he says, "must be educated and led * * *. This is preeminently a task for Presidential leadership."

The Constitution, in Mr. FULBRIGHT'S opinion, is hopelessly outdated. "Government by the people is possible, but highly improbable." Which means, we suppose, that the Revolutionary and Civil Wars were fought in vain, and that the Gettysburg Address can be relegated to the file of historical trivia. The electorate are incapable, through their Representatives in Congress, of running the country; their duties must be handed over to the elite, who, we suppose, inhabit the west wing of the White House and the executive departments.

Congressmen are too susceptible to pressure groups, according to Mr. FULBRIGHT. "Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected, and opportunities lost * * *. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between the executive and legislative branches."

Does Mr. FULBRIGHT suggest that employees of the executive departments are immune to pressure? Does he prefer the risk of bad decisions made by executive fiat to the chance that good programs may occasionally be delayed by Congress? Does he forget that Congress is there as much to prevent mad programs as to enact good ones?

In the past, we repeat, Mr. FULBRIGHT would not have dared make such suggestions. But now we're on a New Frontier, where the President can casually dismiss the Constitution as something "written under entirely different conditions," and where Ambassador Stevenson can deplore old-fashioned patriotism as an obstacle to the hegemony of the United Nations.

And a leading member of the Kennedy team asks us to junk our heritage and substitute the volatile sort of autocracy which General de Gaulle has imposed in France. We're asked to submit to the sort of one-man rule which exists under Mayor Daley in Chicago, where crooked elections are the order of the day.

Let us not forget that this is the same Mr. FULBRIGHT who accused President Eisenhower of muzzling the generals, inhibiting free speech, and usurping the powers of Congress. What better evidence is there that his latest proposal is designed not simply to subordinate Congress to the President, but to subordinate all opposition, and indeed the whole electorate, to the will of a clique which presumptuously regards itself as the elite?

THE ELITE AND THE ELECTORATE

(By Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT)

The question before us can be answered simply: government by the people is possible but highly improbable. The difficulties of self-government are manifest throughout the world.

The history of political thought in the last century and a half is largely one of qualification, modification, and outright repudiation of the heady democratic optimism of the 18th century. "The play is still on," writes Carl Becker, "and we are still betting on freedom of the mind, but the outcome seems now somewhat more dubious than it did

in Jefferson's time, because a century and a half of experience makes it clear that men do not in fact always use their freedom of speech and of the press in quite the rational and disinterested way they are supposed to."

The major preoccupation of democratic thought in our time has been its continuing and troubled effort to reconcile the irrefutable evidences of human weakness and irrationality, which modern history has so abundantly provided, with a political philosophy whose very foundation is the assumption of human goodness and reason. The dilemma has troubled all of the free societies of the West, none more so than the United States, whose national experience until a generation ago seemed to represent the realization of classical democratic theory.

In addition to defects of concept and content, classical democratic thought is marked by a strikingly unhistoric spirit. It grandly and inexplicably conceived of democratic society as an organ created by a single act of human will and reason, ignoring the empirical lessons of the centuries of English history through which representative government had been tortuously evolving in the face of numberless obstacles and diversions. If Englishmen could fall prey to such delusions, it was far easier for Americans, whose revolution lent some credence to the abstractions of rationalist philosophy.

The revolutionaries of 1776 inherited a society that was already the freest in the world. Its freedom was built on solid foundations of English traditions and constitutional principles, which formed the bedrock of future stability. The revolution was not directed against a feudal ancien regime but against the most liberal and progressive monarchy of Europe, whose oppression of the colonists had consisted in recent and limited infringements on long-established rights. The great advantage of America, said Alexis de Tocqueville in a profound insight, lay in not having had to endure a democratic revolution.

The American experience has thus had the appearance but not the reality of a society built by fiat to the specifications of rationalist philosophy. We have been permitted the romance of imagining ourselves revolutionaries when in fact our democracy is the product of long tradition and evolution. The mischief of our rationalist illusion is that it leads to erroneous inferences about our own free society and about the prospects of government by the people elsewhere in the world. Most notably, it blinds us to the powerful limitations on human action imposed by history, to the incalculable difficulties of building a free society, and to the basic incapacity of man to create viable institutions out of the abstractions of pure reason. Society, said Edmund Burke, is indeed a contract, but as the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.

The descent from democratic optimism in Western political thought has been more than borne out by events. As a result of the great conflicts of the 20th century the worldwide dominance of the Western democracies has been lost. These conflicts and upheavals have thrown the democracies on the defensive and generated powerful strains within the free Western societies themselves. There has developed, writes Walter Lippmann, "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the Government." "The people," he writes, "have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising, and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern."

The impact of mass opinion on vital issues of war and peace, in Lippmann's analysis, is to impose a massive negative at critical junctures when new courses of policy are needed. Lagging disastrously behind the movement of events, Lippmann contends, public opinion forced a vindictive peace in 1919, then refused to act against a resurgent Germany in the interwar years, and finally was aroused to paroxysms of hatred and unattainable hopes in a Second World War that need never have occurred. The impact of public opinion, says Lippmann, has been nothing less than a compulsion to make mistakes.

For a politician who serves at the pleasure of his constituency, the course of prudence is to adhere to prevailing views. To be prematurely right is to court what, to the politicians at least, is a premature retirement. We come at last to the ironic inversion of the classical democratic faith in the will of the people: not only does public opinion fail to hold the politician to the course of wisdom and responsibility but, on the contrary, to take the right course requires a singular act of courage on the part of the politician. A few might share the Wilsonian view that "There is nothing more honorable than to be driven from power because one was right." Far more prevalent is the outlook of Lloyd George, who on more than one occasion quite candidly rejected proposals whose merit he conceded on the grounds that he did not wish to be "crucified" at home. In the Lloyd George view, which is a prototype—and not without some merit in my opinion—there is little glory and still less constructive purpose in being defeated for failing to do the impossible.

Can we reconstruct the excessively optimistic democratic thought of the 18th century into a chastened but more realistic philosophy of government by the people? I believe we can, and this belief, I think, is prevalent among the wisest of statesmen and scholars.

The philosophers of the Age of Reason emphasized the hopes and possibilities of a free society, but the strength and viability of democracy rest not only on its aspirations but also on its accommodations to the limitations of human wisdom, to man's inability to perceive the infinite. Democracy, Winston Churchill once said, is the worst form of government men have ever devised—except for every other form. Or in Jefferson's words: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

If men are often irrational in their political behavior, it does not follow that they are always irrational and, what is more important, it does not follow that they are incapable of reason. Whether in fact a people's capacity for self-government can be realized depends on the character and quality of education. It seems to me an astonishing distortion of priorities that the American people and their Government gladly spend billions of dollars for space exploration while denying desperately needed funds to their public schools. I do not believe that a society that has shamefully starved and neglected its public education can claim to have exploited its fullest possibilities and found them wanting.

The case for government by elites is irrefutable insofar as it rests on the need for expert and specialized knowledge. The average citizen is no more qualified for the detailed administration of government than the average politician is qualified to practice medicine or to split an atom. But in the choice of basic goals, the fundamental moral judgments that shape the life of a society, the judgment of trained elites is no more

valid than the judgment of an educated people. The knowledge of the navigator is essential to the conduct of a voyage, but his special skills have no relevance to the choice of whether to take the voyage and where we wish to go.

The distinction of course is between means and ends. The experience of modern times shows us that when the passengers take over the navigation of the ship it is likely to go on the rocks. This does not mean that their chosen destination is the wrong one or that an expert would have made a better choice, but only that they are unlikely to get there without the navigator's guidance.

The demonstrated superiority of democracy over dictatorship derives precisely from its refusal to let ruling elites make the basic moral decisions and value judgments of society. The core of classical democratic thought is the concept of free individuality as the ultimate moral value of human society. Stripped of its excessive optimism about human nature, the core of classical liberalism remains valid and intact. The value and strength of this concept are its promise of fulfillment for man's basic aspirations. The philosopher and the psychoanalyst agree that, whether it issues from reason or instinct, man's basic aspiration is to be a free individual.

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government, accepting the weaknesses as well as the strengths of human nature, must place heavy emphasis on the development of the human capacity for rational moral choice. The challenge to public education is nothing less than to prepare the individual for self-government, to cultivate his capacity for free inquiry and his more humane instincts, to teach him how rather than what to think, in short, to sustain democracy by what Ralph Barton Perry called "an express insistence upon quality and distinction."

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government must replace an ingenuous faith in human nature with a realistic faith in human capacity, recognizing that self-government, though the best form of political organization that men have devised, is also the most difficult. Democracy, in short, must come to terms with man's weaknesses and irrationalities while reaching for the best that is in him.

Such a revised approach to democracy has certain implications for the way in which we organize our Government and conduct its affairs. As Americans with our deeply rooted and fundamentally healthy distrust of government power, we might start by at least reexamining certain long-held convictions based on this distrust of power. We might at least consider the proposition, as expressed by Lord Radcliffe, that "liberty looked upon as the right to find and to try to realize the best that is in oneself is not something to which power is necessarily hostile," that, indeed, "such liberty may even need the active intervention of authority to make it possible."

To return to my metaphor, we must guard against allowing the navigator to determine our destination, but we must allow him to steer the ship without amateur supervision of every turn of the wheel. A political leader is chosen because of his supposed qualifications for his job. If he is qualified, he should be allowed to carry it out according to his own best judgment. If his judgment is found defective by his electors, he can and should be removed. His constituents, however, must recognize that he has a duty to his office as well as to them and that their duty in turn is to fill the office but not to run it. We must distinguish between the functions of representation and of government, requiring our elected leaders to represent us while allowing them to govern.

It may well be questioned whether the enormously complex and slow-moving procedures of the American Government are adequate to meet both the dangers and the opportunities of our foreign relations. Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected and opportunities lost because of the obstacles to decision imposed by our policy processes. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches and the accessibility of all of these centers of power to a wide variety of pressures and interests. The problem is compounded by the durable myth of Jacksonian democracy, the view that any literate citizen can do almost any job and that a democracy can do without a highly trained administrative elite.

"Foreign politics," wrote Tocqueville, "demand scarcely any of those qualities which a democracy possesses; and they require, on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those faculties in which it is deficient . . . a democracy is unable to regulate the details of an important undertaking, to persevere in a design, and to work out its execution in the presence of serious obstacles. It cannot combine its measures with secrecy, and it will not await their consequences with patience. These are qualities which more especially belong to an individual, or to an aristocracy."

My question is not whether we might wish to alter our traditional foreign policy making procedures but whether in fact we have any choice but to do so in a world that obstinately refuses to conduct its affairs under Anglo-Saxon rules of procedure.

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. There are major areas of foreign policy—those relating more to long-term problems than to immediate crises—wherein Presidential authority is incommensurate with Presidential responsibility as a result of the diffusion of power between executive and legislative branches and within the latter. The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals but not itself to initiate or shape policy. These powers, moreover, are widely dispersed within Congress among autonomous committees, each under a chairman who owes little if anything in the way of political obligation to the President.

The defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought. These pertain primarily to foreign policy. In domestic matters, it seems to me, the Congress is as well qualified to shape policy as the executive, and in some respects more so because of the freedom of at least some members from the particular electoral pressures that operate on the President. The frequency of elections and the local orientation of party organizations, however, do not encourage serious and sustained study of international relations. Congressmen are acutely susceptible to local and regional pressures and to the waves of fear and emotion that sometimes sweep over public opinion. The legislator, in short, is under constant and intense pressure to adhere to the prevailing tendencies of public opinion, however temporary and unstable.

Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster a wise and effective foreign policy. This is pre-eminently a task for Presidential leadership because the Presidential office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale. Accordingly, I think that we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs. The prospect is a disagreeable and perhaps a dangerous one, but the alternative is immobility and the paralysis of national policy in a revolutionary world, which can only

lead to consequences immeasurably more disagreeable and dangerous.

The preeminence of Presidential responsibility is in no way an implied license for the legislator to evade national and international responsibility and to surrender to the pressures of local and parochial interest. I can find no better words to define this responsibility than those of Edmund Burke in his classic statement to his constituents at Bristol in 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative, to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you; to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

As a freshman Senator in 1946 I attempted in a speech at the University of Chicago to define the proper role of the legislator in relation to his constituents, to the Nation, and to his own conscience. After 17 years I see no reason to alter the views I then expressed in these words:

"The average legislator early in his career discovers that there are certain interests, or prejudices, of his constituents which are dangerous to trifle with. Some of these prejudices may not be of fundamental importance to the welfare of the Nation, in which case he is justified in humoring them, even though he may disapprove. The difficult case is where the prejudice concerns fundamental policy affecting the national welfare. A sound sense of values, the ability to discriminate between that which is of fundamental importance and that which is only superficial, is an indispensable qualification of a good legislator. As an example of what I mean, let us take the poll-tax issue and isolationism. Regardless of how persuasive my colleagues or the national press may be about the evils of the poll tax, I do not see its fundamental importance, and I shall follow the views of the people of my State. Although it may be symbolic of conditions which many deplore, it is exceedingly doubtful that its abolition will cure any of our major problems. On the other hand, regardless of how strongly opposed my constituents may prove to be to the creation of, and participation in, an ever stronger United Nations Organization, I could not follow such a policy in that field unless it becomes clearly hopeless. * * *

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate the theme of these remarks: government by the people, despite its failures and shortcomings, remains the one form of political organization that offers the promise of fulfillment for our highest aspirations. Although we have been compelled to qualify the unlimited optimism of classical democratic thought, we remain convinced that the core of that thought—the belief in the moral sanctity of the free mind and the free individual—remains the most valid of human philosophies. In Carl Becker's words: " * * * although we no longer have the unlimited and solvent backing of God or nature, we are still betting that freedom of the mind will never disprove the proposition that only through freedom of the mind can a reasonably just society ever be created."

Part II. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, commenting further on my concern over the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject, "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, by Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, discussing the latter herein.

Senator CLARK discusses the "Increasing Role of Government," and suggests that the executive branch be strengthened "at the expense of the legislature" and he makes it clear that the legislature includes State and local legislative bodies as well as Congress.

The seeds of distrust of the legislative process is sown by the statements such as "whether we look at any one of these, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt."

The Senator misjudges my views because I look with pride at our constitutionally founded legislative process in general as being superior to any form of government yet devised by man.

Senator CLARK points derision at Thomas Jefferson's statement "that government is best which governs least" by saying, "Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least."

He adds, sweeping all criticism of Government control over our everyday lives which is ever-expanding by saying "that nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is an hallucination."

His program for decreasing the legislative function include the drastic steps of: wiping out the "advise and consent" functions of the Senate in enabling the executive "to select his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism"; amending "the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives from 2 to 4 years, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in Presidential years." This has the objective of providing the President with a "me too" Congress answerable to every whim of the President because after all they were elected at the same time and therefore the program of the President presented in the campaign is a mandate.

He adds a disturbing finishing thought intended as the coup de grace for all legislative bodies when he says:

I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America,

local, State, and National, are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

This is must reading for anyone who has any doubts as to what the true objectives of the New Frontier and the radical liberals that are running our Government today are; or, as to the distrust of the people to govern themselves under our Constitution with balanced legislative, executive, and judicial powers on the Federal level and with the reserved powers of the States and local communities:

THE ELITE AND THE ELECTORATE—THE INCREASING ROLE OF GOVERNMENT
(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

The expansion of government in the 20th century has been the inevitable result of revolutionary economic, social, and political forces which so threaten civilization that their control becomes essential to human survival. The size, range, and complexity of government increases—and will likely continue to do so. There seems no other feasible approach if civilization is to survive.

It can be argued, of course, that the increasing role of government is undesirable. But even though the argument may be moot, I would defend the proposition that this expansion is good—not bad. Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least. The 18th century's aversion to tyranny has become the 20th century's antitotalitarianism. In fact they are much alike; but our democratic reaction is different. We now know—as Britain and Germany know, and France has just discovered—that to be effective in today's world a national government must be capable of strong action, and have strong leadership.

Otherwise democracy cannot survive. The fallacy in Jefferson's argument is the assumption that the expansion of government leads to the curtailment of individual freedoms. This is just not true. Despite the moans of those who thought Lincoln a tyrant, Franklin Roosevelt a dictator, and now the Kennedy's a dynasty, the history of personal freedom in this country is one of which we can be proud.

Where the civil liberties of our people have not been adequately protected, as in the case of Negro Americans, the failure is one of government inaction, not government action. There are, to be sure, blots on our escutcheon from the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts to the reign of Joe McCarthy. But on the whole the force of government has been on the side of the Bill of Rights and of a free individualistic society.

That nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is a hallucination. I cannot think of one example of the "heavy hand of the Federal Government reaching out into our private lives" that has actually been restrictive of our personal freedoms or detrimental to our economy—if, that is, one accepts the concept of the police power (always to be distinguished from the "police state"), the income tax, and the need for organized society.

The Federal Government has been subsidizing education in this country ever since the Northwest Ordinance of 1784. No harm and much good has resulted. The same is true of social security, housing, urban renewal, and Government plans for health care for the aged.

The real question, of course, is not the power of the Government itself, but how that power is used to promote justice and national well-being. The influence in our essentially free economy of the corporation and the big labor unions with their potential concentrations of economic power requires

the countervailing pressures of a forceful, democratic government as a watchdog. It is this sense of government as a third force, representing the public interest at home and abroad, which in my view is required to protect both freedom and democracy. It is accordingly as salutary as it is inevitable.

The need for further cooperative international action to prevent political, social, and economic chaos is so great and sensible, and intelligent men from all countries are becoming so used to working together for international advancement, that creative control over world problems will be substituted for the essentially amoral international doctrines of the past. And, alas, the recent past.

Thus, I would hope to see the role of government increase in five major international areas in the next 10 years:

1. General and complete disarmament, verified by an international disarmament organization, enforced by an internationally recruited and commanded peace force. International controversy will be settled by international judicial peace-keeping agencies with adequate budgets and power under world law to enforce their decrees.

2. An international agency, perhaps an outgrowth of the present United Nations, adequately financed with funds saved from the armament race, will direct its activities toward assisting underdeveloped nations to that economic breakthrough which is necessary to enable them to raise living conditions within their borders to standards acceptable in the modern world.

3. An expansion of the powers and activities of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will result in the establishment of a world currency as the medium of exchange for international transactions.

4. An extensive development of interlocking regional agreements for the orderly conduct of world trade, including stabilization of raw commodity prices and reduction of impediments to trade such as tariffs and quotas.

5. An international attack on the population problem.

If even some small part of these developments should occur, the role of government in the world economy will surely increase substantially.

The foregoing discussion may well seem to some unrealistic because the words communism, Russia, and China have nowhere been mentioned. It is obvious that the difficulties placed in the way of achievement of these five goals by the present policies of the Communist nations are substantial. But these difficulties are not insuperable. There can be no lasting progress on a worldwide scale unless and until we can either come to terms with, or overcome, the Communist menace to democracy and freedom. But this major problem, with all its intricacies, requires an even greater intervention of free governments than would otherwise be the case.

On the national scene fiscal policy is being taken out of the realm of morals, where it had languished ever since Ben Franklin's lay sermons on thrift two centuries ago. We treat it today as an economic matter. This is a revolutionary change in policy. Only 3 years ago the budget was still treated as a moral document. A balanced budget was prudent, honorable, sound, and good; a surplus was even more so; a deficit was imprudent, profligate, spendthrift, and bad. The terms were those of moral judgment. Today, with a remarkable bipartisan consensus, fiscal policy is couched in the language of economic consequence.

The next question is: Are our democratic governmental institutions adequate for the responsibilities that these extraordinary social, political, and economic forces are thrusting upon us?

We have inherited from our forefathers a governmental structure which so divides power that effective dealing with economic

problems is cumbersome. Local, State, and national governments each have their responsibility in housing and urban renewal, in the appropriate uses of water, in transportation, labor-management relations, and education.

At each level, responsibility for appropriate action is divided between the executive and the legislature, with the judiciary prepared to step in at a moment's notice to declare unconstitutional whatever action the other two may decide upon. Under the circumstances, it is extraordinary how much we accomplish under forms of government heavily weighted against any kind of action, especially any that might alter significantly the status quo.

Of course, inaction is what the Founding Fathers intended—inaction until such time as an overwhelming consensus was prepared for action of some sort, inevitably a compromise. They were right in their day.

But they are wrong in ours.

How, in fact, do our many different governments, with power split three ways both horizontally and vertically, manage in the modern world?

On the whole, better than we have any right to expect. Local and municipal government has revived since the war. State government is the weakest link in the chain, but our Governors, many of them struggling under obsolete State constitutions which hamstringing the executive at every turn, are for the most part increasingly aware of the need for their States to play a more effective part in the growth of the regional economy of which they are a part. Respect for the Office of President of the United States, whatever one's politics, has been justifiably high among serious students of government in the years since the depression. The courts, State and Federal, have played, on the whole, a wide and statesmanlike role in adjusting ancient jurisprudence to modern needs while protecting essential civil liberties.

It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down. This is where the vested interest lobbies run riot, where conflict of interest rides unchecked, where demagoguery knows few bounds, where political lag keeps needed action a generation behind the times, where the 19th century still reigns supreme in committees, where ignorance is often at a premium and wisdom at a discount, where the evil influence of arrogant and corrupt political machines ignores most successfully the public interest, where the lust for patronage and favors for the faithful do the greatest damage to the public interest.

As a former chief executive of a large American city, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, as a public servant who, in both capacities, has been obliged to know a good deal about the workings of State government, I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, State, and National are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

There is another almost equally serious defect in our democratic system, which may well result in government's falling in the role required of it in the next 10 years. We are not enticing into government at all levels the high caliber of individual we must have. The rewards of government service are inadequate, the punishments too severe. We leave the choice of careers far too much to the haggling of the marketplace. We make far too little effort to induce our able young people to fill the places where they are needed to advance American and, indeed, world civilization. In short, we are not adequately staffing that part of the army which must fight for freedom through governmental action.

Finally, the effective conduct of the regulatory agencies, local, State, and Federal, is quite definitely unfinished business. This, too, is closely tied to the problem of recruiting adequate personnel. Without adequate regulatory agencies the economy can on the one hand be strangled through redtape and foolish administration or, on the other, come under the domination of powerful special interests whose unchecked greed can destroy competition and, with it, free enterprise.

Thus I postulate that whether government will play its proper role in the next decade is part of a larger problem: Can we equip democratic government with the framework, the tools, and the men necessary to enable us to perform adequately the whole role of government?

What is necessary to staff freedom more effectively? A few suggestions may be offered:

1. The Executive should be strengthened at the expense of the legislature. Perhaps De Gaulle has shown the way. A constitutional amendment increasing the term of Representatives from 2 years to 4, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in presidential years would help to give greater authority to presidential policy and increase his ability to get it enacted. It is usually 5 years between elections in England, yet democracy is not in jeopardy. We need not fear Executive tyranny in this country merely because the legislature is more responsive to Executive recommendations.

Far too many Executive appointments require legislative confirmation. Under the Philadelphia city charter, the mayor makes all appointments without councilmanic approval, except the city solicitor, who is also the lawyer for council. This precedent might well be extended to State and National Governments to permit the Executive to select

his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism.

Governors and mayors should be entitled to succeed themselves and should serve for 4-year terms. They should have executive authority over the whole range of government instead of having wide areas of executive action controlled by boards and commissions whose members are not directly responsible to the elected executive. New State constitutions and city charters are badly needed in most States and many of the medium-sized and smaller cities.

Executive pay should be adequate to enable the executive to live in comfort and to send his children to college.

2. Legislative customs, manners, traditions, rules, and procedures should be reformed in the interest of expediting action. Among the practices which render legislatures nonresponsive to democratic pressures, as distinguished from plutocratic or political-machine pressures, are:

Selection of committee chairmen by seniority rather than on ability as determined by secret ballot.

Outmoded procedures productive of delay, such as the filibuster in the Senate, the requirement that committees can meet while the Legislature is in session only by unanimous consent, and the "pickling" in committee of bills strongly recommended by the Executive.

A provision requiring legislation recommended by the Executive to be brought to a vote on its merits would be helpful, as would rules requiring proposed legislation to be reported out of committee favorably or unfavorably on motion of a specified number of committee members.

Sensible budgetary procedure similar to that presently existing in many well-governed cities would be a big help at the national level. For example, there should be

a sharp distinction between capital and operating budgets and adequate advance budgetary planning.

3. Reapportionment of legislative districts, now well underway, should help.

4. Living conditions, pay, expense accounts, and working schedules of public servants should be reviewed, with a view to creating the perquisites that will attract talent.

5. The sinister influence of political machines, whose power derives from patronage and the ability to get legislation enacted or defeated, or administrative action taken or denied, at the behest of party contributors, must be destroyed. This can best be done by rigorously enforced modern, merit system legislation, by carefully devised and rigorously enforced laws dealing with political contributions, and by tax inducements to small contributors in the hope that the frightening cost of modern political campaigns can be met without reliance on "fat cats."

6. We must somehow create a climate of public opinion that stops deriding politicians as second-class citizens. To be sure, this is to some extent the problem of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. Politicians must have thick skins. They want, on occasion, to "dish it out" so they must be prepared to "take it." But they are entitled to a presumption of integrity to the same extent as the doctor, the lawyer, the banker. Fear of smear is still a deterrent to the entry into politics of many good citizens.

These are not drastic reforms. They merely modernize our existing governmental structure. Nor, if enacted, will they usher in the millennium. But they should help to make it possible for government to play adequately that role which a continuation of democracy as the most just form of government would seem to require.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until noon Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 6 seconds the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, June 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for the many days of solemn and sacred significance in the calendar of our national life.

We have been privileged to call to mind the vast multitude who gave themselves so sacrificially in order to safeguard our heritage of freedom and democracy.

May our hearts be stirred anew with a passionate longing to lift stricken and suffering mankind out of its miseries and struggles into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Make us eager to join heart and hands with all who are praying and laboring for the dawning of that blessed time when the citizens of our own beloved country and the members of the human family everywhere shall walk together on the highways of peace and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1963, was read and approved.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 368, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as delegates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 1, 1963, and June 30, 1963, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mr. POWELL, of New York; Mr. AYRES, of Ohio. And as alternates to attend said Conference, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

MEXICAN LABOR BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the rejection on Wednesday of the antiwet-back Mexican labor bill will mean increased costs to the consuming public for vegetables and fruits starting January 1, 1964. Also, the failure of the House to extend this law may not be understood by our neighbor and friend, the Commonwealth of Mexico, as this program is in second place, next to the tourist trade in the production of dollars for that great country. An additional and more significant result of the vote on Wednesday would mean the entrance into this country of hundreds of thousands of bracero workers who will swim the river to work on American farms at wages many times the wage that they are receiving in their homeland.

The Mexican labor law brings these workers into this country under a carefully screened and highly regulated procedure by which they are contracted to employers for specified lengths of time to do a particular type of work that our own people are disinclined to perform. This House is a reasonable body and will, upon reflection, extend this law at least 1 year as recommended by the