bill also limits the cumulative size of any acquisition of electric facilities by cooperatives to 5,000 non-rural connections. In addition, no loan may be made to a G & T cooperative which would displace power supplied by private companies unless the cooperative has advertised for bids for the power supply it needs and unless the cost of the power under the proposed loan to the cooperative is lower than the cost of power under the lowest bid submitted.

With these restrictions I firmly believe that the private utilities are adequately protected against unwarranted expansions of G & T cooperatives, as well as any possible increase in competition for non-rural customers.

This entire matter has been under extensive study for many months and the provisions of S. 3720 contain a number of refinements to insure the continued success of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives under a variety of situations that may develop over the years to come.

Highlights of the bill that are of particular interest to me include the provisions that limit federal capitalization to not more than fifty million dollars a year, up to a total of 750 million dollars.

The bill also limits the lending power of the bank to a sum not to exceed eight times the paid-in capital. This is a more conservative restriction than had previously been considered.

Another provision that will lend integrity to the bank is the provision that borrower control will occur only after two-thirds of the stock is held by the borrowers rather than one-half as had been suggested in earlier versions.

One cannot foresee all of the future needs that will undoubtedly occupy the members of this bank board once it is established, but the bill provides for a membership on the Board that will have the expertise in the vital areas of management and finance needed to deal with future problems. At the same time the bill creates an instrumentality capable of meeting the fabulous opportunities of the 21st century—providing we deal successfully with the challenges of today by bringing it into being at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe the cooperatives have an important part to play in the future in providing electric and telephone service to rural areas. They have substantial capital needs which must be met and due to their higher operating costs, low density and meager revenues, they cannot pay prime bank rates at the present time.

I support S. 3720 as the right approach to meet those capital needs and to achieve the ultimate goal of freedom from financial dependence on the federal government. I urge this committee to take action this year to establish this new program.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O satisfy us early with Thy mercy; so that we may rejoice and be glad all our days.—Psalm 90: 14.

O God and Father of us all, who art a tower of defense to all who put their trust in Thee—we come before Thee this moment in gratitude for Thy steadfast love and for Thy enduring faithfulness. In Thee alone is our hope, our strength, and our very life. Inspire us, the leaders of our people, with a clear vision and a definite mission to meet the needs of our country with clean minds, understanding hearts, and loyal spirits. We pray that Thy spirit may be so alive within us that we will be men who put truth before falsehood, good will above ill will, self-denial in place of self-interest, high principles over low prejudices—so shall we be champions of justice and peace, so shall we continue to hold a high regard for personality everywhere. May Thy will be done in us and in all men. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 18, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 8760. An act to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001–1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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. 15941. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15941) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3052) entitled "An act to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15456) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, 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. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar.

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

S. 476. An act to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1596. An act to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3197. An act to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958;

S. 3446. An act to consolidate and reenact certain of the shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. YOUNG of Ohio to be an alternate delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Teheran, Iran, September 27 to October 4, 1966.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appointed Mr. CLARK to be an alternate delegate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference to be held in Paris, France, November 14 to 19, 1966.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ARENDS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, HULL, MORRIS, MAHON, MICHEL, LANGEN, and BOW.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today, August 22.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY, AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE HANDICAPPED OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate today, August 22.

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

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY MILLION DOLLARS STOLEN IN GHANA

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's paper there was an AP story from Ghana to the effect that since the date of the birth of that nation, March 6, 1967, until the date of the most recent coup, February 24 of this year, the officials of that country of Ghana had stolen $140 million—$140 million.

Only one has confessed and he stated that he received illegally $5,600,000.

Mr. Speaker, I checked with the clerk of our committee this morning to find out how much we have given Ghana between those dates and the answer was $163 million.

Now $140 million was stolen from somewhere—I assume from the $163 million that we gave them under the foreign aid program. If that be true, then we must increase our appropriation for Ghana because they are not getting anything like their share of what is coming to them.

TELEGRAMS AND LETTERS DEMONSTRATE THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED OVER HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. 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. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are tremendously aroused by high interest and tight money. They are deeply concerned by lack of action to correct this tragic situation.

The national crisis of high interest has prompted more mail to my office than any issue since World War II. Mr. Speaker, just last Saturday morning, I received more than 75 telegrams representing all sections of the country. These telegrams demanded action on the part of Congress to bring down these usurious interest charges. In addition, I am receiving hundreds of letters on this issue.

My colleagues, I am sure, likewise are receiving heavy mail against the high interest rate policies. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this Congress cannot long delay taking meaningful steps to bring the American people relief.

H.R. 14026 is expected to come before the House in early September. This bill, which lowers interest rate to 4½ percent on consumer certificates of deposit, will put the Congress on record for lower and lower interest rates.

H.R. 14026 will be a clear-cut test of the will of Congress on interest rates.

I hope that Congress will move swiftly to pass H.R. 14026. In any event, I feel very strongly that this 89th Congress should not adjourn until it has solved the problem created by high interest and tight money. We should not walk off and leave this job undone.

REBELS WITH A CAUSE

Mr. BERRY. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a paragraph in an article carried by the Washington Post under the date of August 19. The article is entitled "Anacostia Youth Get Role in Melee Probe; Area Center Quizzed."

The first two paragraphs of the article are as follows:

> District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner yesterday gave the young people of Anacostia one of the things they wanted, a major voice in the committee that will try to determine why the police station there was stoned Monday night.
>
> Walter Williams, 20, a Barry Farm resident and member of Rebels With a Cause, an organization financed by the city's anti-poverty agency, will come in on equal footing with the other two cochairmen, banker Henry K. Willard II and Urban League chief Sterling Tucker.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the statement in the news release:

> Walter Williams . . . member of Rebels With a Cause, an organization financed by the city's antipoverty agency, and so forth.

In other words, unless the news story is wrong, my taxes and the taxes of everybody in South Dakota and the other 49 States are going to finance an organization known as Rebels With a Cause who may or may not have been responsible, or may or may not have taken part in the melee that occurred at the Anacostia police station Monday night of last week.

Mr. Speaker, if this is what our tax money is being used for, the promotion of riots and violence, then I say it is time this Congress and especially the Appropriations Committee in this House take a long look at this kind of abuse of the taxpayer's dollar.

Mr. Speaker, is this what is known as the Great Society?

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 602, an act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

> CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1858)
>
> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its further disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the

following: That the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a et seq.) is hereby further amended as follows:

"(1) In section 2, by striking out the second sentence of subsection (d) and the first two provisos thereto and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds $10,000,000, and no loan, grant, or combination thereof for any project shall be in excess of $6,500,000:' and by striking out 'And provided further,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Provided,';

"(2) In section 4, by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: 'The costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among project functions.';

"(3) In section 4, subsection (b), by striking out the word 'construction' from the phrase which now reads 'and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the project'; by inserting at the end of the parenthetical phrase which follows thereafter ', except as provided in subsection 5(b)(2) hereof,'; and by changing the colon (:) to a period (.) and striking out the remainder of said subsection;

"(4) In section 5, by striking out the present text of items (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the lesser of (1) $6,500,000 or (2) the estimated total cost of the project minus the contribution of the local organization as provided in section 4(b) and the amount of the grant approved;

"'(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization. Said grant shall not exceed the sum of the following: (1) the costs of investigations, surveys, and engineering and other services necessary to the preparation of proposals and plans for the project allocable to fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation; (2) one-half the costs of acquiring lands or interests therein for a reservoir or other area to be operated for fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation purposes; (3) one-half the costs of basic public outdoor recreation facilities or facilities serving fish and wildlife enhancement purposes exclusively; (4) one-half the costs of construction of joint use facilities properly allocable to fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation; and (5) that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to functions, other than recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, which are nonreimbursable under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

"'(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the contract is executed, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such average rate to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, on that portion of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;',

"(5) In section 8, by striking out 'Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401), as amended (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)';

"(6) In section 10, by striking out '$100,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$200,000,000'.

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be applicable to or affect in any way the terms on which any loan or grant has been made prior to the effective date of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ED REINECKE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
FRANK E. MOSS,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 602, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The three significant differences between the language agreed upon and the language of the House amendment are explained hereinafter.

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE OF THE PROGRAM

The Senate-passed bill made no change in the basic act with respect to the geographical coverage of the program (presently limited to the 17 western reclamation States and Hawaii). The House amendment extended the small reclamation projects program to the entire United States—an action prompted by the ever-growing water problems and needs throughout the Nation. On the basis of strong indication that, at the present time, there is little interest in the Eastern States in the benefits which this program provides, the conference committee agreed to retain the present geographical coverage and continue the program only in the 17 reclamation States and Hawaii.

CEILING ON THE AMOUNT OF THE LOAN AND GRANT

The Senate-passed bill included language to amend the basic act by increasing the maximum amount of any loan or combination loan and grant for a single project from $5,000,000 to $7,500,000.

The House amendment retained the $5 million limitation but with qualifying language to permit adjustment of the amount to reflect changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the particular project which may have occurred between January 1, 1957, and January 1 of the year in which the loan is made. At the present time, the language of the House amendment would provide a ceiling of between $6 million and $6.5 million depending upon the particular project involved.

The conference committee adopted language which places a ceiling of $6,500,000 on the amount of any loan or combination loan and grant for any single project. A specific amount seemed preferable in view of the problems that would be inherent in administering the House language. The $6,500,000 figure is considered an equitable amount on the basis of increases in construction costs since the enactment of the basic act 10 years ago. In other words, at today's prices, $6,500,000 will purchase about the same in the way of project works and facilities as $5,000,000 would have paid for 10 years ago.

INTEREST RATE

The formula included in the Senate-passed bill for determining the interest rate to be used in repaying those portions of any loan allocable to the irrigation of excess lands, to municipal and industrial water supply, and to commercial power is the formula based on coupon rates which has been adopted by Congress in recent years for various Federal water project programs.

The House amendment made no change in the interest formula in the basic act which is based on yield rather than coupon rates.

The conference committee adopted the interest formula embodied in the Senate-passed bill in the interest of maintaining consistency among all Federal programs. It seemed particularly important that there be consistency between the interest rate used for this small reclamation projects program and the program of the Department of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT

The language of the conference report makes the following important changes in the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956:

(1) The ceiling on the amount of a loan or combination loan and grant for any one project is increased from $5 million to $6.5 million.

(2) The formula used for determining the interest rate for the interest-bearing portions of loans under this act is changed from a formula based on yield to a formula based on coupon rates.

(3) New language is added updating the basic act by incorporating recently adopted cost-sharing policies applicable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. This is substantially the same as in the House amendment to S. 602.

(4) An additional $100 million is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this small reclamation projects program. This is the same as in the House amendment to S. 602.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ED REINECKE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a unanimous report and there is only one difference between the report that was previously filed and this one, I ask that the report be considered as read and printed in the Journal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we bring back to the House today is identical to the report considered by the House on July 21 with one exception. The language extending the geographical coverage of the Small Reclamation Projects Act to the entire United States has been eliminated. Thus, the program will be continued only in the 17 western reclamation States and Hawaii. The action of the House on July 21, turning down the previous conference report, made it quite clear that, at the present time, there is little interest in the Eastern and Southern States

in the benefits which this program provides. On the basis of that action, the House conferees receded from the previous House position and concurred in the Senate language with respect to geographical coverage of the program.

As presented to the House today, the conference report on S. 602 provides for continuing a very successful small water projects program which was initiated 10 years ago. The purpose of this program is to encourage State and local participation in the development and rehabilitation of small water projects primarily for irrigation. The Federal Government assists such undertakings by providing loans to the States or local public agencies. The local agencies retain full responsibility for the planning, construction and operation of these small projects.

When this program was initiated 10 years ago, Congress authorized an appropriation of $100 million to carry out its purposes and objectives. Over the last 10 years, Congress has appropriated funds for small project loans which have almost exhausted the total amount authorized to be appropriated. The conference report on S. 602 authorizes the appropriation of an additional $100 million to continue this worthwhile program. Funds will be appropriated only after the legislative committees have had an opportunity to fully review and approve the individual project loan applications.

The language of the conference report makes three other significant changes in the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956: First, the ceiling on the amount of a loan or combination loan and grant for any one project is increased from $5 million to $6.5 million; second, the formula used for determining the interest rate for the interest-bearing portions of loans under this act is changed from a formula based on yield to a formula based on coupon rates; and third, new language is added updating the basic act by incorporating recently adopted cost-sharing policies applicable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 21, 1966, this conference report, with one minor change, was presented by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

At that time we ran into opposition, and many of our colleagues were told by those who opposed this bill and the conference report at that time, if they voted against the conference report, they would be making a great vote for economy and they would be saving $100 million.

The chairman pointed out—and I tried to point out—to the Members of the House that the question was not whether we would save $100 million, because that was not the issue. The question was whether or not all 50 States would have the benefit of this program. Lo and behold, by a vote of 136 to 204, the conference report was refused.

We went back to conference with the Senate, because this had been an amendment which the House had adopted. We receded, and we now have the conference report. I am asking you to support it.

I hope that those Members from the East and nonreclamation States who are running for reelection in November are confronted by their farmers and people who are short of water, asking why they voted against the conference report and ask why their area is not able to go to the Federal Government and participate in this program.

This program still has in it $100 million, the same amount that it had before, but instead of the 50 States of the Union being entitled to participate in it, only the 17 Western States can participate. I might say that those who voted against it were on both sides of the aisle, and the story was put out that it was a great economy vote.

You did not save a cent, but you people who live now in the arid East or the semiarid East, in an area which for the past 7 years has had the worst drought in recorded history, will not be able to go to the Interior Department and ask them to help your people get water to take care either of their crops, their towns, or their people.

I hope in the coming elections it rises to haunt those who voted against the conference report on July 21.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I understand the gentleman is saying that the $100 million is still there?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. Perhaps we ought to vote against this conference report, then.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is the gentleman's prerogative. The program is a good program.

Mr. HAYS. I will see that we get a record vote, and that is how I will vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds 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 198, nays 81, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—198

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Fascell
Fisher
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Greigg
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Hosmer
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McFall
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Miller
Mills
Mink
Mize
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pool
Price
Quie
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Saylor
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wright
Young
Younger

NAYS—81

Abbitt
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Bates
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Duncan, Tenn.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Hall
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Hull
Joelson
Jones, Mo.
Krebs
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
McCulloch
McDade
McGrath
MacGregor
Marsh
Matthews
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
Patten
Pirnie
Poff
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Roberts
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Vanik
Waggonner
Whalley
Widnall

NOT VOTING—153

Adams
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Ala.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilligan
Grabowski
Grider
Gurney
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Helstoski
Hicks
Howard

Huot	Olsen, Mont.	Skubitz
Irwin	Olson, Minn.	Stalbaum
Jennings	O'Neill, Mass.	Stephens
Keith	Philbin	Stratton
King, N.Y.	Pickle	Sweeney
Kornegay	Poage	Talcott
Kupferman	Powell	Teague, Tex.
Landrum	Pucinski	Thomas
Long, La.	Purcell	Todd
Love	Quillen	Toll
McCarthy	Randall	Tupper
McDowell	Resnick	Tuten
McEwen	Reuss	Van Deerlin
McVicker	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vigorito
Macdonald	Rivers, S.C.	Vivian
Mackay	Rivers, Alaska	Walker, Miss.
Mackie	Robison	Watkins
Martin, Ala.	Rodino	Weltner
Martin, Mass.	Ronan	White, Idaho
Mathias	Rooney, N.Y.	Williams
Meeds	Rooney, Pa.	Willis
Moeller	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Moorhead	Roudebush	Wilson, Charles H.
Morrison	Roybal	
Morse	Satterfield	Wolff
Multer	St Germain	Wyatt
Murphy, N.Y.	St. Onge	Wydler
Murray	Schisler	Yates
Nix	Scott	Zablocki
O'Brien	Senner	
O'Konski	Sickles	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Morse against.

Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Wyatt for, with Mr. Kupferman against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Halpern against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Mathias against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Cahill against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Cameron for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Wydler against.

Mr. Van Deerlin for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Keith against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Curtin against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Howard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Sickles.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Gilligan.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee, with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Randall.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington, with Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Stalbaum.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Vivian with Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Grider.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Flood.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Senner.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Farnum with Mr. Love.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McDowell.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Huot.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Scott.

Mr. ROUSH, Mr. PELLY, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GRAY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BURKE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. MINSHALL and Mr. HECHLER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SIKES, WHITTEN, GEORGE W. ANDREWS, FLOOD, LIPSCOMB, LAIRD, MINSHALL, and BOW.

SUMMARY OF THE LUNAR ORBITER I MISSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1966, Lunar Orbiter I, this country's first spacecraft designed to orbit the moon and return high-resolution photographs of its surface, was launched from Cape Kennedy on an Atlas-Agena rocket. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., is responsible for Lunar Orbiter project management. The 850-pound spacecraft was developed and manufactured under a prime contract by the Boeing Co. of Seattle, Wash., with major subcontract assistance by the Radio Corp. of America, Astro-Electronics Division, Hightstown, N.J., and the Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

After nearly 4 days en route to the moon, during which a nominal trajectory correction was made by its small rocket, Lunar Orbiter I was commanded to initiate a new maneuver and inject itself into an elliptical lunar orbit. This was accomplished by a 10-minute rocket burn—an extremely long period for continuous thrusting in space—almost precisely as planned. In spite of difficulties with the Canopus star sensor which provided attitude reference, engineers were able to "fly" the spacecraft on autopilot with extreme precision; this is a tribute to the careful design concepts employed.

While in its 26th lunar orbit at an altitude of about 133 miles above the moon, the spacecraft took 20 photographs of the east limb of the moon. These first pictures were intended to provide engineering analysis and planning for the subsequent phases of the mission. Difficulties were encountered with the high resolution camera, although images produced by the moderate resolution camera were classed as "superb."

As a part of the subsequent operations and tests of the system, three sets of photographs of the far side of the moon were also taken. These showed the greatest details of these areas ever seen by man. While in orbit about the moon, precise radio tracking allowed scientists to determine for the first time the exact shape and mass distribution of the moon.

On August 21 the Orbiter again fired its rocket motor on command, and lowered its orbit to a close approach altitude of about 35 miles above the lunar surface. The spacecraft is set to begin photographing sites today—August 22—which may be suitable for future Surveyor and Apollo landings.

Over a thousand maneuvers have been successfully performed by the spacecraft to date. This is extremely significant in view of the fact that the Lunar Orbiter project was initiated formally only 2½ years ago.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is the day for the call of the District Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 931 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 931

Whereas, the sovereign power of this Nation is reserved to the people of all the States under the Constitution, and

Whereas, the powers delegated by the people in the Constitution include the command to the Congress that it "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" in the Nation's Capital, and

Whereas, this power was delegated by the people of the States for their own benefit to make the seat of government secure for the conduct of the National government free from threats, coercions, insurrections, or interferences, to protect the persons and property of its representatives and officials, and the visitors and residents at the seat of the National government, and to preserve to all the people of the Nation the records, buildings, shrines, and monuments in the National Capital, and

Whereas, the police power delegated to the Congress by the Constitution for the protection of the interests of all the people obligates the Congress to supervise and control the organization and operation of the Metropolitan Police Department in the District of Columbia, and

Whereas, complete reorganization of the Metropolitan Police Department has been recommended without reference to the views of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that no alteration, reorganization, or other change shall be made in the organization of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia until such time as the House of Representatives shall have had reasonable opportunity to thoroughly examine the complete and final report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia on the Metropolitan Police Department.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 931 is to express the sense of the House of Representatives that a reasonable opportunity shall be given to the House of Representatives to examine the complete and final report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, the first part of which calls for the reorganization of the Metropolitan Police Department.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia is distinctly a creature of the Congress of the United States. The powers delegated by the people of this Nation in the Constitution include the command to the Congress that it "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" at the seat of the National Government. This power was delegated to the Congress by the people for their own benefit to make the Nation's Capital secure for the conduct of the National Government without threats, coercions, insurrections or interferences, to protect the persons and property of its representatives and officials and of visitors and residents at the seat of the National Government, and to preserve to all the people the records of the Nation, its buildings, shrines and monuments. Since this delegation of power included the exclusive exercise of the police power within the District of Columbia, the Congress had not only the duty to establish an organization to police the District of Columbia but it has a continuing obligation to supervise and control the organization and operation of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Your committee recognizes that under laws enacted by the Congress, certain powers have been delegated for the administration of the Police Department. It likewise believes that because of the primary repsonsibility of the Congress for the organization and functing of the Metropolitan Police Department, it is a reasonable and proper request by the Congress to the delegee of administration over the Police Department that the Congress be given the opportunity to be reasonably informed concerning the nature, purposes, and necessity for such reorganization prior to its alteration.

Your committee, in recommending the adoption of this resolution, makes no presumptions concerning the desirability or validity of the entire report concerning the Metropolitan Police Department or any specific recommendation therein. There has been no opportunity to make any proper examination of the Commmission's recommendations.

PREVIOUS ACTION BY CONGRESS

During the last 25 years, almost without exception, the House or Senate Committees on the District of Columbia have considered matters relating directly to the Metropolitan Police Department and indirectly in connection with the study of the crime problem in Washington. About 15 years ago, the Congress made a major study of the operation of the Police Department, which resulted in important changes in its operation. Beginning in 1952, and running to 1958, there was a substantial annual decrease in the amount of crime in the District of Columbia at a time when the crime rate was increasing in almost every other jurisdiction in the United States. The rate of clearance for crime reached a point near or about 50 percent and ranked Washington among the highest for any city within the entire Nation. Repeatedly in testimony before committees, in reports, and in magazine articles, the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia was said to be one of the finest and most efficient in the United States.

In recent years, the Congress has increased the size of the police force, and there have been improvements in the organization of the Department. New training methods and equipment have been used, and new electronic equipment and methods have been employed. However, despite the demonstrated competence of the Department and these improvements, but due to factors not related to police efficiency or department organization, the crime rate in the District of Columbia became one of the most rapidly rising rates in the United States. The percentage of clearance of crime declined within a few years from 50 percent to approximately 25 percent.

The press announcements accompanying the release of the Crime Commission's recommendations leave the impression that the organization of the Police Department is a prime factor, if not the most important one, relating to the adverse crime rates in the District of Columbia. In view of your committee's long and intimate contact with the knowledge of the operation of the Police Department of the District of Columbia and of the crime situation in the District of Columbia, your committee does not question that there are some possible improvements to be made in the organizing of the Metropolitan Police Department, but it sees no basis for or any probability of expectation that such reorganization can bring about any substantial improvement in the enforcement of the laws in the District of Columbia. No judgment can be made on this entire matter as to the pertinence, and importance, of the reorganization of the Police Department in relation to the crime situation until the full and final report of the Commission has been made available and its contents studied. It should be noted, in this connection, that the resolution in no way proposes any delay in the expeditious carrying out of recommendations which may otherwise be made by the Crime Commission.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

Your committee need hardly remind the House of the efforts made by your committee and the House of Representatives in the last 8 years to secure enactment of legislation to deal with the crime situation in the District of Columbia.

On five occasions the House has passed legislation to deal with problems of law enforcement resulting from the decision in the *Mallory* case (*Mallory* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 449).

Your committee over a period of 4 years considered legislation relating to the juvenile court and spent 2 years in detailed study of that court and the juvenile crime situation in the District of Columbia.

In the two preceding Congresses and the present Congress your committee has reported to the House and the House has approved anticrime legislation which has yet to become enacted. Of course, the recently House-passed pay bill (H.R. 15857) with its salary increases averaging 9.9 percent—ranging from 11.4-percent increase for beginning privates, who will start at $6,700, to 7.1-percent increase in the top grades—and its other beneficial provisions should aid materially in meeting the President's recommendations to the Congress to provide "substantial increase in police salaries to attract and retain the best qualified officers in the District of Columbia"—and thereby aid in the war against crime.

During all these efforts, although the crime rate has increased substantially in the District of Columbia, your committee at no time has been presented with any indication that such increase was due to the organization of or the operation of the Metropolitan Police Department.

THE IMMEDIATE PROBLEM

The concern of your committee, and of the Congress, with lawbreakers and repeat offenders, is the same concern expressed by President Johnson in his

message at the beginning of this Congress, entitled "Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice," wherein he stated:

This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws.

Particularly with regard to Washington, he stated:

We must improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice in the District * * *. Both in its own right and as a model for other cities, Washington can and should be a focus for intensive efforts in crime prevention, the detection and prosecution of crimes, rehabilitation, and related activities.

What is the greatest immediate conconcern of your committee is the unquestioned critical, alarming, and continuing crime situation in the Nation's Capital, as revealed daily by the local news media, by the monthly reports of the local police, and by the quarterly and annual reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The latest figures show the following shocking picture of Washington:

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, JULY 1966 [1]

During July 1966 a total of 3,628 offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 784 offenses or 27.6% from July 1965.

This was the 50th consecutive month with an increase in crime in Washington. During July, increases occurred in the classifications of criminal homicide, up 4 offenses, or 40.0 percent; robbery, up 74 offenses or 23.2 percent; aggravated assault, up 59 offenses or 22.2 percent; housebreaking, up 202 offenses or 28.6 percent; grand larceny, up 43 offenses or 30.9 percent; petit larceny, up 270 offenses or 30.8 percent; auto theft, up 132 offenses or 25.7 percent.

The classification of rape, with 14 offenses, showed no change.

The increase for the month of July, 1966, brought the trend of serious offenses (total offenses for the past 12 months) to 36,006, an increase of 2,997 offenses or 9.1 percent from the trend of July 1965, and an increase of 127.9 percent from the low point of June 1957.

Clearances of part I offenses for the 12-month period ending with July 1966, were down to 27.2 percent as compared with 36.0 percent for July 1965.

WASHINGTON COMPARED WITH OTHER CITIES

In terms of current, nationwide crime rates, the District stands high with other cities of comparable size. FBI statistics just released for 1965 show that for 16 cities in the 500,000 to 1 million population class, as indicated in the tabulation below, Washington ranks fourth in the actual number of offenses as well as in the rate of crime index offenses per 1,000 population.

In the various categories of crime index offenses during 1965, the District, as shown in the next tabulation, ranked as follows among such cities:

First in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.

First in robbery.

Second in aggravated assault—assault with a dangerous weapon.

Third in housebreaking.

Fourth in auto theft.

Fifth in forcible rape.

Fifth in larceny.

Crime index offenses—Calendar year 1965 [1]

[Cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population]

City	Population, 1960 census	Total offenses	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Housebreaking	Larceny $50 and over	Auto theft
Baltimore	939,024	26,193	131	260	2,109	3,830	7,393	7,053	5,417
Boston	697,197	22,542	57	77	1,109	930	4,681	2,775	12,913
Buffalo	532,759	9,833	16	50	381	418	3,899	2,359	2,710
Cincinnati	502,550	6,076	41	122	317	651	2,451	1,656	838
Cleveland	876,050	16,697	108	149	1,832	1,288	7,374	1,025	4,921
Dallas	679,684	15,830	116	137	592	1,320	7,715	2,256	3,694
Houston	938,219	25,238	139	121	1,434	2,314	12,860	4,380	3,990
Milwaukee	741,324	10,361	27	33	214	477	2,433	3,841	3,336
New Orleans	627,525	16,621	87	119	1,065	979	5,798	3,953	4,620
Pittsburgh	604,332	18,495	40	152	1,373	1,108	6,001	3,833	5,988
St. Louis	750,026	25,750	138	323	2,293	2,256	12,661	2,533	5,546
San Antonio	587,718	15,222	53	94	331	1,380	7,161	4,165	2,033
San Diego	573,224	10,251	26	44	367	479	3,165	4,372	1,798
San Francisco	740,316	26,924	57	85	2,087	1,830	11,535	3,975	7,355
Seattle	557,087	11,826	24	78	516	394	4,965	3,938	1,911
Washington, D.C.	763,956	25,462 (1965)	148	140	2,881	2,635	9,886	4,153	5,619
		22,932 (1964)	132	96	2,279	2,605	8,910	3,518	5,392
Rank order of Washington (based on actual number of offenses):									
1965		4th	1st	5th	1st	2d	3d	5th	4th
1964		4th	4th	9th	1st	1st	4th	9th	5th

[1] Based on "Uniform Crime Reports—1965" issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, July 28, 1966.

While, according to the latest FBI report, nationwide suburban crime rates were increasing twice as fast as those in the big central cities, Washington is an exception. Here the crime rate is rising faster in the central city than in the surrounding suburbs.

CRIME FACTORS

In the foreword to the FBI report referred to, it is stated:

Crime is a social problem and the concern of the entire community. The law enforcement effort is limited to factors within its control. Some of the conditions which will affect the amount and type of crime that occurs from place to place are briefly outlined below:

Density and size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part.

Composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex, and race.

Economic status and mores of the population.

Relative stability of population, including commuters, seasonal, and other transient types.

Climate, including seasonal weather conditions.

Educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.

Effective strength of the police force.

Standards governing appointments to the police force.

Policies of prosecuting officials and the courts.

Attitude of the public toward law enforcement problems.

The administrative and investigative efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.

Obviously, from the foregoing, the organization and status of the Metropolitan Police force is but one of the many factors which may bear upon the solution of the blatant crime situation in the Nation's Capital.

Admittedly, the preliminary report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, devoted solely to the Metropolitan Police force, at best relates only to one of the many facets involved in the alleviation of crime; namely, the detection and assistance in the bringing to justice the perpetrators of criminal offenses here.

CONCLUSION

There is nothing in this first report of the Crime Commission to show a correlation between the rising criminal tide in the District of Columbia and the organization of the Police Department. Until the complete picture is available on the other crime factors, such as are listed above in the FBI report, it would seem unwarranted to proceed in a piecemeal fashion.

If there be weaknesses in the organization of the police, your committee will recommend appropriate and necessary legislation for the consideration of the Congress. But your committee has been urging for months that the first and most important job for the District government and the courts, the police and Congress alike, is to meet head on and curb the incidence of crime as is already known here and to take positive steps with respect thereto. Toward that end, your committee is endeavoring to finalize legislation through a conference agreement with the other body on the omnibus anticrime bill—H.R. 5688. Already over a dozen conferences of members and of staff have produced many agreements, and it is hoped that final conference action may be reached shortly and a report brought to the House and Senate.

As the President has well stated:

We cannot postpone our responsibility to act against crimes committed today.

Only when the full recommendations of the Crime Commission are made and are available, however, can the Congress or anyone else intelligently take other steps which may be needed or desirable—whether reorganization of the Police Department or otherwise—to give the Nation's Capital the degree of protection and security that citizens and visitors alike are at a minimum entitled to receive.

[1] Summary of Metropolitan Police Department report for July.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPAND MEMBERSHIP OF POLICE DEPARTMENT BAND

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 8205) to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force", approved July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 311), as amended (sec. 4–182, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioners are authorized in their discretion to detail officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the District of Columbia Fire Department to participate in the activities of such band."

SEC. 2. The Act approved July 11, 1947, as amended, is further amended by striking section 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the United States Park Police force to participate in the activities of the band established by this Act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the White House Police force to participate in the activities of such band."

SEC. 3. The Act approved July 11, 1947, as amended, is further amended by adding a section 6, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Appropriations to carry out the provisions of this Act are authorized."

With the following committee amendments:

1. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force', approved July 11, 1947, is amended as follows:

"(1) The second sentence of the first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–182) is amended to read as follows: 'The Commissioners are authorized in their discretion to detail officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the District of Columbia Fire Department to participate in the activities of such band.'

"(2) Such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the first section the following new section:

" 'SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the United States Park Police force to participate in the activities of the band established by this Act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to detail officers and members of the White House Police force to participate in the activities of such band.'

"(3) Section 5 of such Act is repealed and section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–184) is redesignated as section 5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8205 is to permit members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Park Police force to be detailed by the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, to participate in the activities of the Metropolitan Police Department band.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Actually, some members of these other forces do participate as members of the Police Department band. However, since present law does not permit them to be officially detailed to this duty, they must do so without any coverage as to disability compensation which applies when such members are performing their official duties. In short, therefore, while members of all these forces may and do participate as members of the Police Department band, only members of the Metropolitan Police Department are presently protected against injury or disability incurred while engaged in the band's activities.

It is the opinion of your committee that all members of this band should be adequately protected against injury incurred while engaged in the band's activities. This bill will accomplish this by providing that members of all these forces, when assigned to the police band, will be engaged in official duty and hence will be eligible during such activity for the same disability benefits to which they are entitled when performing their regular duties.

Another present difficulty in connection with members of the Fire Department, White House Police, and the U.S. Park Police participating as members of the Police Department band is that they must do so on their own time, whereas the time spent by Police Department members of the band in rehearsals and performances counts as part of their regular workweek. Further, if such time is spent outside their regular duty hours, then the Police Department members are entitled to an equal amount of compensatory time off. The provisions of this bill will extend this arrangement also to members of these other forces who participate in the band's activities, so that the time so spent by all members of the band will be considered as part of their duty hours.

It is the view of your committee that these provisions will have the desirable effect of materially increasing the size of this fine Police Department band.

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Police Department band was first officially authorized by an act of Congress in 1947, as "a band to perform at such municipal or civic functions and events as may be authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The members participate in this band without extra compensation, though a director is authorized at a salary not to exceed that of a captain in the Metropolitan Police Department.

The Metropolitan Police Department band presently consists of 20 regularly participating members. By calling upon other musicians in the White House Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, and the Metropolitan Police force, it is possible to organize a unit of approximately 50 pieces. This will be done, for example, in connection with the forthcoming American Legion parade.

ROLE OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT BAND

At a public hearing on this bill conducted on August 1, 1966, your committee was informed that the mission of the Police Department band is far broader in scope than merely playing at parades, ceremonials, and dedications for whatever public relations value these may have. While the band does strive, of course, to make a good showing in such highly competitive performances as American Legion parades and Shriners parades of far greater importance to the Police Department, and to the District, is the band's contribution in the fields of community relations, cadet recruiting, crime deterrence, and bringing the true image of the police before the District of Columbia citizen of tomorrow.

This portion of the Police Department band's mission is made possible by an arrangement with the District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools, by which this police band joins with the various high school bands in the city for special assembly programs. Each of these programs requires two 1-hour rehearsals. During these rehearsals and the assembly program itself, the seating arrangement is such that a police musician sits in a group of high school musicians, all playing the same type instrument. Through this experience of common interest and participation in music, the children and the policemen discover a mutual appreciation and understanding of each other, which the Police Department has found to be invaluable to all concerned. These children will be less hesitant and reluctant to call on their new friend, the police bandsman, and their parents will also be more apt to regard the policeman in the light of friendship.

The point is eloquently expressed in a letter addressed to District of Columbia Police Chief John B. Layton from the principal of one of the senior high schools in the District. This letter was submitted to your committee in testimony, and states in part as follows:

DEAR CHIEF LAYTON: On Thursday, February 11, it was our pleasure to have the Police

Band perform for our student body at an assembly. The students and faculty were quite impressed. It is my belief that this was an excellent bit of public relations. You are to be commended for encouraging and maintaining this group. It is an image of the Police Department we need to encourage just as well as the law enforcement side of the Department. In closing, I would like to again commend you for maintaining and promoting this worthwhile group.

The Metropolitan Police Department band offers opportunities also to members of these forces with no previous musical training to come into its program. For example, the present director has organized a group of District of Columbia police cadets, most of whom had no previous knowledge of music whatever, into a group of drummers. Also, he offers private lessons free of charge to any member of the various forces who wishes to learn to play an instrument.

CONCLUSIONS

Your committee is of the opinion that this police department band represents a useful weapon in the war against crime in the District of Columbia. Further, we believe that its service in this respect has not been utilized to its fullest extent. Your committee suggests, for example, that this band, as it will expand under the provisions of this bill, might well be sent outside the District of Columbia to perform as an aid to the recruitment program. Such a demonstration to the public that the Metropolitan Police Department offers opportunities for outlets other than just police work could prove a valuable asset, indeed, to recruitment.

The committee recommends this proposed legislation, therefore, to augment the important contribution which this band is making toward alleviating crime in the District of Columbia, and urges that its use be expanded as far as is practicable.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The amendments to this bill are designed to make it completely clear that members of all three services—the District of Columbia Fire Department, the White House Police, and the U.S. Park Police—are included in its provisions, and also to achieve a greater clarity in the compliation of the present law. No change in the original intent of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners is involved.

The language in the present law which specifies that the members of the Police Department band, with the exception of the director, shall receive no additional compensation for participating in the activities of the band, has been omitted in these amendments to the act as recommended by the Commissioners. However, this omission is based upon the assumption that this language is not necessary to the act, and is not to be construed as an intention to authorize additional compensation for such participation. On the contrary, it is the opinion of your committee that since this activity comprises a part of the members' regular duty hours, participation therein should not entitle the members to extra pay.

It is not intended that any officer or member of any of these forces shall be detailed unwillingly to participate in the activities of the Police Department band, as this would obviously not serve the best interests of the organization itself.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' RECOMMENDATION

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia request this legislation.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for H.R. 8205, which relates to participation in the Metropolitan Police Department band. I introduced this legislation on May 17 and it was reported by the House Committee on the District of Columbia on August 5; I want to thank my colleagues on that committee for their unanimous support for this measure.

The bill authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to detail members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments to play in the Metropolitan Police Department band. It also authorizes the Secretary of Interior to detail members of the White House Police force to participate in the activities of the police band. In so doing, the bill makes clear that the participants in the band, whether in rehearsal or in actual performance, are on official duty and therefore eligible for coverage as to disability compensation. It will also insure that the time spent by all members of the band will be considered as part of their regular duty hours. At present, only members of the Metropolitan Police Department are covered by disability compensation and are considered to be on regular duty when participating in band activities.

With only police members participating in the band, the unit has a size of about 20. But when musicians from the Fire Department and some of the Federal services are added, the size of the band swells to about 50 members. Since the band not only plays at parades, ceremonials and dedications, but also makes a significant contribution to community relations and cadet recruiting, it is, of course, desirable to have as large a band as possible.

As an old bandsman myself, I strongly urge House passage of this measure.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS IN ESCHEAT CASES

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 15706) to amend section 5 of the Act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first proviso of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia", approved February 11, 1929 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-906), is amended by inserting ", except, a claim or suit under section 19-701 of the District of Columbia Code," immediately after "no claim or suit so compromised".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, immediately after "except" insert ", with the approval of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15706 is to amend the act of February 11, 1929—65 Stat. 131—District of Columbia Code, title 1, section 906—to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting for the District, to settle a disputed claim regarding the surplus of a decedent's estate which the District is a statutory escheatee, by accepting a percentage of the net assets of the estate where such compromise would result in a reduction of more than $10,000 in the amount of the claim against the estate.

EXISTING LAW

The type of claim which is the concern of this proposed legislation may arise under title 19, section 701, of the District of Columbia Code, which provides:

Where there is no surviving spouse or relations of the intestate within the fifth degree reckoned by counting down from the common ancestor to the more remote, the surplus of real and personal property es-

cheats to the District of Columbia to be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the benefit of the poor.

Annually, there are between 5 and 15 cases where a person dies in the District of Columbia as to whom it is believed there are no heirs. Commonly, after publication of notice, people come forward as claimants under law against the estate. In such cases, as noted hereafter the burden of proof which falls upon the District of Columbia may be very substantial. In such situations, it may be highly desirable and advantageous to the District of Columbia to be able to compromise such claims.

The authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise any claim is strictly limited by the act of February 11, 1929, as amended—District of Columbia Code, title 1, section 906—which provides:

SEC. 5. That upon a report by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia showing in detail the just and true amount and condition of any claim or suit which the District of Columbia may now or hereafter have against any person, firm, association, or corporation, and the terms upon which the same may be compromised, and stating that in his opinion the compromise of such claim would be for the best interest of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they hereby are, authorized to compromise such claim or suit accordingly: *Provided, however,* That no claim or suit so compromised shall be reduced by an amount greater than $10,000: *And provided further,* That this section shall not apply to claims or suits for taxes or special assessments.

Thus, regardless of the desirability and benefit to the District of Columbia, no compromise may be made by the District in an escheat case if the compromise would result in a reduction of more than $10,000 in the amount of the claim.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

As noted above, the surplus of an estate escheats to the District of Columbia on proof that there is no surviving spouse or relative of the deceased within the fifth degree counting down from the common ancestor to the more remote. The burden of proof of the District was established in the case of *Frazier* v. *Kutz*, decided by the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia on December 13, 1943 (139 Fed. 2d 380). In that case, the court said:

In every case of this nature there is a presumption of law that the deceased left heirs, and this presumption obtains until the claimant by escheat overcomes the presumption by strong and convincing evidence.

To comply with the standards of proof required by the courts, the District of Columbia often finds it necessary to trace the ancestory of the deceased through a series of generations to determine whether or not there is an ancestor having progeny who may or may not inherit. This may involve extensive searches of records in foreign countries to examine the validity of claims and the authenticity of foreign documents. Where records have been destroyed by conflagrations, or due to wartime destruction, it may be extremely costly or even impossible to establish essential facts of relationship. Claimants may be scattered in different nations and they would have to come to this jurisdiction themselves or by designation of representatives to testify affirmatively because of the questioned validity of or the lack of documentary proof which might otherwise support a disposition of the estate.

Where such circumstances exist, it may require expenditures which would consume a substantial part of or all of the net estate and involve several years of time for the District to resolve a case.

During a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 5 on August 1, 1966, testimony was presented regarding the difficulties which may be involved under existing provisions of law, and the committee was advised of specific cases now pending which involve such elements of uncertainty as might be best resolved to the benefit of the District of Columbia through a compromise agreement which compromise would involve a reduction by an amount greater than $10,000. No objections were voiced to the purpose and language of the bill. Accordingly, your committee finds that the proposed legislation is reasonable and desirable.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

In the course of committee deliberations on the proposed legislation, consideration was given to the desirability of some court supervision over compromises proposed in connection with escheat cases. Your committee concluded that such supervision would simplify the problem of securing bond for the administrator, protect the administrator if later issue was raised by some disgruntled party, and protect the District government as to any question which might be raised concerning the propriety of the compromise. Accordingly, the committee amendment was added, requiring that any compromise in escheat cases should have the approval of the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia reported favorably on the legislation and urged its enactment in a letter to the chairman.

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

AMEND THE PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6143) to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1049; sec. 1–1203, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) is amended (a) by striking "travel expenses of enforcement personnel from other jurisdictions" and inserting in lieu thereof "travel expenses of enforcement personnel, including sanitarians, from other jurisdictions"; and (b) by striking "policemen and firemen" and inserting in lieu thereof "policemen, firemen, and other municipal employees".

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

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

There was no objection.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill (H.R. 6143) is to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956—70 statute 1049 District of Columbia Code title 1, section 1201 and the following—in two particulars:

First. To provide for the payment of travel expenses of "sanitarians" (expert health advisers) whom the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are already authorized to employ, on a temporary basis, to promote adequate inspection and enforcement of health regulations during the inaugural period.

Second. To provide meals for employees of Health Department, and other municipal employees, who are required to remain on duty at their posts through mealtimes during such inaugural period, many of them being stationed along the line of march of the inaugural parade. The act now authorizes such meals for police and firemen.

BACKGROUND

Under the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act referred to, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to charge such fees for such privilege, as they may deem proper.

Pursuant to this authority the Commissioners, in connection with the inaugural ceremonies, employ additional sanitarians—expert health advisers—from other jurisdictions as may be needed to supplement the staff of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health to promote adequate inspection and enforcement of health regulations during the inaugural period. Particularly they are needed to help enforce those regulations pertaining to the preparation and dispensing of food, on account of the many visitors here to attend

the various ceremonies and functions attendant to the inauguration. Further, the sanitarians not only assist in inspection and the enforcement of fixed regulations to protect the public health, but they also study the District practices and make a report thereon to the local authorities.

The act referred to also authorizes the appropriation of—and in the past the Congress has appropriated—such sums as are necessary to enable the Commissioners to provide additional municipal services in said District during the inaugural period, including employment of personal services without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses of enforcement personnel from other jurisdictions; hire of means of transportation; meals for policemen and firemen, cost of removing and relocating streetcar platforms, construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first aid stations, and information booths; and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners.

However, as presently construed, this authority does not permit payment of travel expenses of sanitarians, nor meals for municipal employees referred to—other than police and firemen—who are required to remain on duty through mealtimes.

The reported bill corrects these omissions and provides authority for payment thereof.

PRECEDENTS FOR THE LEGISLATION

The Congress has already, in several acts passed since the President Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956, enacted into law provisions identical to those in your reported bill to cover travel expenses of sanitarians, and meals for municipal employees, as for example:

House Joint Resolution 888—Public Law 88-1836, approved July 28, 1964—and House Joint Resolution 195—Public Law 1178, approved July 19, 1966—to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to promulgate special regulations for the July 1965 and July 1967 Washington conventions of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America.

House Joint Resolution 195—Public Law 89-25, approved May 22, 1965—giving the District of Columbia Commissioners similar authority with respect to the American Legion convention scheduled to be held in Washington the latter part of this month.

HEARING

The enactment of the reported bill was urged by representatives of the District of Columbia Commissioners and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health at a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 5 on August 1, 1966. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

The letter of the President of the Board of Commissioners recommending this legislation follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICES,

Washington, March 5, 1965.

The Honorable SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill "To amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act."

The draft bill amends section 3 of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act in such manner as to take care of two matters which have been brought to the attention of the Commissioners. The first of the amendments, providing for the insertion in such section of the phrase "including sanitarians", is proposed in the expectation that it may become necessary for the District of Columbia to employ, on a temporary basis, sanitarians from other jurisdictions to provide adequate inspection and enforcement of health regulations during the Inaugural Period, including those regulations pertaining to the preparation and dispensing of food, so that the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia will not be forced to neglect completely its routine responsibilities for such inspection and enforcement during such Inaugural Period. The second amendment of this section of existing law is proposed for the purpose of authorizing the procurement of food to feed municipal employees required to remain on duty during such Inaugural Period and who, unless the District of Columbia arranges for their feeding, may find it difficult or impossible to provide themselves with food.

The Commissioners, in the belief that the proposed amendments of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act will be to the benefit of the general public during the Inaugural Period, strongly recommend the enactment of the attached draft bill.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 16337) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with sundry committee amendments, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1501) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The following are the salary schedules for teachers, school officers, and certain other employees of the Board of Education whose positions are included therein:

"Salary class and position	Service Step 1	Service Step 2	Service Step 3	Service Step 4	Service Step 5	Service Step 6	Service Step 7	Service Step 8	Service Step 9
Class 1	$26,500								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	22,000								
Deputy superintendent.									
Class 3	16,410	$16,715	$17,020	$17,325	$17,630	$17,935	$18,240	$18,545	$18,850
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	14,500	14,810	15,120	15,430	15,740	16,050	16,360	16,670	16,980
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	12,740	13,025	13,310	13,595	13,880	14,165	14,450	14,735	15,020
Group B, master's degree	13,275	13,560	13,845	14,130	14,415	14,700	14,985	15,270	15,555
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,495	13,780	14,065	14,350	14,635	14,920	15,205	15,490	15,775
Group D, doctor's degree	13,715	14,000	14,285	14,570	14,855	15,140	15,425	15,710	15,995
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									

"Salary class and position	Service Step 1	Service Step 2	Service Step 3	Service Step 4	Service Step 5	Service Step 6	Service Step 7	Service Step 8	Service Step 9
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	$12,805	$13,090	$13,375	$13,660	$13,945	$14,230	$14,515	$14,800	$15,085
Principal level IV	12,805	13,090	13,375	13,660	13,945	14,230	14,515	14,800	15,085
Principal level III	12,525	12,810	13,095	13,380	13,665	13,950	14,235	14,520	14,805
Principal level II	12,245	12,530	12,815	13,100	13,385	13,670	13,955	14,240	14,525
Principal level I	14,965	12,250	12,535	12,820	13,105	13,390	13,675	13,960	14,245
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,025	13,310	13,595	13,880	14,165	14,450	14,735	15,020	15,305
Principal level IV	13,025	13,310	13,595	13,880	14,165	14,450	14,735	15.020	15,305
Principal level III	12,745	13,030	13,315	13,600	13,885	14,170	14,455	14,740	15,025
Principal level II	12,465	12,750	13,035	13,320	13,605	13,890	14,175	14,460	14,745
Principal level I	12,185	12,470	12,755	13,040	13,325	13,610	13,895	14,180	14,465
Group D, doctor's degree	13,245	13,530	13,815	14,100	14,385	14,670	14,955	15,240	15,525
Principal level IV	13,245	13,530	13,815	14,100	14,385	14,670	14,955	15,240	15,525
Principal level III	12,965	13,250	13,535	13,820	14,105	14,390	14,675	14,960	15,245
Principal level II	12,685	12,970	13,255	13,540	13,825	14,110	14,395	14,680	14,965
Principal level I	12,405	12,690	12,975	13,260	13,545	13,830	14,115	14,400	14,685
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools)									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation)									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services)									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school)									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety									
Director, special education									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capital Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	11,860	12,145	12,430	12,715	13,000	13,285	13,570	13,855	14,140
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,080	12,365	12,650	12,935	13,220	13,505	13,790	14,075	14,360
Group D, doctor's degree	12,300	12,585	12,870	13,155	13,440	13,725	14,010	14,295	14,580
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervision director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Directors, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	11,390	11,675	11,960	12,245	12,530	12,815	13,100	13,385	13,670
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,610	11,895	12,180	12,465	12,750	13,035	13,320	13,605	13,890
Group D, doctor's degree	11,830	12,115	12,400	12,685	12,970	13,255	13,540	13,825	14,110
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	10,380	10,665	10,950	11,235	11,520	11,805	12,090	12,375	12,660
Group B, master's degree	10,915	11,200	11,485	11,770	12,055	12,340	12,625	12,910	13,195
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,135	11,420	11,705	11,990	12,275	12,560	12,845	13,130	13,415
Group D, doctor's degree	11,355	11,640	11,925	12,210	12,495	12,780	13,065	13,350	13,635
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	10,445	10,730	11,015	11,300	11,585	11,870	12,155	12,440	12,725
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,665	10,950	11,235	11,520	11,805	12,090	12,375	12,660	12,945
Group D, doctor's degree	10,885	11,170	11,455	11,740	12,025	12,310	12,595	12,880	13,165
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	9,975	10,260	10,545	10,830	11,115	11,400	11,685	11,970	12,255
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,195	10,480	10,765	11,050	11,335	11,620	11,905	12,190	12,475
Group D, doctor's degree	10,415	10,700	10,985	11,270	11,555	11,840	12,125	12,410	12,695
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	9,505	9,790	10,075	10,360	10,645	10,930	11,215	11,500	11,785
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,725	10,010	10,295	10,580	10,865	11,150	11,435	11,720	12,005
Group D, doctor's degree	9,945	10,230	10,515	10,800	11,085	11,370	11,655	11,940	12,225
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	8,525	8,875	9,225	9,575	9,925	10,275	10,625	10,975	11,325
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,745	9,095	9,445	9,795	10,145	10,495	10,845	11,195	11,545
Group D, doctor's degree	8,965	9,315	9,665	10,015	10,365	10,715	11,065	11,415	11,765
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

Salary class and position	Service Step 1	Service Step 2	Service Step 3	Service Step 4	Service Step 5	Service Step 6	Service Step 7	Service Step 8	Service Step 9	Service Step 10	Service Step 11	Service Step 12	Service Step 13	Longevity Step X	Longevity Step Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,960	$7,250	$7,540	$7,830	$8,120	$8,410	$8,700	$8,990	$9,280	$9,570	$9,860	$10,150	$10,440		
Group B, master's degree	7,495	7,785	8,075	8,365	8,655	8,945	9,235	9,525	9,815	10,105	10,395	10,685	10,975		
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,715	8,005	8,295	8,585	8,875	9,165	9,455	9,745	10,035	10,325	10,615	10,905	11,195		
Group D, doctor's degree	7,935	8,225	8,515	8,805	9,095	9,385	9,675	9,965	10,255	10,545	10,835	11,125	11,415		
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	5,795	6,060	6,325	6,590	6,855	7,110	7,365	7,620	7,875	8,130	8,385	8,640	8,895	$9,490	$10,085
Group B, master's degree	6,330	6,595	6,860	7,125	7,390	7,645	7,900	8,155	8,410	8,665	8,920	9,175	9,430	10,025	10,620
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,550	6,815	7,080	7,345	7,610	7,865	8,120	8,375	8,630	8,885	9,140	9,395	9,650	10,245	10,840
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	6,770	7,035	7,300	7,565	7,830	8,085	8,340	8,595	8,850	9,105	9,360	9,615	9,870	10,465	11,060
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspector.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
Schoo lpsychologist.															

"(b) Each employee appointed to a position of teacher-aide (noninstructional), established under section 5(c), shall be paid in accordance with the following salary schedule:

	Step									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
"Teacher-aid (noninstructional)	$4,715	$4,925	$5,135	$5,345	$5,555	$5,765	$5,975	$6,185	$6,395	$6,605."

(2)(A) Section 2(c)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1511 (c)(1)) is amended is read as follows:

"(1) The terms 'master's degree' and 'doctor's degree' mean, respectively, a master's degree and a doctor's degree granted in course by an accredited higher educational institution."

(B) Section 2(c)(2) (D.C. Code sec. 31–1511(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The term 'plus sixty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than sixty graduate semester hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the sixty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such sixty credit hours."

(3) Section 4 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1521) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Board of Education in group C of a salary class in the salary schedule in section 1(a) of this Act who possesses a doctor's degree, and any employee of the Board of Education in group C of salary class 15 of such salary schedule who possesses a master's degree plus sixty credit hours, shall be transferred in accordance with section 10(a) to group D of such salary class."

(4) Section 5 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522) is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(c) The Board of Education, with the concurrence of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to establish a position which shall be designated "teacher-aid (noninstructional)' and the compensation for which shall be fixed in accordance with the salary schedule in section 1(b). A person appointed to the position of teacher-aid (noninstructional) shall be eligible for leave, retirement, life insurance, and health benefits as provided in the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959. The minimum qualification for appointment to such position shall be successful completion of at least sixty semester hours of an accredited junior college, college, or university. A person appointed to such position shall be a noninstructional employee, and his primary duty shall be to assist the instructional staff in tasks related to instruction. The total of the number of teacher-aids (noninstructional) appointed under this Act and the number of persons appointed under any other Act to perform the same duties as teacher-aids (noninstructional) shall at no time exceed 4 per centum of the number of classroom teachers in salary class 15.

"(d) The initial assignment of each position of school principal in the public school system of the District of Columbia to one of the four principal levels within salary class 6 of the salary schedule in section 1(a) of this Act shall be made in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) Within sixty days following the date of enactment of this subsection, the Board of Education, with the cooperation of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall assign each position of school principal to one of the four principal levels within group B, C, or D in salary class 6 of the salary schedule in section 1(a). Such assignment shall be made on the basis of an evaluation by the Board of Education, with the cooperation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of the duties and responsibilities of each position of school principal in the school administered by the person holding such position. Such evaluation shall be based on (A) such workload factors as (i) the academic program, (ii) the number of teachers, nonteaching personnel, and other professional and nonprofessional personnel supervised, (iii) school enrollment, (iv) cocurricular activities, (v) extracurricular activities, and (vi) community activities; and (B) such other factors as the Board of Education deems appropriate. The initial assignment of a position of school principal to a principal level within salary class 6 shall be effective on the effective date of this subsection.

"(2) In the case of a person holding the position of school principal on the effective date of this subsection, the initial assignment of the position held by such person to one of the four principal levels within salary class 6 shall not (A) affect the group and service step occupied by such person, or (B) for the period during which such person holds such position, reduce his rate of compensation below the rate of compensation to which he was entitled immediately prior to such effective date.

"(3) During the period beginning on such effective date and ending on the date of such initial assignment, each person holding the position of school principal on such effective date shall have his compensation fixed in accordance with the rate of compensation prescribed for that service step, corresponding to his creditable years of service, of principal level I in that group within salary class 6 which corresponds to his academic qualifications. Each such person shall be paid for such period the difference, if any, between the amount of compensation he received during such period and the amount of compensation that he would have been paid during such period if his compensation had been fixed in accordance with the rate of compensation prescribed for the principal level in salary class 6 to which he was assigned.

"(e) On July 1, 1967, and on July 1 of each year thereafter, the Board of Education, with the cooperation of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall evaluate the duties and responsibilities of each position of school principal on the basis of the factors prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) to determine whether the principal level within salary class 6 to which such position is assigned is commensurate to the duties and responsibilities of such position. The Board of Education may assign a position of school principal to a different principal level within salary class 6 only if it determines on the basis of three consecutive annual evaluations that such assignment should be made. A person holding a position

of school principal which the Board of Education has assigned to a different principal level shall not be placed in a lower service step in the new principal level than the service step he occupied immediately prior to such assignment."

(5) Subsection (a) of section 7 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1532(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Each employee who is newly appointed or reappointed to any position in salary classes 3 to 15, inclusive, of the salary schedule in section 1(a) shall be assigned to the service step numbered next above the number of years of service with which he is credited for the purpose of salary placement. The Board, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to evaluate the previous experience of each such employee to determine the number of years with which he may be so credited. Employees newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned to any position in salary class 15 shall receive one year of such placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not exceeding nine years, in the District of Columbia in salary class 15, or in the same type of position regardless of school level, in an educational system or institution of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board. Employees newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned to any position in salary classes 3 to 14 inclusive, except the positions of chief librarian and assistant professor, associate professor and professor, shall receive no placement credit for educational service or trade experience outside the District of Columbia public schools. Employees reappointed or reassigned to positions in salary classes 3 to 14, inclusive, shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service in the same salary class or in a position of equivalent or higher rank within the District of Columbia public schools, except that no such employee shall receive more than five years of placement credit for previous service rendered as a temporary employee within such system. Persons appointed to the position of shop teacher in the vocational education program shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of approved experience in the trades, as determined by the Board but not in excess of nine years for any combination of trade experience and educational service outside the school system. Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board.

"(2) Salary placement credit for service rendered either inside or outside the public school system of the District of Columbia shall be effective on the date of appointment or on the first day of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of such placement credit by the Board, whichever is later.

"(3) Each probationary or permanent employee in salary class 15 who is in the employ of the Board of Education on the effective date of this paragraph shall move to the numerical service step or longevity step, as the case may be, commensurate with the additional creditable service allowed such employee under the amendments made by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1966."

(6) Section 9 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1534) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 9." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The following provisions shall apply to all temporary employees in salary class 15:

"(A) Each temporary employee in salary class 15 employed cumulatively as such an employee in such salary class less than three full years as of July 1, 1966, must qualify as a probationary employee within five years after the date of employment or July 1, 1966, whichever date is later, or his employment shall be terminated as of the date of completion of the then current school year.

"(B) Each temporary employee in salary class 15 employed cumulatively as of July 1, 1966, for more than three but less than ten full years as such an employee in such salary class, must qualify as a probationary employee within seven years after July 1, 1966, or his employment shall be terminated as of the date of completion of the then current school year.

"(C) Each temporary employee in salary class 15 who has accumulated more than ten full years of satisfactory service as of July 1, 1966, as such an employee in such salary class, may be continued as temporary teacher contingent upon satisfactory service.

"(c)(1) A temporary employee in salary class 15 who receives a permanent appointment shall be advanced on and after the date of such appointment in double annual increments to the place in the salary schedule which he would have occupied if he had been employed as a probationary employee from the date of his appointment as a temporary employee. A temporary employee in salary class 15 who receives a probationary appointment within two years of the date of his appointment as a temporary employee shall receive full placement credit on the date of his appointment as a probationary employee as if he had been employed as a probationary employee from the date of his appointment as a temporary employee.

"(2) Temporary employees in salary class 15 with fifteen or more total years of satisfactory service in the District of Columbia public schools shall be advanced to service step 10, effective July 1, 1966."

(7) Section 10 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1535) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1966, each promotion to group B, group C, or group D, within a salary class, shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular meeting of the Board immediately preceding the date of approval of that promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree, as the case may be, whichever is later.

"(b) Any employee in a position covered by section 1 of this Act who is promoted to group B, group C, or group D, of the same salary class, shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his new group as he would have occupied in the group from which promoted."

(8)(A) Section 13(a) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: extended school year programs, adult education school programs, and an Americanization school, under and within appropriations made by Congress. The pay for teachers, officers, and other educational employees in the summer schools, adult education schools, and veteran's summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Step		
	1	2	3
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)	Per diem		
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist and instructor; District of Columbia Teachers College	$22.59	$24.93	$27.27
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	27.11	29.92	32.72
Clinical psychologist	28.24	31.16	34.09
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	29.37	32.41	35.45
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	32.76	36.15	39.54
Supervising director	33.89	37.40	40.91
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	36.11	39.89	43.63
VETERANS SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher	33.89	37.40	40.91
	Per period		
ADULT EDUCATION SCHOOLS			
Teacher	$5.52	$6.09	$6.67
Assistant principal	8.00	8.83	9.67
Principal	8.83	9.74	10.67."

(B) Section 13 is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Board of Education is authorized to pay to a classroom teacher in salary class 15 who performs an extra duty activity (specified in the schedule in paragraph (3) of this subsection or an extra duty activity included by the Board in such schedule under such paragraph), and who meets the requirements of this paragraph, the additional annual compensation prescribed for that activity in paragraph (3). To be eligible for such additional compensation, a teacher—

"(A) must be assigned the standard teaching load for a regular day school teacher at his particular school level, and

"(B) must perform on a continuing basis during hours beyond the regular school day an extra duty activity which—

"(i) is approved by the Board as an authorized cocurricular or extracurricular activity,

"(ii) involves the supervision and instruction of students who select such activity voluntarily, and

"(iii) requires no less than twenty-five hours in any one semester beyond the normal schoolday.

"(2) The additional compensation authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the compensation prescribed by the salary schedule in section 1(a) of this Act for classroom teachers in salary class 15. Payment of such additional compensation shall be made in a lump sum at the end of the school year or upon termination of service for that portion of services rendered. Such additional compensation shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement

or insurance, and such additional compensation shall not be considered as salary (A) for the purpose of computing annuities pursuant to the Act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia', approved August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–721 et seq.), and the Civil Service Retirement Act, or (B) for the purpose of computing insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (5 U.S.C. 2091 et seq.). Such additional compensation may be paid for more than one activity assigned to a classroom teacher so long as such activities are not performed concurrently.

"(3)(A) The additional compensation authorized by this subsection shall be paid in accordance with the following schedule:

"Extra duty activities—Annual compensation per teacher for each activity

Head coach: football, basketball, baseball, or track (senior or vocational high school)	$750
Assistant coach: football, basketball, baseball, or track (senior or vocational high school)	550
Junior varsity coach: football, basketball, or baseball (senior or vocational high school)	450
Intramural or extramural supervisor (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	300
Coach: swimming, golf, tennis, or cross country (senior high school)	450
Music director: vocal or instrumental (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	550
Newspaper faculty adviser (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	550
Yearbook adviser (senior or vocational high school)	300
Dramatics director (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	450
Forensics director (senior or vocational high school)	300

"(B) The Board, with the concurrence of the Board of Commissioners and on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, may specify other extra duty activities for which additional annual compensation may be paid if such activities meet the requirements specified in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection. The Board may specify the amount of additional compensation which may be paid for the performance of such activities, which amount may not exceed the highest amount of additional annual compensation specified in the schedule in this paragraph."

SEC. 3. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), for services rendered during the period beginning on July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1966.

(b) Paragraph 2 of section 7(a) of the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955 (as added by paragraph (5) of section 2 of this Act) shall take effect with respect to appointments made by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia after July 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 4, strike out the following in the salary schedules:

"Class 1 ..... $26,500
Superintendent."

and insert in lieu thereof:

"Class 1 ..... $26,000
Superintendent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 4, strike out the salary schedules for salary class 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Group B, master's degree:									
Principal level IV	12,805	13,090	13,375	13,660	13,945	14,230	14,515	14,800	15,085
Principal level III	12,605	12,890	13,175	13,460	13,745	14,030	14,315	14,600	14,885
Principal level II	12,405	12,690	12,975	13,260	13,545	13,830	14,115	14,400	14,685
Principal level I	12,205	12,490	12,775	13,060	13,345	13,630	13,915	14,200	14,485
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours:									
Principal level IV	13,025	13,310	13,595	13,880	14,165	14,450	14,735	15,020	15,305
Principal level III	12,825	13,110	13,395	13,680	13,965	14,205	14,535	14,820	15,105
Principal level II	12,625	12,910	13,195	13,480	13,765	14,050	14,335	14,620	14,905
Principal level I	12,425	12,710	12,995	13,280	13,565	13,850	14,135	14,420	14,705
Group D, doctor's degree:									
Principal level IV	13,245	13,530	13,815	14,100	14,385	14,670	14,955	15,240	15,525
Principal level III	13,045	13,330	13,615	13,900	14,185	14,470	14,755	15,040	15,325
Principal level II	12,845	13,130	13,415	13,700	13,985	14,270	14,555	14,840	15,125
Principal level I	12,645	12,930	13,215	13,500	13,785	14,070	14,355	14,640	14,925

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY as a substitute for the committee amendment: On page 2, after line 4, strike out the salary schedules for salary class 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Group B, master's degree:									
Principal level IV	12,805	13,090	13,375	13,660	13,945	14,230	14,515	14,800	15,085
Principal level III	12,605	12,890	13,175	13,460	13,745	14,030	14,315	14,600	14,885
Principal level II	12,405	12,690	12,975	13,260	13,545	13,830	14,115	14,400	14,685
Principal level I	12,205	12,490	12,775	13,060	13,345	13,630	13,915	14,200	14,485
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours:									
Principal level IV	13,025	13,310	13,595	13,880	14,165	14,450	14,735	15,020	15,305
Principal level III	12,825	13,110	13,395	13,680	13,965	14,250	14,535	14,820	15,105
Principal level II	12,625	12,901	13,195	13,480	13,765	14,050	14,335	14,620	14,905
Principal level I	12,425	12,710	12,995	13,280	13,565	13,850	14,135	14,420	14,705
Group D, doctor's degree:									
Principal level IV	13,245	13,530	13,815	14,100	14,385	14,670	14,955	15,240	15,525
Principal level III	13,045	13,330	13,615	13,900	14,185	14,470	14,755	15,040	15,325
Principal level II	12,845	13,130	13,415	13,700	13,985	14,270	14,555	14,840	15,125
Principal level I	12,645	12,930	13,215	13,500	13,785	14,070	14,355	14,640	14,925

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended by the substitute amendment, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 2, after "perform" insert the following: "in the public school system of the District of Columbia".

Page 7, line 16, strike out "group B, C, or D in".

Page 9, line 8, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "his position".

Page 14, strike out lines 17 through 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Any employee in a position in a salary class in the salary schedules in section 1(a) of this Act who is promoted to group B, group C, or group D of such salary class, shall be placed in the same numerical service step in his new group which he would have occupied in the group from which promoted."

Page 16, line 4, strike out "mets" and insert in lieu thereof "meets".

Page 17, line 9, after "under" insert "the".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the principal purposes of H.R. 16337 are the following:

First. Increase the salaries of District of Columbia teachers and school officers an average of 7.9 percent, effective as of July 1, 1966.

Second. Authorize the position of "teacher-aid—noninstructional" to provide assistance to the classroom teachers in various nonteaching functions.

Third. Establish four salary levels in each group in salary step 6 for principalships based upon factors common to all principalships, but without regard to school level.

Fourth. Extend from 5 years to 9 years the salary placement credit given for previous acceptable teaching experience to persons appointed or reappointed in the District of Columbia school system.

Fifth. Require temporary teachers to qualify fully for probationary appointment within a prescribed period of years dependent upon length of previous service in the District of Columbia system.

Sixth. Authorize extra pay for classroom teachers who perform extra duty activity on a continuing basis during hours beyond the regular schoolday.

The provisions of H.R. 16337 represent, for the most part, though with some modifications, the recommendations of the Superintendent's Salary Committee, which was appointed in January of 1964 at the request of the District of Columbia Board of Education and which spent more than a year in an exhaustive study of the various aspects of the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955. Membership of this Committee represented the District of Columbia School Administration, the District of Columbia Education Association, and the American Federation of Teachers, and the Committee was aided by officials from the District of Columbia Personnel Office. Their recommendations, in large part, were transmitted to the Congress in the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners' request for legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act.

Your committee gave serious consideration to proposed legislation providing for a two-part salary increase, one part of which would be made retroactive to that date, which was recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and introduced in this session. The committee's conclusion, however, was that the single increase as proposed in H.R. 16337, slightly higher in average percentage than was recommended by the District of Columbia Commissioners and effective on July 1, 1966, will more properly compensate the District of Columbia teachers for having received no salary increase in 1965, and at the same time from the standpoint of all considerations comes reasonably close to the limitations contained in the Commissioners' recommendations.

I. SALARY INCREASES

Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the bill is designed to provide an overall increase of approximately 7.9 percent in the salaries of all professional personnel in the District of Columbia public school system except for the Superintendent and the Deputy Superintendent, effective as of July 1, 1966. Your committee is of the opinion that inasmuch as the present salary of the Superintendent of Schools is equal to that of the members of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, a further increase at this time would be inappropriate, and that the salary of the Deputy Superintendent is properly related at its present level both to the salary of the Superintendent, and to the salary assigned to the Assistant Superintendents by the new salary scale.

In addition, there is a very acute problem of recruitment and retention of qualified teachers in the District of Columbia, which can be solved in part by realistic salary increases. The most vigorous competition for the recruitment of new teachers and the retention of experienced teachers comes, of course, from the six surrounding school jurisdictions, comprising Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax County, Falls Church, in Virginia, and Prince Georges County, and Montgomery County in Maryland.

COMPETITIVE POSITION

In 1964, all area systems placed into effect substantial teacher salary adjustments. At that time, the District maintained a good competitive position by the enactment of a 7-percent salary increase. This competitive position was short lived, however, because of new salary adjustments approved for the 1965–66 school year by all the other area systems except Falls Church, whose competitive position is currently quite favorable. Further, the District's position is now in more serious jeopardy by reason of further increases recently adopted in several of these surrounding areas for the school year 1966–67. In short, whereas in past years salary adjustments made by these six local school systems could be predicted on a 3-year cycle, this cycle has now been shortened to 2 years and seems to be moving toward an annual basis.

The following chart provides a visual picture of the competitive position which this proposed legislation will provide for the District of Columbia for the recruitment and retention of teaching personnel, both as compared with the other six jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area and also with all the U.S. cities with populations in excess of 500,000 persons:

Degree	Minimum and maximum salaries	Rank among 7 school systems in Washington metropolitan area	Rank among 21 largest U.S. cities
Bachelor's	$5,795 (minimum)	1	3
	10,085 (maximum)	3	2
Master's	6,330 (minimum)	1	5
	10,620 (maximum)	3	4
Master's plus 30 hours	6,550 (minimum)	1	5
	10,840 (maximum)	3	4
Master's plus 60 hours; or earned doctor's	6,770 (minimum)	2	5
	11,060 (maximum)	4	6

As this chart reveals, this proposed salary scale will place the District in a very favorable competitive position in the area, particularly in the minimum salaries offered to new teachers, in which the District will rank first in three of the four teacher categories. Also, in the maximum salaries where the District does not rank first in the area, the differences by which other jurisdictions exceed the District's salaries are very small. Also, the District's rankings in comparison with the other 20 largest U.S. cities will be excellent indeed, when it is considered that in most instances the District's salaries will be exceeded only in cities located on the west coast, with which the District of Columbia does not compete for teachers.

In addition to direct comparisons of pay, two other facts should be remembered in comparing annual salaries of various school systems. First, that the length of the work year varies by as much as 4 weeks among the school systems. New York, for example, has a 190–195-day work year versus 184 in the District. The second fact is that only two other large cities provide both health and life insurance benefits, and these are not as extensive as those provided by the District of Columbia government, as are shown in the following table prepared by the District of Columbia Accounting Division.

Cost of fringe benefits for District of Columbia teachers and school officers, fiscal year 1966

(1) Regular teachers retirement	$7,369,400
(2) Civil service retirement (temporary teachers)	1,154,700
(3) Health benefits	170,000
(4) Life insurance	128,200
(5) Social security	55,000
Total	8,877,300

Your committee is of the opinion that this proposed salary scale will permit the District to compete adequately in a labor market where there has been a chronic teacher shortage for 20 years, and where the need for the most dedicated teachers is greater than ever before.

II. TEACHER-AID POSITIONS

Paragraph (4) of section 2 of this bill authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Education to establish positions of teacher aid—noninstructional—as assistants to the classroom teachers. The function of these teacher-aids will be to assist teachers by performing such noninstructional duties, as setting up science experiments, monitoring libraries or homerooms, acting as lay readers, correcting test papers, and similar duties. Such teacher-aids must have had at least 2 years of successful work in an accredited college, and will be paid a starting salary of $4,715 per year, with annual step increases to a maximum of $6,605 attainable in 10 years of service. They will receive the same fringe benefits as employees under the Classification Act.

Actually, during the past school year and during the current summer school session, the District of Columbia school system has employed two types of noninstructional aids under authority granted in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89–10, approved April 11, 1965. The numbers and distribution of these employees in the different school levels are as follows:

	1965–66	Summer 1966
Number at elementary schools	212	153
Number at junior high schools	26	26
Number at senior high schools	50	50
Total	288	229

These aids are employed under the Classification Act, and are paid with Federal-grant funds. It is stipulated that they may be designated to serve only in public schools in deprived or impoverished areas, and their qualifications and duties depend upon their placement in either class 2 or class 4 of the classified pay schedule.

Of these employees, only those in class 4 are designated as "teacher aids" and perform duties comparable to those which will be assigned to the teacher aids authorized by this bill. The purpose of authorizing these positions in this legislation, therefore, is to install the teacher aid as a permanent entity and an integral part of the District of Columbia public school system. Also, your committee is advised that the number of teacher aids—class 4—employed in the District of Columbia last session and in the present summer school is to be reduced next year.

The bill limits the total number of teacher aids who may be employed under this act and under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 together, to 4 percent of the number of classroom teachers in the District of Columbia school system. At present, this would be a maximum of approximately 248 such employees.

Your committee is advised that more than 30 percent of the large school systems utilize positions of this type, while many other systems are presently considering their use. Montgomery County, Md., has used such teacher aids for at least 5 years, and its current budget provides for the assignment of these positions in every elementary school in the county.

The use of teacher aids to carry out routine clerical and nonteaching tasks is a promising development in conserving the time of the teacher for her vital role in actual teaching.

III. PRINCIPALS' SALARIES

Prior to 1962, salary scales for the principals in the District of Columbia public school system were based upon school levels. That is, the principals of the senior and vocational high schools were all in class 7, junior high school principals in class 8, and elementary school principals were assigned to class 9 of the salary schedule in existence at that time.

Under Public Law 87-881—76 Stat. 1229—approved October 24, 1962, amending the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, however, all public school principals were placed in the same salary class 6 without regard to the varying degrees of their responsibilities and the relative complexities of their positions. Thus, the principal of the Capitol Page School, with an enrollment of approximately 70 pupils, is paid the same salary as the principal of the largest school in the city.

In acknowledgment of the obvious inequity of this situation, the District of Columbia Board of Education requested the District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools several years ago to review this entire matter and to submit an appropriate recommendation.

As a result of this request, representatives of the District of Columbia Personnel Office and the District Public Schools Administration worked for the past year and a half on a reasonable and equitable evaluation plant for school principals. The plan as developed takes into account factors which are common to all principals' positions, properly weighted in accordance with their relative significance, to constitute a scale which will serve as a truly equitable yardstick of comparative evaluation for salary placement purposes. The implementation of this plan comprises paragraph (4) of section 2 of the bill.

The Superintendent of Schools recommended this plan to the Board of Education, who voted its adoption. It also has the unanimous approval of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

To say that all principals should be paid the same salary is comparable to saying that the administrator or superintendent of schools of a town of 40,000 population should be paid the same salary as an administrator or superintendent of schools of one of the Nation's largest cities. Surely this is not reasonable or practicable. Yet it cannot be denied that the administrator or superintendent of schools of the town of 40,000 performs many of the same duties as his big city counterpart and that his job is just as important to the health, safety and welfare of his town folks as is that of the city administrator or superintendent of schools to the city's residents. On the other hand, it is equally undeniable, just as it is in the case of the principal of a small elementary school as compared with a principal of a large secondary school, that the city administrator or superintendent of schools not only affects the lives of more people, but will have vastly greater administrative responsibility, a greater number of and more varied problems and, generally, a greater number of and more varied duties and responsibilities.

Not only is there a wide variation in administrative responsibility among different school levels, but also there is commonly a significant variation within the schools of a single level. For example, the elementary schools in a large urban system may vary widely in such vital factors as the number of pupils and the number of professional subordinates for whom the different principals are responsible. This is the reason for a trend away from salary schedules for principals being based solely upon school level, such as existed in the District of Columbia prior to 1962. However, a single salary scale for all principals in large school systems is even more of a rarity, and in fact at present is virtually nonexistent.

IV. NINE-YEAR PLACEMENT CREDIT

Under present law, the District of Columbia public school system, cannot give prospective teachers credit for more than 5 years' teaching experience in or outside of the District of Columbia school system, for the purposes of salary placement. This means that an incoming teacher with more than 5 years of previous experience cannot be placed higher than step 6 in the District of Columbia teachers' salary schedule. Of course, any previous teaching experience must be evaluated, and credit even within the 5-year limitation is predicated upon acceptability of this experience.

Your committee is informed that more than 59 percent of all public school systems with enrollments in excess of 100,000 pupils now give credit for more than 5 years of successful teaching experience, and all the other school jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area give either 9 or 10 years of placement credit for acceptable experience.

This situation places the District of Columbia at an obvious disadvantage in attracting experienced teachers. For this reason paragraph (5) of section 2 of H.R. 16337 provides that the District may give placement credit for as much as 9 years of acceptable teaching experience. Hence, an experienced teacher coming into the District of Columbia system on probationary status will be able to start at step 10 on the salary schedule, with at least 9 years of such experience.

This provision will not affect the maximum hiring level for temporary teachers, which will remain at step 6.

In fairness to teachers who are presently in the District of Columbia school system, and who entered this system with more than 5 years of acceptable experience, the bill provides that they shall receive credit for all such experience not to exceed a total of 9 years, or 4 years in excess of the 5 for which they were credited, and be placed in the salary step appropriate to this experience. For example, a teacher with as much as 9 years of acceptable previous experience who is now in step 8 will be placed in step 12, by virtue of her 4 years of experience for which she has not heretofore received placement credit.

Your committee is of the opinion that this provision will do much to enhance the District's ability to compete effectively for experienced teachers who are qualified for probationary employment.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN SALARY PLACEMENTS

This is an amendment to present laws requested by the District of Columbia Board of Education, designed to prevent unjust losses of salary on the part of the District of Columbia school employees by reason of delays in submission of pertinent material from previous employers, or clerical errors made in the District of Columbia school system resulting in improper placement on the salary schedule.

The bill provides that proper salary placement, authorizing the payment of the appropriate salary, shall be effective either on the date of employment or 12 months prior to the approval of the Board of Education, whichever date occurs later. Thus, the employee will receive any back pay to which he is entitled by reason of such error for as much as a year prior to the Board's corrective action.

This provision is made retroactive to apply to all employees appointed after July 1, 1965.

V. TEMPORARY TEACHERS

Your committee is deeply concerned over the growing problems posed by the steadily increasing percentage of "temporary" teachers in the District of Columbia public school system. A temporary teacher is one who cannot meet all the requirements established by the Board of Education for permanent employment as a qualified teacher. Over the past 10 years, the percentage of District of Columbia teachers in this "temporary" status has risen from 19.1 percent to 43.2 percent. It should be explained that all qualified teachers appointed in the District of Columbia system must serve for a "probationary" period of 2 years before attaining "permanent" status.

Temporary teachers must be reappointed each year, and regardless of their years of service cannot attain higher than step 6 on the teachers' salary scale. Also, they are not eligible for benefits under the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act, although they can qualify for less advantageous retirement benefits under the civil service system. Despite these facts, however, many of these "temporary" teachers have been serving in the District of Columbia system for some years.

Your committee is informed that the principal qualifications which these temporary teachers most commonly fail to meet are the following:

First, a passing minimum score on the national teachers' examination;

Second, specific college course requirements of a particular position;

Third, college degree requirements.

While there can be no doubt that some of these temporary teachers are excellent, and in fact among the most capable in the system, there is no question that as a group, they have not met the standards of professional competence established by the District of Columbia Board of Education. And when this group encompasses nearly one-half of the teachers in the system, as is the case in the District of Columbia today, a most serious problem exists. As an evidence of this fact, in June 1964, as a result of the District of Columbia Public Schools' efforts to encourage teachers to become fully qualified, 343 temporary District of Columbia teachers took the national teachers examination. It is certainly reasonable to assume that all these teachers were interested in attaining permanent status. Yet only 67 of these 343 temporary teachers scored at or above the thirty-third percentile—that is, in the upper two-thirds of all those who have taken the test—which is the minimum passing level set by the District of Columbia Board of Education for qualification as probationary and permanent teachers.

In contrast with this situation in the District of Columbia schools, your committee is informed that in none of the suburban jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area is there any appreciable number of percentage of temporary or unqualified teachers. This is despite the fact that over the years the Congress has maintained salary levels for District teachers at or near the top in the metropolitan area.

These facts point up clearly an undeniable need for action to alleviate this grave problem, which obviously cannot be corrected by salary increases alone. In recognition of this critical situation, the District of Columbia Board of Education has recommended the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 2 of this bill, which they believe will be effective.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Briefly, section 2(b) provides that a person who has served less than 3 years in the District of Columbia school system as a temporary teacher must become fully qualified within 5 years after his date of appointment or after July 1, 1966, whichever date is later, or his service will be terminated at the end of that school year. If such a teacher has served more than 3 but less than 10 years as a temporary teacher, he must qualify fully within 7 years; and a temporary teacher who has been employed in the District of Columbia system for more than 10 consecutive years will be allowed to continue on in temporary status contingent upon continued satisfactory service.

It is further provided that a temporary teacher who receives a permanent appointment shall be advanced in double annual increments to the place on the salary scale which he would have occupied had he been employed originally as a probationary; also, if a temporary teacher becomes fully qualified within a period of 2 years after the date of his employment, he shall be advanced immediately to whatever place on the salary schedule he would be in had he been employed originally as a qualified, probationary teacher. These provisions are intended as an incentive to temporary teachers to become qualified as quickly as possible, for increased salary benefits.

Finally, it is provided that temporary teachers with 15 or more years of satisfactory service shall be advanced to service step 10. At present, as has been pointed out, no temporary teacher may advance beyond service step 6.

Your committee is informed that similar measures, designed to require temporary teachers to qualify for certification within a prescribed period of time, are being used successfully in a number of other school systems. Both Virginia and Maryland, for example, require all temporary teachers to achieve a prescribed minimum of progress each year toward certification.

At public hearings conducted on June 6, 7, and 9, 1966, these provisions, designed to alleviate this serious and growing problem in the District of Columbia school system, were endorsed by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and by spokesmen for the District of Columbia Education Association. No opposition was expressed to these provisions.

VI. EXTRA-DUTY PAY

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, upon the recommendation of the District of Columbia Board of Education, requested that the Congress authorize the payment of additional compensation in specified amounts to junior high, senior high, and vocational high school teachers who are assigned to perform extra duties on a continuing basis during hours beyond the regular school day.

The extra compensations requested and contained in H.R. 16337, are in 10 categories, as follows.

Extra duty activities—Annual compensation per teacher for each activity

Head coach: football, basketball, or track (senior or vocational high school)	$750
Assistant coach: football, basketball, baseball or track (senior or vocational high school)	550
Junior varsity coach: football, or baseball (senior or vocational high school)	450
Intramural or extramural supervisor (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	300
Coach: swimming, golf, tennis, or cross country (senior high school)	450
Music director: vocal or instrumental (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	550
Newspaper faculty adviser (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	550
Yearbook adviser (senior or vocational high school)	550
Dramatics director (senior, vocational, or junior high school)	450
Forensics director (senior or vocational high school)	300

These amounts are payable in a lump sum at the end of the particular period of extra-duty service, and are not to be considered as salary for the purposes of computing retirement annuities or insurance coverage based upon annual salary. Additional compensation may be paid to a classroom teacher for more than one of these extra-duty activities, provided they are not performed concurrently.

In addition to these specific activities for which extra pay is authorized, the proposed legislation allows also the addition of other activities by the Board of Education, with the concurrence of the Board of Commissioners and upon the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools. Payment for such added activities, however, cannot exceed the highest amount authorized in the schedule provided in this bill.

In order to assure adequate safeguards insofar as eligibility is concerned, the bill stipulates definite requirements which all such activities must meet. To comply with these eligibility requirements, the following must be present:

A teacher must be assigned a standard teaching load for a regular day school teacher;

The extra-duty activity must be approved by the Board of Education as an authorized cocurricular or extracurricular activity;

The activity must require no less than 25 additional hours in any one semester over and above the regular school day; and

The activity must involve the supervision and instruction of students who select the activity voluntarily.

The intent of the legislation is also to include extra-duty activities in elementary schools when these activities are

approved by the Board of Education with the concurrence of the Commissioners.

It is estimated that approximately 450 teachers will be affected by these extra-duty pay provisions, at an annual cost of $225,000.

In the District of Columbia public school system, there has never been any payment of additional compensation for the performance of extracurricular duties, even though some of these duties are on a continuing basis during hours beyond the regular school day. Football coaches, for example, are required to report for duty late in August, as much as 2 weeks before the official opening of the school session, so that their teams may be ready by mid-September. This extra time is not paid for. Also, the Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, and other normal holiday periods all involve unpaid working days for coaches.

In 1948, a policy of giving compensatory time to the coaches, in lieu of pay for their extra work, was adopted as a method of adjusting and equalizing their workload and reducing the obvious inequity of their positions. However, your committee is informed that within a short time this compensatory time practice ceased to function adequately, until by 1963 less than 30 percent of the coaching time was actually being accorded this adjustment. According to the District of Columbia Coaches Association, a survey made during the 1963–64 academic year revealed that whereas the coaches in the District devoted some 24,000 hours to coaching duties, they received only 7,000 hours of compensatory time. Thus, during that year the coaches gave 17,000 hours of their time to the intramural and interscholastic athletic programs of the city's school system, with no compensation of any kind.

In the summer of 1965, in recognition of this situation, the District of Columbia Board of Education adopted the first written and definitive policy statement on the compensatory time regulation, and this has alleviated the problem to some extent. However, neither the school administration nor the coaches themselves consider even a properly administered "compensatory time" rule as the proper solution, and favor instead a system of extra-duty pay, for many reasons. First, your committee is advised that an extra-pay system would be less costly than the policy of compensatory time has proved to be. Further, as far as athletic coaches are concerned, it has been pointed out that a compensatory time rule adversely affects the regular program of health education and physical education, because when a teacher-coach is given time off during the school day, fewer classes must be scheduled with larger numbers of children, to the detriment of all concerned.

The overwhelming practice prevailing in the large public school systems in this country is to compensate the classroom teacher for extra duty performed beyond his normal classroom workload.

It is the view of your committee that it is important to maintain a well-rounded educational program which will give the student a form of competitive spirit, whether it be on the football field, debating hall, or on the staff of the school newspaper. Further, we are convinced that such educational programs are an effective force in the vital effort to combat the dropout problem in our public schools. Since the students participate in these activities voluntarily, if the teachers are motivated to assume this important additional responsibility, they should certainly be duly compensated. At the same time, however, your committee feels strongly that the amount of such compensation should be specified as in this proposed legislation, as the Commissioners and the Board of Education recommended.

VII. COSTS

The following is an analysis of the annual costs involved in this proposed legislation, prepared by the District of Columbia Personnel Office:

A. Salary increases averaging 7.9 percent:	
1. Total cost of increased salaries	$4,025,770
2. Interest in advance (retirement)	369,000
3. Added normal cost (retirement)	246,430
4. Civil service retirement (temporary teachers)	106,765
5. Cost of summer and evening schools	75,000
6. Cost of life insurance	12,000
Total	4,834,965
B. Estimate of cost for 9-year placement credit proposal	220,000
C. Estimate of cost for extra-duty pay for classroom teachers	225,000
D. Estimate of maximum cost for 248 teacher-aids if implemented fully in fiscal year 1968: [1]	
a. Initial cost at step 1	1,169,320
b. Civil service retirement	76,000
Total	1,245,320
Grand total	6,525,285

[1] This is the total cost which would accrue if all these teacher-aids were appointed under the authority provided in this legislation. Actually, at least some of these aids will presumably be appointed under the Federal authority referred to earlier in this report. Hence, the cost to the District of Columbia apparently will not reach this figure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask a few questions concerning this bill. What is the percentage pay increase for the teachers in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. Seven and nine-tenths percent.

Mr. GROSS. Seven and nine-tenths percent?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Does this conform to the Presidential guidelines or have the guidelines disappeared to where the woodbine twineth and the whangdoodle whangeth?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, this is not too much above the recommendations. The recommendations which came before the committee for the teachers had one raise retroactive to last October. Another raise to be effective January 1 of this coming year. We consolidated them.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that this increase of—what was the percentage increase again?

Mr. DOWDY. Seven and nine-tenths percent.

Mr. GROSS. This increase of 7.9 percent was recommended by the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. DOWDY. No, I tried to say that the Executive recommendation was for a retroactive increase to last October. That was for 6.9 percent. We cut out the retroactive feaure of the year's retroactivity and combined it into one.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will recall that effective last October the classified employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government received a pay increase of approximately 3.6 percent and a further increase of approximately 3.2 percent effective July 1 of this year. When you add those two together, it is about the approximate amount that was recommended by the Commissioners for the District of Columbia teachers.

In other words, the increase of 6.7 percent, the District of Columbia Committee, in its wisdom, provided for a pay increase for police and firemen in the amount of 9.9 percent because they were having problems in securing recruits. The same problem was involved in the District of Columbia school teacher vavancies. Therefore, the committee felt that this was a reasonable compromise between the amount of 9.9 percent and the amount recommended by the Commissioners of 6.7 percent.

Mr. GROSS. I am trying to ascertain whether this is an exercise in futility; whether President Johnson will veto this salary increase bill because it busts his guidelines, if he has any guidelines left.

Now, I should like to ask someone on the committee when it is proposed to do something about the increasing number of teachers in the District of Columbia who hold only temporary certificates. As I understand the report, the number has gone up in the last 10-year period from 19.1 to 43.2 percent. It seems unconscionable to me that there should be this number. And I understand that some of these temporary teachers have been on the payroll for 15 years. No one seems to do anything about it. What is the answer to this situation?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. The bill requires that a person who has served less than 3 years in the District of Columbia School System as a temporary teacher must become fully qualified within 5 years after his date of appointment or after July 1, 1966, whichever date is later, or his service will be terminated at the end of that school year. If such a teacher has served more

than 3 but less than 10 years as a temporary teacher he must qualify fully within 7 years or lose his job.

Mr. GROSS. All of these teachers are going to participate in this pay increase, are they not?

Mr. DOWDY. They are.

Mr. GROSS. With this increase how will the pay schedules in the District of Columbia compare with the pay schedules in the contiguous areas of Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. With the increase provided in the bill the pay scale will compare favorably. Without this bill they will lag behind the pay of schoolteachers in the six surrounding districts. With this bill the District of Columbia schoolteachers will rank first insofar as starting salaries are concerned, that is, those having a bachelor's degree, master's degree, and a master's degree plus 30 hours.

For the maximum salaries they will rank third among the surrounding communities. They compare favorably, and yet they have a difficult time recruiting teachers in the District of Columbia, much more difficult than in the surrounding areas.

Mr. GROSS. Why is that?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. There are several reasons given to the committee. There is, first, the matter of disciplinary problems in the District of Columbia school system. There is the overcrowdedness, and the difficulty of getting people to move in here from other areas.

Mr. GROSS. Does it not seem strange to the gentleman, inasmuch as we hear so much about this being the Nation's Capital and the paragon city of virtue and culture, that there should be a serious problem of recruiting schoolteachers because of a lack of discipline on the part of students?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It is most strange, but pay is one of the reasons, and we are attempting to change that at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question, since he is conversant with the situation in Virginia and Maryland. What is the percentage of teachers holding temporary certificates in Virginia and Maryland?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. A very, very small and insignificant number.

Mr. GROSS. There again we have a strange contrast, for in some cases only a comparatively small stream of water separates the two areas.

Apparently I am not going to get a good answer to the question of why 43 percent of the teachers of the District of Columbia hold temporary certificates and only a comparatively few in the areas within a stone's throw of the District of Columbia hold such certificates. I hope that some day someone who has authority to do something about the situation in the District of Columbia will put an end to this business. I am not saying that there is incompetence in all cases in temporary certificates, but certainly the teachers in the District of Columbia do not measure up, if the standards set by the National Education Association, or whoever sets the standards, are good, reliable, and fair.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. The reason we have so many probationary teachers or temporaries, or whatever you might call them, is because they cannot get others.

On the question of disciplinary problem, you will recall that the House has passed a bill which would assist in maintaining discipline in the schools of the District of Columbia, but we have not been able to get any further action on it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I was pleased indeed to introduce this bill, the main purpose of which is to provide an increase of 7.9 percent in the salaries of the teachers and other professional personnel in the District of Columbia public school system, effective as of July 1, 1966.

The last salary increase for District of Columbia teachers was enacted in 1964. Since that time, classified employees in the Federal and District of Columbia Governments have received two salary increases; one was for 3.6 percent, effective October 1, 1965, and the other was recently approved at 3.2 percent, to take effect as of July 1, 1966.

In 1964, teachers' salaries were increased in all of the school jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area, and at that time the District of Columbia's competitive position was maintained at a satisfactory level by virtue of a 7-percent increase approved for the District of Columbia teachers that year. Since that time, however, this position has deteriorated because five of the six other school systems in the area enacted a further increase for their teachers for school year 1965–66; and it is now even less favorable by virtue of the fact that three of these other jurisdictions have approved additional teachers' salary increases for the coming school year of 1966–67. This situation makes it imperative that the Congress take action now to restore the District's ability to attract and retain highly trained, competent teaching personnel.

The increases provided in this bill will establish minimum and maximum salaries for District of Columbia teachers, and comparative rankings among the seven jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area, as follows:

Level	Minimum	Rank in area	Maximum	Rank in area
Bachelor's degree	$5,795	1	$10,085	3
Master's degree	6,330	1	10,620	3
Master's degree plus 30 hours	6,550	1	10,840	3
Master's degree plus 60 hours; or earned doctor's degree	6,770	2	11,060	4

These salaries also rank very near the top among those in all U.S. cities of populations in excess of 500,000.

While I realize that salaries alone do not constitute the only cause of the problem of recruitment and retention of qualified teachers in the District of Columbia, I am convinced that these salary scales will have a highly salutary effect on this situation.

Another major provision of H.R. 16337 would establish a formula for determining the salaries of District of Columbia school principals. The present system of unified salaries for all principals was adopted in 1962, as a provision in Public Law 87–381. Actually, this single salary scale for principals was never favored by the District of Columbia Commissioners nor by a majority of the members of the District of Columbia Board of Education, nor has it found acceptance in any other major school system with the exception of Boston, where I understand it is a subject of controversy.

The formula for placement of District of Columbia school principals into four categories for salary purposes, all in class 6 of the salary schedule, is the result of nearly 2 years of careful study by representatives of the District of Columbia Personnel Office and the District of Columbia Public School Administration, and is based upon factors which are common to all principals' positions, without regard to whether the school be elementary, junior high, senior high, or vocational in nature. These factors are not equally weighted and include academic program, supervision of teachers, school enrollment, cocurricular and extracurricular programs and activities, supervision of nonteaching personnel, and extra administrative responsibilities.

This plan will eliminate the obvious inequities of the present unified salary scale, under which the principal of the Capitol Page School with its enrollment of 71 pupils receives the same salary as the principal of the largest high school in the city, and it is my opinion that this formula may well become adopted as a model for other large urban school systems.

A further important provision of H.R. 16337 is to limit the number of years of employment of temporary teachers. Over the past 11 years, the percentage of teachers in the District of Columbia system who cannot qualify for a certificate and thus are employed as "temporary" teachers has risen steadily until today some 48 percent of the entire staff are thus unqualified for permanent status. The vast majority of these temporary teachers are unqualified for certification because they have not been able to achieve a sufficiently high score on the national teachers' examination. While it undoubtedly is true that some temporary teachers may be among the most capable in the District system, a definite problem exists when this group constitutes so large a percentage of the total teaching staff as at present.

At present, temporary teachers must be reappointed each year, and they may not be credited with more than 5 years of service for the purpose of salary placement. Also, they are not eligible for the same retirement and other benefits which accrue to permanent teachers. However,

they may remain in the District of Columbia system indefinitely.

Under the provisions of this bill, temporary teachers coming into the District system would have to qualify for probationary status within 5 years, or be dismissed from the system. Temporary teachers already in the system will be required to qualify also within a prescribed period of years dependent upon the length of previous service. However, a temporary teacher with at least 10 years of service will be permitted to continue in the system contingent upon satisfactory service. Also, temporary teachers with at least 15 years of satisfactory service will be advanced to service step 10 on the salary scale.

These provisions, recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Education, are designed to enhance the standards of professional competence of the District of Columbia teaching staff as a whole.

Another important provision of this bill will authorize additional salaries for certain extra-curricular duties for teachers in the District of Columbia junior, senior, and vocational high schools. This extra work, which must involve at least 25 hours of duty per semester beyond the normal school day, would include the duties of athletic coaches, music directors, newspaper and yearbook advisers, and dramatic and forensics directors. The extra pay for these extra duties would range from $750 per year for a head coach of a major sport to $300 for a director of forensics.

The bill further provides that in order to be eligible for such additional compensation, a teacher must also be assigned the standard teaching load for a regular day schoolteacher at his particular school level. Further, such additional salary shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement or insurance, nor shall such compensation be considered as salary for the purpose of computing either retirement annuities or insurance coverage.

At present, of the public school systems in the Washington metropolitan area, all have extra duty pay provisions for teachers except the District of Columbia and Montgomery County, Md.—and the latter does pay its athletic coaches for practice held prior to the opening of the school term. Further, at least 17 U.S. cities with populations in excess of 500,000 have some form of extra duty pay, and most such plans have been in effect for more than 10 years.

This provision was recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and I feel strongly that proper recognition and compensation for the hours of work involved in these coaching and other extracurricular duties is long overdue in the District of Columbia school system.

Another major provision of the bill will extend from 5 to 9 years the placement credit for previous teaching experience which the District of Columbia may give upon appointing or reappointing a teacher. The present limitation of 5 years credit for such experience has long since been outmoded, and the District stands alone in the entire Washington metropolitan area in this archaic restriction. The extension to 9 years of placement credit will be of particular importance to the District system in the matter of recruitment of experienced teachers, an area in which they are badly handicapped today.

H.R. 16337 provides also for the appointment of teacher aids in the District school system, to assist the classroom teachers in such noninstructional tasks as setting up science experiments, monitoring homerooms or libraries, correcting papers, and so forth. These employees will have a starting salary of $4,715 per year and a maximum salary of $6,605, attainable in 10 years of service. More than 30 percent of the large school systems are using such personnel, and I feel that this is a step forward in the proper utilization of the teachers' time for strictly instructional work.

The annual cost of the salary increases provided in this bill is estimated at approximately $4.8 million, and the total cost of all the provisions at some $6.5 million.

When the Congress enacted a cost-of-living salary increase for classified employees in the Federal and District of Columbia Governments last October 1, and time did not permit proper consideration of an equivalent increase at that time for teachers, policemen, and firemen in the District, I stated then that I would exert every effort to provide such an increase for these personnel during this session of the 89th Congress, retroactive to October 1, 1965, as an act of simple fairness. As a matter of fact, I introduced a bill, recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, which would have granted the District of Columbia school employees two salary increases, one of which would have been retroactive to that date. The total of these two increases, however, would have been only 6.7 percent. Under the provisions of H.R. 16337, there will be a single increase averaging 7.9 percent; and our committee decided that in view of the greater percentage of salary increase it would be most practical to make the increase effective as of July 1, 1966, rather than to make any part of it retroactive to an earlier date. This is the same course we followed in a recent bill to increase salaries for District of Columbia policemen and firemen. Thus, it is my feeling and that of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee that in providing a more generous increase in salaries, without a retroactive provision, we have kept faith with these dedicated public servants.

I wish to make it clear that while I personally would favor a higher salary increase for teachers than this bill provides, I urge support at this time for the enactment of this legislation, as representing the very minimum which the Congress owes to these dedicated, hard-working public servants whose work is so vitally important to every citizen of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask some member of the committee a few questions with regard to the creation of the new position of teacher aid. There is the feeling in some quarters in education that they are unable to obtain qualified teachers because salaries are insufficient. I would like to ask the question of the committee, if we are decreasing the possibility or opportunity at some point in the future of obtaining qualified and certified teachers, to replace these who now teach with temporary certificates, by diluting or draining off the amount of money available to pay teachers with by creating this new position here in the District of Columbia of teacher aid?

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, these matters came up in the hearings on the bill and in the discussions on it. At the present time, there are, I believe, as many teacher aids in the schools as this bill makes provisions for. They are working under the poverty program. These teacher aids have routine and clerical duties and not teaching jobs. They relieve teachers of some of the things that take up so much of their time, such as paperwork in school offices, typing up tests, mimeographing reports, passing out books, arranging and rearranging libraries, supervising play and games and lunches and tutoring and marking papers. We provide in the bill that the number of teacher aids shall not exceed 4 percent of the number of teachers. It will not add anything, as I understand it, in the District of Columbia over what they have at the present time under the poverty program.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman says that teacher aid people now are employed in the school system under the provisions of the poverty program and they are serving in the capacity of teacher aids now? Is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. After the authorization for this new teacher aid position are those personnel who work as part of the poverty program paid by OEO to remain in that program, or are they to be removed from it, or are we just adding a number of additional people?

Mr. DOWDY. If they remain, they will be a part of the 4 percent. There will not be a duplication. We made that clear, and we discussed that particular point.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Can they remain, if they remain, on the payroll of the poverty program and not be under the District of Columbia school system? Does the percentage ceiling still apply?

Mr. DOWDY. Up to 4 percent of the teachers. If I did not make it clear, there can be 4 percent of the number of teachers as teacher aids, whether they are employed by the poverty program or employed by the District of Columbia, or a combination thereof. It is still a 4-percent maximum.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The report says that these people are to serve in various capacities, assisting the regularly assigned teacher to do such things as setting up science experiments, monitoring

libraries or homerooms, acting as lay readers, correcting test papers, and similar duties.

I notice in the distribution which the committee has allocated to these teacher aids, that the majority of positions, 212 out of 288, will go to the elementary schools. Exactly what in these elementary schools would these teachers be doing? Would they be serving an educational function, or would they be performing a nursemaid function in the lower grades?

Mr. DOWDY. I suspect a great many of them may be serving in that function as playground advisers and that sort of thing. It does not require the education of a teacher, but it takes some of the duties away so that teachers will not have to do them.

I might say we are advised that 30 percent of the large school systems are already utilizing this type of position, and many others are going to. In Montgomery County, Md., they have been using teacher aids for at least 5 years. The current budget provides for the assignment of these positions in every elementary school in that county.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONNER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Montgomery County, Md., has an extremely high per capita income.

Mr. DOWDY. Nearly as high as the District of Columbia, I believe.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The committee says they would justify the use of these teacher aids in low-income areas. How does the gentleman reconcile that with the existing high income level?

Mr. DOWDY. I do not try to.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is the gentleman saying he cannot justify the creation of these positions?

Mr. DOWDY. I say that they are using them. Personally, I would not believe it necessary to limit them to a low income. I believe the teacher aids, to carry out the routine clerical and nonteaching tasks, probably represent a very promising development in the conserving of the time of the teacher for her vital role in actual teaching.

There are schools in the District of Columbia in which the scholastics are from very low-income families. This would permit the teacher to give more time to the pupils, rather than spending her time in discharging routine duties.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the gentleman tell me what the average student-teacher ratio is in the District of Columbia in the elementary schools?

Mr. DOWDY. The last I knew, it was about 30 to 1, and I believe it is still about 30 to 1.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It is my opinion that the District of Columbia should be served in the best possible manner.

I believe, as a Member of this body, that we are spending a good deal of money for many programs all over the country which have questionable value, but I am also of the opinion that our school system in the District of Columbia has been to a degree neglected in the way of adequate facilities.

Our committee in total, I believe, agrees that we need to make more progress.

In the teachers' salary bill, which we have before us, one comparison has not been alluded to. I refer to the 21 largest cities.

In this category, if this pay scale goes into effect, the District would rank first for those holding bachelors degrees among the 21 large cities; fifth for masters degrees; fifth for masters plus 30 hours; and fifth for masters degrees plus 60 hours. We would not be at the very top, but we would be up on a comparable basis, at least a level of which we could be proud.

It is true that a large number of teachers in the District are not properly certified—43.2 percent to be exact. There are many factors involved. One is inadequate salary. Another is the fact that it is true that in the District of Columbia we have had a serious disciplinary problem in many of our schools. We have had a great incidence of juvenile delinquency—many involving attacks on teachers. Such occurrences naturally do not help in the District's teacher recruitment problem which is serious.

There is much reluctance on the part of teachers to work in the District of Columbia because of the factors I have mentioned.

We will be going in the right direction by passing this bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Could it then be said that some of this increase might come under the general heading of "combat pay"?

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman can draw his own conclusion on that question.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman has made a comparison of the proposed legislation with the 21 large cities in the United States.

It has been known that teacher pay throughout the Nation is traditionally low.

I have here a chart which shows the average pay for people in other vocations with the same education, that is, a bachelor's degree. It shows here that one with a degree in engineering would receive pay of $7,900 a year. One with a degree in physics would receive pay of $7,400 a year, and one with a degree in chemistry would receive pay of $7,300 a year. And so on down the line, with teachers at the bottom of the totem pole. We want the absolute best in education. We know we are going to get what we pay for. We know that teachers must be a dedicated group, but why should they sacrifice in order to enter the teaching profession? So we have a shortage of teachers in the country and a shortage here in the Nation's Capital. One way of helping to alleviate that shortage is to make the pay a little more attractive and somewhat more comparable with other vocations and professions which require the same amount of study and preparation.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his contribution.

I would like to make mention to the Members of this body that in our committee we have made great strides forward in the area of planning for education in the District of Columbia. In my judgment, one of the greatest needs is to train people to be qualified to hold a job. When we find people who are not trained to hold a job, they certainly face a very bleak future. I think we should be doing more and will be doing more. Our committee has stood shoulder to shoulder on this and is unanimously of the opinion that we should move in that direction. I think the House of Representatives would agree that this is a needed addition to our school system.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested and would like to query the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], the chairman of the subcommittee which brings this bill to the floor, about purpose No. 6 of the bill, on page 2 of the report, which is elucidated on page 18. This is the "extra duty pay." I understand this has previously been taken care of in the District of Columbia as far as compensatory days off are concerned, and that has been unsatisfactory. I know that the School Board and the Commissioners of the District recommended that this would be less expensive. I have read the specific requisites for the extra-duty pay. I have read the complete report and the bill in fact, but is this not a bit unusual inasmuch as teachers are paid usually on a yearly contract and teach 9 or 10 months of the year and most of their time is spent not in the classroom but in preparation? Athletics, which I thoroughly believe in, are an important part of school training. Is this extra pay for extra duty hours not unusual?

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I am not sure that it is, but this provision applies, as I understand it, to teachers—and I will be corrected if I am wrong—who are bearing a full load of teaching. This is in addition to an already full load of teaching.

Mr. HALL. Yes. The stipulations on page 19 of the report are very clear that they must do certain things and have a full load and be a regular teacher. Primarily it is for the coaches and others. As I said in my original question, I am not against coaching. I am for body contact exercise for these children. In fact, I think it would be all right for some of

them to walk to school instead of being "bussed" to school, in order to get the exercise. I am for a directed program of athletic activities and competition, but I am not at all sure in the surrounding areas such as Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, Arlington County, Fairfax County, and others, that they get extra pay for extra duty. I am sure they do not get extra pay for extra duty in Missouri.

Mr. DOWDY. As I understand it, some schools in this area have this provision and some do not. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may be able to tell you more definitely about that.

But, I will say this, that this is a recommendation that came to us from the school officials and from the District Commissioners.

Mr. HALL. And there will be about 450 teachers affected, at an annual cost of $225,000; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that figure is in the RECORD. I believe that is correct, but I do not recall the exact figure. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may have it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman is correct in the estimate of the cost. And, also, in response to the gentleman's question, it is my understanding that there is some provision for extra pay and for extracurricular activities which is provided in the school systems in northern Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will note in the report itself, on page 20 thereof, it points out that 17 of the school systems in the major cities of the United States have a comparable provision for extra-duty pay.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is this just a mechanism for supporting high school players or their coaches, or is it included for teachers' extra-duty pay and as compensatory extra-duty pay for coming into the "guild" for schoolteachers? Should not it be applicable to all overcompensatory hourly time such as, for instance, the employees of the Post Office Department? They receive only "compense days," as I understand it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Certainly, the Post Office Department employees receive compensatory time for extra duty. This does not apply to coaches, as the gentleman knows, in Virginia, but to teachers of music and many other activities that require an excess of 25 hours additional duty in a semester.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri referred in the earlier part of his remarks to the fact that he was of the understanding that this had been provided for in the District of Columbia school system. There was an attempt to do so administratively, I understand, but it did not work out. This is setting up the standards by legislation, that the Board of Education and the school system would have to follow if it were adopted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, all I referred to was the attempt to use reimbursement only for compensatory time, and I believe this is fair. There is no reason to think that the compensation in additional pay for overtime is unfair. I am not at all sure that I am adverse to it. I just wanted to establish the record in regard thereto.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a matter of practice—a common practice—over a great part of the United States, I believe, that extra compensation be paid in such positions as coaches who do spend a great deal of time outside of the regular school hours.

As a result of this extra compensation there have been requests made, of school systems around over the country, including my home State of Louisiana, by some teachers that they be paid extra compensation for having to grade papers or buy teaching materials for example during overtime periods or at night and after school hours.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get a statement from some member of the committee to the effect that they in no way intend that this be included as a justification for extra compensation.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the bill is very specific in listing the duties which would qualify for the extra-duty activities and extra compensation therefor. This appears on page 17 thereof where there is a chart setting forth that it applies to coaches, assistant coaches, varsity coaches, junior varsity coaches, intramural or extramural supervisors, coach of swimming, golf, tennis, or cross country, music director, newspaper faculty adviser, yearbook adviser, dramatics director and forensics director.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, the last two items which the gentleman mentions are the ones which concern me, because when we start paying extra compensation to every school employee who has some extracurricular responsibility beyond the classroom, then we are near assuming the need to pay extra compensation to every school employee. I believe we are treading on dangerous ground and what we will have to recognize there is a limit beyond which we cannot go.

Mr. HALL. This is the reason we want to make this legislative history now.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I think this is what we had in mind, if the gentleman will yield, in being very specific in what it covers.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that interpretation.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, throughout America, teachers' salaries have been too low for too long. The problem has been especially acute in the Nation's Capital. We can and should begin to raise teachers' salary levels here in Washington with passage of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1966.

As a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia as well as of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have a long and deep commitment to improving the lot of our city's teachers. In May, I introduced legislation similar to the bill before us. At that time I spoke of the need for a salary scale in the District which could compete with the scales in the adjoining Maryland and Virginia suburbs.

I regret that the pending legislation does not go as far as my bill proposed. Nevertheless, I fully support this legislation, since it does significantly raise the District of Columbia teachers' salaries. It would be self-defeating to oppose this bill because it fails to raise salaries the full amount recommended. I recall that President Kennedy used to describe himself as "an idealist without illusions." I agree with the late President that high ideals tempered with necessary pragmatism can often lead to valuable results.

The competitive position of the District of Columbia in recruiting teachers is clearly improved by the bill as reported. Under this bill, almost all new teachers entering the District of Columbia system will receive higher salaries than new teachers with comparable training entering anywhere else in the Washington metropolitan area. Salaries will range from $5,795 for a teacher entering with a bachelor's degree, up to $6,770 for a teacher entering with a doctorate, or a master's plus 60 hours work toward a Ph. D. In every case the District will rank in the top 6 among the 20 largest cities in the country.

This legislation also recognizes that it takes more than salaries to recruit teachers. Certain provisions install the valuable teacher-aid program as a permanent entity in the District of Columbia public school system. Teacher aids free the teachers from routine clerical and nonteaching tasks. After spending half the morning taking roll, collecting milk money, imposing library fines, and filling out forms, I know that I would find it dif-

ficult to teach with any enthusiasm. My only reservation about this provision is that it limits the number of teacher aids to 4 percent of the teacher force. In my opinion, there should be more aids than the 300 or so authorized by this legislation.

A third provision of the bill provides for a more equitable determination of principals' salaries. The present system of lumping every principal in the city into one salary class is unrealistic and it is undoubtedly discouraging for the principal of a school with thousands of students. The salary differentials this bill provides for should improve school administration, and thus the teachers' environment.

Teachers have been recognized throughout history as being at the very basis of an individual's intellectual development. The explosion of knowledge in modern times makes good teaching more important than ever. The 1966 amendments to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act will help recruit better teachers and thus give more people a chance to keep pace with the inexorable advance of modern life. Keeping pace is vitally important. As Alfred North Whitehead said, when science moves forward "there is no appeal from the judgment which is pronounced on the uneducated."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

AMENDING CHARTER OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 16863) to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16863

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate Georgetown College in the District of Columbia", approved June 10, 1844 (6 Stat. 912), is amended by striking out "College.'" and inserting in lieu thereof "College' or 'Georgetown University.'"

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of June 10, 1844 (6 Stat. 912), is amended (1) by striking out "College,' by which name and title" and inserting in lieu thereof "College' or 'Georgetown University, by either which name, style, and title" and (2) by striking out ": *Provided*" and all that follows through the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": to encumber property by deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise; to borrow money and secure payment of same by lien or liens on the realty or personal property of the corporation (including but not limited to student fees, building fees, or other types of fees or charges); and to lease for any term, to build, erect, remodel, repair, construct, and/or reconstruct any and all buildings, houses, or other structures necessary, proper, or incident to the needs and purposes of a college, university, or institution of higher learning. In addition the corporation shall have and may exercise all such powers conferred upon nonprofit corporations by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (as now enacted or hereafter amended) as are not conferred herein and not inconsistent with the powers included herein."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Act of June 10, 1844 (6 Stat. 912), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The corporation shall have one class of members who are the successors of James Ryder, Thomas Lilly, Samuel Barber, James Curley, and Anthony Rey. The number, qualification, and rights including the right to vote, of said members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation. The powers of the corporation shall be exercised by a board of directors whose number and the manner of whose election or appointment shall be as provided in the bylaws. The bylaws shall be adopted by the members and may be amended from time to time as provided therein."

SEC. 4. Except as specifically provided therein, the amendments made by this Act shall not affect any obligations, rights, or privileges of Georgetown University.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill—H.R. 16863—is to amend the corporate charter granted to Georgetown University by the act of June 10, 1844, under the name and style of "President and Directors of Georgetown College"—6 Stat. 912—and to permit the university otherwise to conform to, and to exercise the powers granted generally to nonprofit corporations under the terms of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act of August 6, 1962—76 Stat. 271.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The first act of Congress relating to the "college of Georgetown" was the act of March 1, 1815—6 Stat. 152—in which act the Congress authorized the institution to admit to academic honors students of the institution or other persons meriting such recognition to any degree in the arts, sciences, and liberal professions to which persons are usually admitted in other colleges and universities of the United States and to issue diplomas and certificates testifying to the admission to such degrees.

The institution thereafter continued to operate without any corporate charter until 1844. In that year, a special act to incorporate "Georgetown College" was enacted—act of June 10, 1844, 6 Stat. 912—under the name, style, and title of "the President and Directors of Georgetown College." This act established the institution as a corporate entity with perpetual succession.

The act empowered the directors of the institution to conduct the college; to receive gifts of financial support and real property to be held and used, including income therefrom, for the benefit of the college; to sue and be sued in courts of law; and to do and to transact all and every business touching or concerning the institution. The institution, which has become commonly known as Georgetown University, has grown through the years and has become one of the great educational institutions in the United States.

NONPROFIT CORPORATIONS

Accompanying the growth of our Nation, groups of individuals interested in community betterment banded together to form various types of organizations devoted to educational, religious, charitable, and cooperative and beneficial associations which were operated without any objective of profit. An increasing number of such endeavors adopted corporate charters as a means of conducting the operations of the organizations.

As of the year 1900, the Congress had enacted several general laws under which various types of educational, religious, charitable, and other nonprofit organizations might incorporate in the District of Columbia. These laws, along with others applying to business corporations, were codified in the District of Columbia Code by the act of March 3, 1901—31 Stat. 1189—found, as amended, in title 29 of the present District of Columbia Code.

Because of the antiquated, confusing, and inadequate patchwork of laws for the incorporation of nonprofit organizations, the Congress enacted the Uniform Nonprofit Corporation Act—act of August 6, 1962, 76 Stat. 265; District of Columbia Code, title 29, section 1001 and the following. This act was based upon the Model Nonprofit Corporation Act developed by the American Bar Association. This act provided general statutory authority for all types of nonprofit organizations, whether religious, educational, or charitable. While this act did not repeal the statutory provisions under which such corporate entities had been organized in the past, existing nonprofit organizations were given the option to come under the provisions of the act.

In House Committee Report No. 1032 of August 24, 1961, to accompany H.R. 6967, providing for the incorporation of nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, the desirability of such legislation was stated, on page 2, as follows:

> Such an act is deemed necessary to replace the present confusion and to spell out in detail the rights, obligations, and means for conducting the affairs of nonprofit corporations, whether domestic or foreign. At the present time incorporators of a charitable organization often find it difficult to determine which of several sections of the District of Columbia Code, relating to the formation of corporations, is most appropriate for their purposes. Sometimes there is a choice between two or more sections with different requirements and granting different authority.
>
> Although the formation of charitable corporations in the District of Columbia is quite easy because of the sketchiness of statutory requirements, that same characteristic has made it very difficult to know what the rights

or obligations of the corporation may be after its formation. The confused areas include such important matters as merger, consolidation, dissolution, and transfer of property.

With respect to existing corporations, the Committee report further explained the provisions of section 103 granting the option to existing nonprofit corporations, many of which were formed under special charter acts, to elect to come under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, as is set out more fully hereinafter in the section-by-section analysis.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill amends the act of June 10, 1844—6 Stat. 912—an act to incorporate Georgetown College in the District of Columbia, so as to permit the use of the commonly used name of "Georgetown University" for the institution.

Section 2 of the bill, in addition to conforming the change of name as in section 1, amends the above act by substituting a new proviso clause at the end of section 2 of the act of June 10, 1844, which new proviso authorizes the university to encumber its property, borrow money and secure payment of the same by lien on the realty or the personal property of the corporation; and to lease, construct, or reconstruct any and all buildings incident to the needs and purposes of the university. The proviso likewise enables the university to exercise the powers provided in the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act—act of August 6, 1962, 76 Stat. 265—insofar as such powers are not conferred by the act of June 10, 1844, as amended by this proposed legislation and to the extent they are not inconsistent with the powers provided in the pending bill.

Section 103 of the Nonprofit Corporation Act of 1962—District of Columbia Code, title 29, section 1099d—provides the option to the existing nonprofit corporations to elect to accept the provisions of that act. That act was not made applicable to existing nonprofit corporations unless they desired to avail themselves of the provisions of that act. The committee report accompanying that legislation commented on this right of election as follows:

The right to accept the act would apply also to corporations under special acts of Congress. Many of the corporations existing in the District of Columbia were formed under such special acts, and purely local, as well as national organizations, have this distinction. Although such corporations would probably be reluctant to jeopardize their claim to this honor by electing to accept this act, it is conceivable that some of them, faced with an extremely vague and sketchy statement of their rights and powers in their old congressional charter, might want the opportunity to accept the advantages of this act. This would enable them to do so if they wished."

In the same report, on page 2, it was noted as follows:

In the several chapters of title 29 authorizing the formation of nonprofit corporations, there is substantial overlapping and provisions are contained therein that have application to individuals, partnerships, or nonincorporated associations as well as corporations. This latter defect was notably true in connection with educational institutions.

Thus, section 2 of the pending legislation, is a legislative expression of the intent that Georgetown University, as a corporation chartered under special act of Congress, elects to have the provisions of the Nonprofit Corporation Act of 1962, applicable to it to the extent that the provisions of that act are not presently conferred on the institution and to the extent that such powers are not otherwise inconsistent with the corporate charter of the institution as provided in the charter as amended by this legislation.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 3 of the act of June 10, 1844, preserving the reference to the original incorporators and providing that the powers of the corporation shall be exercised by a board of directors whose number and manner of election or appointment shall be provided in the bylaws of the corporation, which bylaws may be amended from time to time as may be provided therein. The provisions for the powers of the board of directors, their election and appointment, term of service, under bylaws of the corporation, are essentially in harmony with similar provisions of the Nonprofit Corporation Act of 1962.

Section 4 of the bill provides that nothing in the amendments proposed shall affect any obligations of Georgetown University or its rights or privileges except as provided in the amendments carried in the bill.

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

AMEND CHARTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 16940) to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, District of Columbia, organized under and by virtue of a certificate of incorporation pursuant to the incorporation laws of the District of Columbia, as provided in subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia", approved April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 113), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The trustees constituting and managing the said corporation shall number not less than eight nor more than fifteen. The board of trustees shall, at suitable intervals, elect their successors in accordance with the bylaws of the corporation now or hereafter established and obtaining. A majority of the board of trustees shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business and for all other purposes. The board of trustees shall elect from among themselves one member to be president, one member to be vice president, one members to be treasurer, and one member to be secretary; shall fix the term for which the officers shall serve, their duties and authority; and shall elect their successors at such regular intervals thereafter as they may determine. The board of trustees may elect, appoint, or employ such further minor or assistant officers and agents as they may deem decessary and expedient for the purposes of the corporation, it not being necessary that such officers or agents be members of the board."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "members" and insert in lieu thereof "member".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 16940 is to amend the corporate charter granted to Trinty College of Washington, in the District of Columbia, by the act of April 8, 1935—49 Stat. 113—in two respects:

First. To permit members of the laity to be elected to the board of trustees of the college.

Second. To permit the board members to elect their successors.

Presently, except for the archbishop of Baltimore, who is an ex officio member of the board, all the trustees must be members of the religious congregation of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, and ther successors are elected by said religious congregation.

This bill was introduced at the request of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur who stated that the proposed changes in the Charter Act will offer an opportunity to enhance the prestige of the college and to stimulate interest in the welfare of the college among members of the laity, and that these proposals have the approval of the archbishop of Washington.

The proposed bill would amend section 2 of the Charter Act, so that the board of trustees shall elect their successors in accordance with the bylaws; and the requirement that all trustees be members of the religious congregation of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur would be eliminated.

BACKGROUND

Trinity College of Washington, D.C., was founded in 1897 for the higher education of women and is located in the Northeast section of the city. Since its foundation, Trinity College has greatly developed not only with regard to size but in respect to academic achievement. Its studies are mostly undergraduate, with some summer courses leading to the master of arts degree. With a student body of over 900 drawn from all parts of the country, it has become a national rather than a purely local institution.

In 1917, Trinity College was recognized by inclusion on the Association of American Universities list; in 1921 it was accredited by the regional agency. Trinity College received a place on the American Council of Education's list of American colleges prepared for foreign institutions in 1921. The college was accredited in 1904 by the board of regents of the University of New York State, and in 1914 it

was ranked among colleges of the first grade by the U.S. Bureau of Education; it is also a member of the Association of American Colleges, an institutional member of the American Council on Education, and a member of the American Association of University Women.

Trinity College at first was organized and operated under certificate of charter filed in 1897 pursuant to the incorporation provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia. These articles of incorporation in time became obsolete, inadequate, and unworkable. Consequently, Congress, upon request of the college, enacted the special Charter Act of 1935, referred to above.

The 1935 act was similar to legislation enacted for the benefit of Catholic, Columbus, Georgetown, George Washington, and National Universitites—all in the District of Columbia. The act provided for an increase in the number of trustees and a designation of who shall be members of the board of trustees of Trinity College; by whom the board of trustees shall be elected and who shall be eligible for membership on the board of trustees and the powers and duties of the board of trustees; that Trinity College may enter into affiliated agreements with other institutions of learning; that Trinity College may receive, invest, and administer endowments and gifts of money and property absolute or subject to payments by way of annuities; that Trinity College shall adopt a common seal by which all acts of Trinity College shall be authenticated; and that no institution of learning hereafter incorporated in the District of Columbia shall use the words in whole or in part "Trinity College."

CONCLUSION

Your committee has not been apprised of any objections to the enactment of H.R. 16940 and hence urges it adoption.

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

PROHIBITING PICKETING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANY CHURCH

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] to call up a bill from his committee.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 16340) to prohibit picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16340

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) except as provided in section 2 of this Act, it shall be unlawful to picket, parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in the District of Columbia within five hundred feet of any building or residence used as a church.

(b) Whoever violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned not more than sixty days, or both. Prosecution for any such violation shall be in the District of Columbia court of general sessions, upon information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants.

SEC. 2. In order to permit the due observance of proper occasions, recognized as such by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners may make and amend such rules and regulations as they deem necessary to suspend for such proper occasions so much of the prohibitions contained in the first section of this Act as would prevent the use of the public streets and walks of the District of Columbia by processions or assemblages, and the use upon them of suitable decorations, music, addresses, and ceremonies. Such regulations shall include a requirement that responsible officers shall have been appointed, and arrangements determined, which are adequate (in the judgment of the Commissioners) for the maintenance of suitable order and decorum in the observance of any such proper occasion and for the protection of life and property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

1. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That whoever, during any religious service or ceremony which is conducted in a building in the District of Columbia used as a church or other place of worship or which is conducted on the surrounding grounds of such building, or during the two-hour period immediately preceding such service or ceremony or the two-hour period immediately following such religious service or ceremony—

"(1) displays within five hundred feet of such grounds, any sign, placard, banner, or device designed or adapted to annoy, embarrass, intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony, and refuses to cease such display when so ordered by police authorities of the District of Columbia; or

"(2) congregates with others within five hundred feet of such grounds for the purpose of (A) displaying any such sign, placard, banner, or device, or (B) annoying, embarrassing, intimidating, coercing, or bringing into public odium or disrepute any such person, and refuses to disperse when so ordered by police authorities of the District of Columbia;

shall be fined not more than $300 or imprisoned for not more than sixty days, or both."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 2, line 19, after the word "the" strike out "District of Columbia" and insert "United States of America, or its territories and possessions,".

On page 3, line 7 add a semicolon after the word "authorities" and strike "of the District of Columbia,"

On page 3, line 13 add a semicolon after the word "authorities" and strike "of the District of Columbia;".

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve the point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] reserves his point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a good amendment in my opinion. I think it is long since overdue in this day when we have riots and insurrection; when we have "peaceniks," "beatniks," and picket lines without regard to time or place. As late as Saturday, this building was, according to existing law, defended by rallying and calling back on duty Capitol Police officers to watch over those people who would have illegally invaded these premises and the Capitol Grounds.

If it is good for a God-fearing nation—and certainly we are one builded on such ideals—it is good for the District of Columbia. The corollary is true. If, indeed, this is the Federal City; if, indeed, there is any reason why we should not picket in the environs or render annoyance to those who are attending or carrying on services in a church, certainly the same should be equally applicable across the length and breadth of this land. Many States, subdivisions, and/or municipalities have ordinances versus saloons, and so forth, within a radius of similar distance. All the amendment would do to the bill is simply to make it applicable to all of the United States of America. Since we are sitting as the Congress, so to speak, for the "City Council" of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington therein, I see no reason why this Federal body should instigate or institute a bill which is not applicable to all the churches of the Nation.

I strongly recommend that the amendment be accepted. I can see very little objection. Thereafter, of course, the title would likewise have to be amended, and I would propose to move to do that, after acceptance of this amendment.

The amendment would simply provide that wherever "District of Columbia" appears in the bill, and subsequently wherever it appears in the title, in lieu of the prohibition against demonstrations, annoyances, or other well-written devices, as set forth in the bill on page 3, and elsewhere, being applied only to the District of Columbia, a similar prohibition within a similar distance would apply to churches throughout the land. I strongly recommend that the amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SISK. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I renew my point of order. In spite of sympathy for some of the problems which my good friend from Missouri has discussed, and possible sympathy even for what he proposes to do here, Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment on the grounds that it is not germane to the legislation under consideration, that it deals with a matter and subjects over which the Committee on the District of Columbia has no jurisdiction. Therefore, I believe it is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. The bill under consideration prohibits picketing in the District of Columbia.

The amendment, of course, would extend the prohibition to all 50 States. It would add prohibitions not within the contemplation of the bill. It would bring in subject matter entirely outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Accordingly, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which would prohibit picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 of any place of worship within 2 hours of a ceremony, if the picketing—and I read from the bill—is "designed—to annoy, embarrass, intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony"—

I would hope that we in this House would be most hesitant to pass any legislation which restricts freedom of speech. Americans have no more precious right, and the freedom of this country has no greater safeguard, than the right of freedom of speech and the right of every citizen to express his opinions.

The constitutional concern for the freedom to express one's views through a picket line is well established. It is as well established as the constitutional right to express one's views through the written word or spoken word, whether it is in the form of a pamphlet or speaking from a soapbox.

I refer the Members to the landmark decision on picketing, the Supreme Court decision in *Thornhill* v. *Alabama*, 310 U.S. 88 (1940). I will quote from Mr. Justice Murphy's decision because I think it is important for us to bear this in mind:

> Mere legislative preference for one rather than another means for combatting substantive evils, therefore, may well prove an inadequate foundation on which to rest regulations which are aimed at or in their operation diminish the effective exercise of rights so necessary to the maintenance of democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone doubt that the purpose of this legislation is to limit the forms by which citizens can express their views? It may well be that under its police power the State can constitutionally restrict demonstrations which interfere with public thoroughfares. But this legislation is not designed to regulate picketing or demonstrations per se.

Rather, it is concerned with the substance of picketing. It would disallow picketing which is "designed or adapted to annoy"—however that is defined—"embarrass"—however that is defined—"intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony."

The distinction between laws which prohibit picketing in order to limit "patroling," and those which prohibit picketing in order to limit freedom of speech, has been made clear by the Supreme Court. I refer to Mr. Justice Black's concurring opinion in *Labor Board* v. *Fruit Packers*, 377 U.S. 58.

The decisions referred to in the report of the committee deal with laws designed to limit patroling rather than speech. Yet it is clear that the purpose of this bill is to limit speech and the effect is to remove from the constitutional guarantees of the first amendment all places of worship or any area within 500 feet of those places of worship.

In view of the fact that this bill would limit the forms by which people express themselves in our society, I am firmly opposed to it.

I should also like to remark that the event which motivated this legislation passed without incident. The District of Columbia police proved capable of handling the situation and peace and quiet and public order prevailed on the day of the wedding. There is simply no reason for us to pass this legislation.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of California. First I would like to commend the gentleman, and second, associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York.

Does the gentleman share my concern that, in addition to this legislation running afoul of the first amendment, it probably also runs afoul of the due-process clause in that its language is sufficiently vague and uncertain as to deprive those accused of violating its provisions, of due process?

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman has made an important point, that this is vague and ill defined. It is the kind of legislation which should certainly not be passed by this House. In addition to violating the guarantee of freedom of speech under the first amendment, I question whether this proposal is consistent with that part of the first amendment which says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. The Supreme Court has held that the amendment requires that the state be neutral concerning religion. I would like to quote the Everson case.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RYAN. The Everson case—*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1—is a landmark case on the establishment of religion clause, I quote from it:

> The establishment of religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: neither a state nor the federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religion, or prefer one religion over another.

I raise the question as to constitutionality on that ground also.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, if I have the time.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has referred to the Everson case in New Jersey. The gentleman, I assume, is completely aware that the finding in the Everson case was completely at odds with the philosophy expressed in their decision handed down by the Court.

Mr. RYAN. That may be the gentleman's interpretation. I certainly would not view that decision in that way.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of California. Is the matter before the House the proposed committee amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct?

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to ask a question, if I may, of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], with reference to the amendment.

Could the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] tell me why the legislation as introduced has been so significantly amended by the committee?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield for that purpose, I shall be glad to comment on the subject.

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

Mr. SISK. I believe there is nothing unusual at all in the procedure of striking all after the enacting clause and inserting new language from time to time. Actually, the subcommittee which I headed, on holding some brief discussions and hearings, determined that in our wisdom there was some better wording which could be used to achieve the purpose.

Mr. BURTON of California. Is it not a fact that the Attorney General's Office indicated that the legislation in its proposed form was probably not constitutional?

Mr. SISK. No. I do not believe we actually had any decision as to whether they felt it was constitutional or not. There was some discussion about the possibility of constitutionality. No determination was made, of course. That is a matter which ultimately will have to be determined by the courts, either as to the original language or the language now pending before us.

Mr. BURTON of California. Did the Attorney General's Office support the bill as introduced, or in its amended form?

Mr. SISK. I do not know what the position of the Attorney General is on this piece of legislation, because I have not discussed it with the gentleman, I might say.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the bill as introduced was clearly unconstitutional. The effort to render it constitutional by amendment has not succeeded.

If this legislation ever becomes law—and I doubt that it will—I am confident the courts will strike it down.

I intend to vote against this bill because it runs afoul of the Constitution.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] would oppose this bill. Last week they took the floor to defend Communists who were trying to make a mockery of the proceedings of Congress,

and I would expect that both of them would take the floor today to advocate that religious services be disturbed and disrupted and intimidated and whatever could be done to destroy them.

The fact of the matter is, the gentleman says he is going to vote against the bill. He is going to get an opportunity, because I am going to ask for a rollcall vote, and unless there are more Members on the floor I will make a point of order that a quorum is not present, and get a rollcall, because I want him on record. I think it is high time that the country knows exactly where people stand on these kinds of things.

So far as the bill being constitutional or being unconstitutional is concerned, I attended one of the hearings before the subcommittee, and there was considerable testimony that they thought it would be constitutional. But that is not something that this body will decide. The people who might violate this language, if it becomes law, would have plenty of opportunity to go to court.

The fact of the matter is that the courts have spoken on this pretty substantially.

The gentleman talked about the rights of free speech and assembly. The court is on record on that, in 1965, in the case of Cox against Louisiana. It said:

> The rights of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our democratic society, still do not mean that everyone with opinions or beliefs to express may address a group at any public place and at any time. The Constitutional guarantee of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order.

That, my friends, is exactly what these tramps who were around here last week were trying to destroy. They not only said they were Communists and they were proud of it, but they are anarchists, they do not want any public order of any kind.

I noted that the Communist attorney—and you would be interested to know, and I am not going to violate any confidences, one of the men who defended him last week on the floor, who defended Mr. Kinoy, said:

> Oh, I have known him for 40 years. I was in various schools with him, and he has always been a Communist.

So when I call him a Communist attorney, I am not blackening him with any tar brush that he has not applied to himself. I noticed he was convicted of creating a public disturbance, which is exactly what he came there to do, because after that he had the disturbance and immediately when he was dragged out another fellow ran out with a mimeographed copy of a statement saying how he had been choked until he was popeyed and this, that, and the other thing. Immediately. Now, they had to mimeograph it beforehand. I understand the policeman who testified showed that there was considerable resistance. The gentleman could have walked out, but he chose to fight and kicked the shins of the policeman and so on. So I think the vote on this thing this afternoon will be for those who believe in law and order versus those who believe in anarchy and disorder. It will be just that simple.

Nobody is trying to take anything of constitutional rights away from anybody. That is a phony issue, as phony as a $3 bill, because the gentleman said the police handled the matter the other day, in the case of the President's daughter's wedding, and they did. And what did they do? They arbitrarily set up a block 500 feet away from the church and did not let any of these crumb bums penetrate it. I notice these bleeding hearts did not go to court to try to get an injunction to let them picket the wedding, because the courts would have thrown it out. You know, where we made the biggest mistake around here last week—and I probably made the mistake myself, because I thought about it, but I did not really want to get on television with any of these long-haired males or females. Sometimes I am a little bit like George Brown, the new Foreign Minister of Great Britain, who was heckled by some of them in his last campaign and he said:

> I do not know whether to call you "sirs" or "madams," because I cannot tell which you are, but whatever you are, will you shut up?

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. What I probably should have done or somebody should have done the other day was go to one of the supermarkets and get a case of Ivory soap and get one of the pages to put it on one of these little rubber-tired dollies and take it over to that line of beatniks outside of the hearing room and hand every one of them a bar of Ivory soap, because that would have done them more good than anything I know of.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 16340, as expressed in the title of the bill, is to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church or other place of worship in the District of Columbia.

The bill provides that it shall be unlawful for any person, during a period beginning 2 hours before any religious service or ceremony or within the 2-hour period immediately following the end of such religious service or ceremony, and within 500 feet of the grounds of a church or other place of worship, to display any sign, placard, banner, or device which is designed for the purpose of annoying, embarrassing, intimidating, coercing, or of bringing into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony.

Any person who engages in the activities prohibited, and who refuses to discontinue such display when ordered by the police, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment of not more than 60 days, or both.

The bill similarly applies to those who congregate within the distance and during the time period specified for such purposes and who refuse to disperse when so ordered by the police, and provides that they shall be subject to similar penalties.

APPLICABILITY OF THE PROVISIONS

The language of the bill is designed to apply generally to all religious services or ceremonies and to protect and preserve the right of enjoyment of peace and quiet in the exercise of free assemblage for religious purposes by all persons attending, during the time of arrival, during the service, and during the time of departure from such services. The legislation does not limit its application to a particular religious group, type of service or ceremony, or to a particular occasion. It provides the same right to quiet enjoyment for all persons arriving at, participating in, or departing from a religious service or ceremony, so that there will be freedom from any annoyance or embarrassment.

Historically, in this Nation, the free and open practice of religious beliefs without interference, annoyance, ridicule, or disruption has been considered an expression of the basic freedoms enjoyed by the people of the United States. Your committee believes that it is a proper exercise of the police power of the Congress, in the exercise of its "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" within the District of Columbia, to make such reasonable provisions in law within the limited area surrounding a church or other place of worship and for a limited time so as to permit the peaceful assembly of those who attend and their departure without being subject to any disruptions or embarrassments.

BACKGROUND

The power and responsibility of the Congress at the seat of the National Government, as delegated by the people of the States, finds expression in article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution. This provision in the Constitution directs that the Congress "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" in the National Capital.

This power, delegated by the people of the States, and which may be altered or withdrawn by amendment to the Constitution, as they see fit, was deemed necessary for the benefit of all the people of the Nation. The separate jurisdiction of the Congress in the National Capital was established so that the Congress and the other agencies of the Federal Government would not be dependent upon any other governmental jurisdiction, State or local, so as to assure that the conduct of the National Government would be free from interferences, threats, insurrections, coercions, or any other disturbances which might delay or hinder the processes of government. Similarly, this power was for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of the representatives of the people and the officials of the National Government, and of the visitors to and residents at the seat of the Government. Likewise, the power was deemed necessary for the benefit of all the people to protect the records, buildings, monuments, and shrines in the Nation's Capital which are the property of all the people.

As a part of this power of "exclusive legislation," the people of the States delegated to the Congress the full police power over the District of Columbia to accomplish the foregoing purposes.

Prior to the location of the National Government in the separate jurisdiction provided for in the Constitution, the Congress was without power to exercise the authority provided in the Constitution. Beginning from the time the Federal Government was transferred to the District of Columbia, the Congress has exercised the police powers delegated to it. Since 1800 the Congress has enacted such laws as it deemed necessary to protect the property and functions of the Government and to preserve the peace and quiet of the public within the District of Columbia, as well as their persons and property. The jurisdiction of the Congress provided in the Constitution is not limited solely to the buildings and grounds of the Federal Government and its agencies but applies to the entire area within the boundaries of the District of Columbia. The Congress thus may exercise powers in the District of Columbia which it may not exercise within the States. The constitutional authority of the Congress with regard to the District of Columbia must be accorded equal effect to that accorded to any other provision of the Constitution including its amendments. While the exercise of the authority by the Congress may not be in derogation of any other provisions of the Constitution, likewise other provisions of the Constitution may not be in derogation of the power of Congress to enact such legislation, consistent with the other provisions of the Constitution, as is necessary to carry out its mandate in the Nation's Capital.

COMPARABLE LAWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Existing law in the District of Columbia provides for the exercise of the police power to accomplish the usual purposes of protecting the peace and quiet and the persons and property of people within the community. The law regarding disorderly conduct provides penalties for those who provoke breach of the peace by (1) acts which annoy, disturb, or interfere with, obstruct, or are offensive to others; (2) the making of noise or shouts inside or out of building during nighttime which annoy or disturb any considerable number of persons; (3) groups which congregate on a public street in such a way as to bring about the breach of the peace; and (4) by disturbances in public conveyances.

In addition to the usual local government provisions, the Congress has legislated specifically and especially in certain instances because the District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital.

The act of March 3, 1901—31 statute 1324, District of Columbia Code, title 22, section 3102—relates to unlawful entry on property. This act makes it unlawful for a person to enter either a private building or a public building and to refuse to quit the premises on order of proper authority.

The act of March 30, 1867—15 statute 12, District of Columbia Code, title 9, section 105—further relates to public buildings; namely, the U.S. Capitol. This law gives broad authority to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and House to make such regulations as they deem necessary for preserving the peace and securing the Capitol and the protection of public property therein.

The act of July 31, 1946—60 statute 718, District of Columbia Code, title 9, section 123—forbids the making of any harangue or oration or the uttering of loud or threatening or abusive language on the U.S. Capitol Grounds. No discretion is given any person to permit the making of speeches on the Capitol Grounds. The same statute—60 statute 719, District of Columbia Code, title 9, section 124—prohibits parades or processions or assemblages on the Capitol Grounds or the display of signs or devices and banners except for occasions of national interest and on approval by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House authorizing such activities.

Since the District of Columbia is the National Capital, it is likewise the location for the embassies and chanceries of foreign governments. The act of February 15, 1938—52 statute 30, District of Columbia Code, title 22, section 1115—prohibits the display of flags, banners, placards, or the congregating of persons within 500 feet of any building used or occupied by a foreign government as an embassy, legation, consulate or for other official purposes, for the purpose of or designed to intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium, any foreign government, any officer thereof, or to bring into public disrepute political, social, or economic acts, views or purposes of any foreign government, or to similarly reflect on any officer or officers of any foreign government or to interfere with the free and safe pursuit of the duties of any diplomatic or consular representatives within the District of Columbia, except in accordance with a permit issued by the Superintendent of Police.

The act of July 29, 1892—27 Statute 323, as amended, District of Columbia Code, title 22, section 1107—relates to unlawful assembly in the District of Columbia. The test of this section of the District of Columbia Code is as follows:

> It shall not be lawful for any person or persons within the District of Columbia to congregate and assemble in any street, avenue, alley, road, or highway, or in or around any public building or inclosure, or any park or reservation, or at the entrance of any private building or inclosure, and engage in loud and boistrous talking or other disorderly conduct, or to insult or make rude or obscene gestures or comments or observations on persons passing by, or in their hearing, or to crowd, obstruct, or incommode the free use of any such street, avenue, alley, road, highway, or any of the foot pavements thereof, or the free entrance to any public or private building or inclosure; it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to curse, swear, or make use of any profane language or indecent or obscene words, or engage in any disorderly conduct in any street, avenue, alley, road, highway, public park or inclosure, public building, church, or assembly room, or in any other public place, or in any place wherefrom the same may be heard in any street, avenue, alley, road, highway, public park or inclosure, or other building, or in any premises other than those where the offense was committed, under a penalty of not more than $250 or imprisonment for not more than ninety days or both for each and every such offense.

This law, which has been in effect for many years, is an unqualified prohibition upon any person or congregation of persons in any of the areas specified to engage in conduct which interferes with others, to use foul language, or to insult persons, passing by or within hearing, with comments or observations concerning such persons. This provision of the District of Columbia Code, however, does not cover the use of posters, signs, banners, or devices which might be equally insulting to persons.

It may be noted that the language of the bill H.R. 16340 is very similar to the above longstanding enactments of Congress, except that the proposed legislation applies to sanctions relating to other offensive material which may be carried on signs, posters, banners, or other devices, and except that the language of the bill is less restrictive in that the use of such displays is prohibited only in narrowly described areas and within certain limited periods of time related to specific religious services or ceremonies.

RECENT COURT OF APPEALS CASE

It is in point to refer to a recent decision of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, wherein the defendants challenged the validity of their arrest under provisions of present District of Columbia law. This case was decided June 17, 1966—Feeley against District of Columbia, Nos. 3863 and 3864; Uhrie against District of Columbia, Nos. 3871 and 3872; and Dunlap against District of Columbia, Nos. 3869 and 3870.

This case involved the arrest of three persons who were with a group of 250 demonstrators who, after parading pursuant to permit issued by the U.S. Park Police, continued their march to the Capitol grounds. At the Capitol grounds they were warned against their violation of the District of Columbia law and encroachment upon the Capitol grounds. After they were advised of the laws of the District of Columbia and warned three times, and refused to comply with the warning, the arrests were made. The Government had the option to prosecute under District of Columbia Code title 22, section 1107 or District of Columbia Code title 22, section 1121, both mentioned heretofore. The Government chose to prosecute under the latter section. The offenders were convicted and the case went on to appeal. The convictions were sustained.

In this decision, the Court made observations to the rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and petitioning the Government, and cited the case of *Cox v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 536 (1965), and quoted thereform as follows:

> The rights of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our democratic society, still do not mean that everyone with opinions or beliefs to express may address a group at any public place and at any time. The Constitutional guarantee of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excess of anarchy. The control of travel on the street meets as

a clear example of governmental responsibility to insure this necessary order. A restriction in that relation, designed to promote the public convenience in the interest of all, and not susceptible to abuses of discriminatory application, cannot be disregarded by the attempted exercise of some civil right which, in other circumstances, would be entitled to protection. One would not be justified in ignoring the familiar red light because this was thought to be a means of social protest. Nor could one, contrary to traffic regulations, insist upon a street meeting in the middle of Times Square at the rush hour as a form of freedom of speech or assembly. Governmental authorities have the duty and responsibility to keep those streets open and available for movement. A group of demonstrators could not insist upon the right to cordon off a street, or entrance to a public or private building, and allow no one to pass who did not agree to listen to their exhortations.

CONCLUSION

In considering the proposed legislation, your committee carefully considered existing laws of the District of Columbia providing for the protection of the peace and quiet within the community and for freedom from insult, coercion, or intimidation. Laws relating to unlawful assembly provide such protection to the community from verbal assaults and abusive language. Existing law provides protection to officials of foreign governments and the buildings occupied by such governments and from demonstrations and the use of posters, signs, banners, and other devices designed to ridicule and insult such nations or their representatives. Your committee found nothing, however, in existing law providing similar protection for those attending or participating in religious services or ceremonies during the time of their arrival or departure. Your committee feels that the freedom of citizens to participate in such occasions free from interferences and insults is needed, is reasonable, and proper in the exercise of basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

In the course of study of the legislation, the committee consulted with law enforcement officials of the District of Columbia in the review of existing law, and the need for, and desirability of such legislation. Cases involving the enforcement of existing laws of the District of Columbia were reviewed. Your committee is not aware of any court decision at any level dealing with laws proscribing the acts mentioned in the bill which would indicate any limitation upon the propriety and the power of Congress to enact such legislation with full anticipation that its provisions would be sustained by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to have certain types of legislation come to the floor, because it is rather amazing how some people seem to come out of the woodwork, you know. We all took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States when we were sworn into office. We are certain that every Member of this body is dedicated to the upholding of our Constitution and are doing everything to see to it that that Constitution is preserved and defended and kept in existence. But I sometimes get just a bit amused at how a few of my friends act who classify themselves as civil libertarians.

I have never had any direct definition of this, but I do become a bit amused at their methods of defending the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question their conscience, I do not question their dedication to what they believe in defense of it, but the manner in which they defend it.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], for whom I have a great deal of regard and one whom I believe classifies himself as a "civil libertarian" is talking about freedom of speech. I do not believe and insofar as I know—and certainly it was my understanding—that when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] introduced this piece of legislation, that was exactly what he sought to do—preserve freedom of speech.

He desired to see that not only the daughter of the President of the United States and the attendants at the wedding and the guests who would be there and the minister who presided, but all others under similar circumstances would have an opportunity to go through the simple ceremony of uniting a couple in the holy bonds of matrimony without the hue and cry and other disturbances which might cause a failure on the part of the guests to hear what the preacher was saying over the screams and outbursts of some of these hoodlums who unfortunately attempt to take advantage of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, what I am wondering is whose freedom of speech the gentleman from New York was talking about? I am quite concerned about freedom of speech.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from California is making an absolutely valid point and which is probably the crux of this entire argument. In the course of their talking about freedom of speech, they are denying the freedom of speech to someone who disagrees with them.

Mr. SISK. I might say that the gentleman from Ohio is exactly right.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we could take the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] against this legislation and turn them around and apply them, we would have the best definition and defense of this particular bill about which I know.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my brief remarks by saying that we have ample precedent for this legislation. We have a long series of acts, going back to 1867. There is no question but what the Congress has the jurisdiction and right under the Constitution to carry on the orderly affairs of the District of Columbia and to see to it that they are carried on in an orderly manner in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues know that on the statute books—unchallenged insofar as I know by anyone—is a law which prohibits picketing within 500 feet of any foreign embassy in this city.

Mr. Speaker, there are a variety of other laws dealing with the prohibition against disturbances, against freedom of speech. I have not heard those laws challenged.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have some grave reservations about some of these sudden outcries from a few of my good friends about the unconstitutionality of this proposed legislation.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I did not see any of these gentlemen on the floor protesting when the police carted off some people who violated the ordinance against picketing within 500 feet of the Russian Embassy, and they ordered the police to take them off.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any of these great exponents of the freedom of speech up here talking about that. I do not know why they were not.

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

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, is it not true also that we in this country have developed a body of labor laws which restricts picketing and which has been upheld in the country as being constitutional, over a good long period of time?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I think these are in evidence; there is no question about that. And, I might say that the legislation which we have before us does not prohibit picketing. I believe all of us believe in the right of free speech and petition and the right of assembly and the right to petition the Congress.

In this proposed legislation we do not propose to prohibit any of these things. We are just saying that there are certain things within certain areas that are not in good taste and should not be done, and in the protection of the freedom of other people in their freedom of speech and freedom of assembly that certain activities shall be precluded within 500 feet of a religious gathering to do these things.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HAYS. They can still picket under this bill. They can picket 500 feet away. Somebody said, "Why did you choose 500 feet?"

I will tell you why. We wanted to get them out of the television camera range because if they are not on television, they will not be picketing. They really do not want to be picketing unless they get their faces on TV.

If they have any real gripes, if they have any real picketing they want to do, 500 feet away is all right. But you will see, if this bill passes, there will not be

any picketing because they will be out of the television camera and that will be the end of it.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this matter we are discussing is just as simple as A B C. I have certain rights under the Constitution—one of which is freedom of speech. So do you. My rights end where your rights begin. I cannot interfere with your rights. We are both covered under the same protection of the Constitution.

A man has a right to freedom of speech, but if he goes into a movie house, then he has to sacrifice that right for the protection of the other people who are in that movie house to enjoy the program.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, these people can scream and yell all they want to but they ought to go into the woods to do do it. But as the gentleman from Ohio said, there would be no television out there, and they always seem to manage to get in the line of the TV cameras.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, is my interpretation correct that this would come into effect only after these persons who were displaying these signs have been requested by the police to stop. Then if they refused to stop, this would come into effect.

Mr. SISK. That is my understanding. I think the language is quite clear, if you are doing certain things, and I think here again we spell out very clearly the things that you would have to be doing to bring you into disrepute or attempting to influence other individuals to do so, and upon being asked by the police to move on, if then they refuse to move and continue to assert themselves within the 500 feet, then this would come into effect.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Then this would apply because they would have been put on notice to stop?

Mr. SISK. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This is strictly under the police powers?

Mr. SISK. This is strictly under the police powers; that is right.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to raise some questions about the interpretation of this bill and what brings it before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am frankly puzzled by the circumstances.

I do not pass judgment on the constitutionality or the lack of constitutionality of the bill. I have not had a chance to study it. But I do wonder how a bill of this kind—that at least raises serious constitutional questions—is brought before us under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I asked earlier for the hearings on the bill and I was told that no hearings were available. I take it from that there were no public hearings on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose certain questions to any member of the committee who would care to reply as to just what the need is for this legislation.

Why are the existing statutes in the District not adequate?

What occasions have arisen where the kind of activity aimed at in this bill has happened and where the police were incapable of dealing with it?

What States have laws of this kind on their books? I am not aware of any of this particular type.

What is the position of the churches in the District on this bill? Have the leaders of the Catholic churches in the District made requests that this legislation be passed?

Have the leaders of the Protestant churches been heard on this subject, for or against? The rabbis—have they been heard on it?

I would like to know what all these people would have to say about this bill.

I have not heard much of any reason why this bill is necessary. I do think it raises serious questions.

For instance, I am not clear whether this bill makes the actions aimed at unlawful or not. We have heard just now that the law would not come into operation until somebody is asked to stop doing something. Does that mean it is unlawful before he is asked or is it not unlawful before he is asked? In either case, questions of vagueness are properly raised.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the case has not been made as to the necessity for this bill. I would like to hear more about it.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me what the gentleman from New York says makes a lot of sense. There are a great many holes in the background of this bill. I would like to point out to my colleagues that for this very reason, I will offer a motion to recommit to require the Committee on the District of Columbia to hold public hearings so that the views of the people of Washington, D.C.—who, after all, are the people who are involved in this—can be presented and so that the Department of Justice can be asked for a legal opinion as to the constitutionality of this bill. Because certainly the dialog today has raised grave questions as to whether or not this bill is constitutional under the first amendment to the Constitution.

Also my motion to recommit will require the committee to ask the Attorney General of the United States to testify. Certainly his testimony will be valuable in a very sensitive area such as this.

I would also suggest that if public hearings are held—and I certainly hope the committee holds them—that trade union leaders should be allowed and invited to testify, because the right of picketing is very important to the trade union movement in the United States, and any restriction such as is contemplated in this bill would be very vital to the trade union movement.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. Unless I hear considerably more as to the necessity of this bill and what sort of testimony was given in support of it, I shall be glad to support the gentleman's motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. The question of picketing and how you control picketing and the rights of free speech and free picketing in many cases is observed in its breach rather than the observance of the rights a person has.

I can remember when I was a boy there was no law to protect. There was no law against. But when there was a coal mining strike you were not allowed to picket within 5 miles of a coal town. If you were a stranger, not living within a coal town, you were not even allowed in the same State.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset that I intend to vote for this measure, and I do not have to be smoked out on it. But I have been waiting in vain for someone to speak out on the unfortunate tone of this debate. I do not think it is fair, proper, wholesome, or healthy for the motives of any Member of this House to be impugned, and I do not like to hear it suggested that any one of my colleagues, because he stands up and speaks, is pro-Communist or antireligious.

We are all elected by our constituents, and our constituents pass judgment on us every 2 years. We do not need to pass judgment on one another, and I hope that this is the last time that in this House the finger of accusation will be pointed by one Member against another, and that in the future we confine ourselves to discussing the issues rather than making personal attacks impugning loyalty or religious devotion.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that this could be called the Luci Johnson wedding bill. It was introduced a month ago when a Negro organization opposed to the war in Vietnam announced that it was considering picketing the wedding.

The wedding was held in great style. It was a lovely and peaceful affair. There were no pickets. It would seem to me that the graceful thing for us to do would be to forget this bill.

This bill is not one of which we will be proud. It is aimed at the Negro majority of Washington, D.C. It further restricts their rights of free speech and peaceful assembly.

Negro organizations in Washington, D.C., often publicize their grievances through peaceful demonstrations on the streets. This is entirely right and legal, since the streets of our Nation have been used immemorially for purposes of assembly and discussing public questions.

We recognize, of course, that the local government may regulate this privilege in the public interest, but a restriction such as contemplated in this bill would

not be considered as reasonable by any court in the land.

The next step would be to prohibit placards within 500 feet of a business, or an auditorium, or a factory, or a private dwelling.

This bill is a threat to the right of trade unions to picket in labor disputes. Indeed, the provisions of the bill could be interpreted to require the police to arrest union pickets marching within 500 feet of a church.

There presently exists adequate laws to protect church services from disruption by loud and noisy conduct. Religious services, as well as other meetings, already are protected by a statute on the books since 1892, District of Columbia Code 22–1107.

The right of free speech is the essential element of a free society. Our very existence as a self-governing Nation rests on public dialog that is "uninhibited, robust, and wide open."

It is well established that the right of free speech, protected by the first amendment, includes nonverbal speech such as picketing and the use of banners and placards.

I urge my colleagues not to assent to a flagrant invasion of this vital constitutional right.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16340, a bill to limit picketing within 500 feet of churches within the District of Columbia during the period extending between 2 hours prior to and following any religious service or ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, the function of picketing appears to have been abused by many persons in recent days. This bill would help prevent such abuses. Pickets around a church can interfere with the exercise of religious freedom, as well as the freedom of assembly.

This measure has no bearing on the right to picket in labor disputes, nor does it affect the right to petition the Government to rectify wrongs which have been suffered by a citizen. The type of picketing involved here is that which was threatened recently when the daughter of the President was married to my constituent Patrick Nugent in the National Shrine.

It is true that the pickets on that occasion were cordoned off at a distance of 500 feet from the church edifice. That was probably an appropriate police regulation without the benefit of this legislation. However, the Congress should provide specific authority for such police regulation within the District of Columbia. I intend to vote for this bill. It is intended to protect our heritage of constitutional rights. Furthermore, it is directed toward orderly government and respect for law and for the rights of others. Such respect is urgently needed at this hour.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EDWARDS of California moves to recommit H.R. 16340 to the District of Columbia Committee with instructions to hold public hearings and to request a report of the Department of Justice and the testimony of the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit. We cannot tell a committee who to call as witnesses and what kind of hearings to hold.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has authority to instruct the committee. The motion is in order.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 pro tempore. 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 54, nays 237, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—54

Addabbo
Bingham
Boland
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Cleveland
Conable
Conte
Culver
Daddario
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Foley
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gubser
Hathaway
Hawkins
Horton
Jacobs
Karth
Kastenmeier
Leggett
Matsunaga
May
Mink
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pelly
Pike
Powell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ryan
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Waldie
Yates

NAYS—237

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Cunningham
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Everett
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Fogarty
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wright
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—141

Adams
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Ala.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Grabowski
Grider
Gurney
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Helstoski
Hicks
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jennings
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meeds
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Stalbaum

Stephens
Stratton
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Satterfield.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Olson of Montana with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Flood.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Resnick with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Grider.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hicks.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Vivian.
Mr. Olsen of Minnesota with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Murray.

Mr. CLEVELAND and Mr. CONTE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 44, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—249

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Erlenborn
Everett
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Fogarty
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wright
Young
Younger

NAYS—44

Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Conable
Culver
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Foley
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hathaway
Hawkins
Horton
Jacobs
Karth
Kastenmeier
Leggett
MacGregor
Matsunaga
Mink
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Quie
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ryan
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Smith, N.Y.
Thompson, N.J.
Waldie
Yates

NOT VOTING—139

Adams
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Grabowski
Grider
Gurney
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Helstoski
Hicks
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jennings
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meeds
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Stalbaum
Stephens
Stratton
Sweeney
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Evins of Tennesesee with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. MacDonald with Mr. O'Konski
Mr. Brademas with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Huot with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Vivian.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Friedel.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Moeller.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Moss.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Grider with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Flood.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Stalbaum with Mrs. Thomas.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ronan.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Toll.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PLEA FOR PEACE, QUIET, LAW AND ORDER IN THIS NATION

Mr. ABERNETHY. 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 Mississippi.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions in the last year or so speeches have been made on the floor of this House which actually gave encouragement to marching in the streets of this Nation. Similar speeches were made in the other body and the same have been made at various points over the country by Representatives, Senators, Cabinet officers, the Vice President, President, and others high in political circles within both political parties.

It is well known that these marches have been disorderly, inciting, and have in numerous instances led to violence and riots.

The Nation will recall, yes, it will never forget, a nocturnal joint session of this Congress which was convened about 9 o'clock in the evening, long after dark, and at an hour to assure the speaker of the occasion, the President of the United States, the widest possible viewing and listening audience. Every ounce of drama imaginable was packed into this rare and unusual spectacle. It was an extravaganza extraordinary which not even the late and great showman, P. T. Barnum, could have staged at the height of his great imagination.

Incidentally, there were many vacant seats in the Chamber but House employees and page boys were rapidly ushered to these vacancies so as as give the impression that the speech was being rendered to a packed House.

In his dramatic speech the President picked up the cudgel of the Selma marchers, and inspired them and others on by adopting their slogan and fight song, "We Shall Overcome." Who will ever forget it. And who will ever forget what it has led us to.

Mr. Speaker, so long as the marches were confined to Selma, Jackson, little Grenada, or some other Deep South point they were "all right."

But now, Mr. Speaker, the marchers have turned north, east, and west. It is different now. And the tune of the speakers is also different. Member after Member from these eastern, northern, and western areas are now complaining. They are pleading for self-discipline; so are their constituents. The shoe is on another foot. It is beginning to pinch; and it hurts.

The President, himself, is taking quite a different view from that which he took on that memorable night of March 15, 1965. Since then things have gotten out of control. And, the President is showing some concern. He made a bleeding-heart appeal this past weekend for the marchers to be nice. The headlines in yesterday's paper read, "Johnson Says America Needs Strong Dose of Self-Discipline."

But the marchers and demonstrators paid him no mind. Yesterday and last night after his appeal there were no less than three marches in the Nation marked by violence—the throwing of rocks and sticks and bottles, the destruction of private and public property, and the shedding of blood. As I understand, one of these marches was in direct conflict with a solemn "no marching" order of a court of law. It was led by the man whom J. Edgar Hoover said was the Nation's biggest liar, an accusation he has never retracted. This same man is still a welcome and frequent visitor to the White House and has what amounts to a "hot-line" to the office of the Attorney General.

The radio and newspapers of this morning did not give use too much detail of the marching and rioting of last night. The incidents were hidden deeply in the inner pages and only slightly referred to near the conclusions of the newscasts.

But, Mr. Speaker, if these incidents had happened in little Grenada or in Selma, Jackson, Bogalusa, or in some other Deep South point, the newscasters and reporters would be enjoying themselves to the utmost. And even some Members of this body would be on their feet making their speeches of old, and others would be flying off for the Deep South.

Mr. Speaker, it is so accurate to say that when one sows the wind, he reaps a whirlwind. A wind was sown in this Chamber on the night of March 15, 1965; other winds have been sown by others to whom I have referred. Now they are reaping the whirlwind. And although we are supposed to be a land of law and order, we are becoming the laughing-stock of the civilized world.

I would like to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I make it in all sincerity. I make it without any design to be critical or to belittle or to degrade. I make it with the hope it might help bring peace and quiet to our land.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our President again ask the Congress to meet in a joint session—not tomorrow, nor the next day, nor the next, but tonight, and accord him the privilege and opportunity of urging that there be peace, quiet, law and order in this Nation.

AFRICAN STUDENTS AND STUDY PROGRAMS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a year ago last Thursday, the Subcommittee on Africa, Committee on Foreign Affairs of which I have the honor to be chairman, published a report, "African Students and Study Programs in the United States," which dealt with the educational needs of African students in the United States.

The subcommittee received testimony from noted educators, and other authorities in the private sector, and Government witnesses concerned with African education. It was the subcommittee's hope that the views contained in the report and reflected in the hearings would provide a basis for improving guidance of African students now in the United

States or coming to the United States, in promoting better planning of future programs and in stimulating further research on this very significant subject.

I recently queried the Department of State on the steps taken to implement the recommendations of the subcommittee and last week received the following reply.

While the steps taken to date are modest ones, I am happy to note that a beginning has been made.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This letter is in reference to the final recommendation on page 11 of the Report and Hearings of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs on African Students and Study Programs in the United States.

The Office of African Programs, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, the Office of Education, and the Agency for International Development have taken steps to implement this recommendation of the Subcommittee.

In the present fiscal year, the Office of Education, the agency responsible for the use of funds authorized for the purpose cited in section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act, plans to make 40 grants available to foreign area and language specialists from all over the world for the promotion of modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities. This represents a sizable increase over the 15 grants which were offered during each of the two previous years. The projection for fiscal year 1968 is for 100 grants. The unit cost for each grant is calculated to be approximately $12,000 which would cover international transportation and stipend. A detailed description of this program administered by the Office of Education is enclosed (see Tab 1).

This aspect of the use of funds allocated under section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act will undoubtedly meet some of the needs cited by Gwendolen Carter, James Coleman and Geza Grosschmid in their testimonies in the hearings of the Subcommittee. It will afford increased opportunities for American institutions involved in area studies and language training programs to recommend and advise the Office of Education in the recruitment of foreign scholars to strengthen such programs. There are no restrictions as to the source and location of candidates for these grants. Thus, a director of an African studies program at an American university might nominate an African scholar studying in the United States for one of these grants which would enable the scholar to join the staff of the African studies program at practically no expense to the university.

The Department of State's own educational and cultural exchange program which administers other sections of the Fulbright-Hays Act is also contributing to the strengthening of African studies programs in the U.S. and at the same time providing training for African students which will equip them for teaching positions in African institutions. I am enclosing a partial list of students and specialists in the African studies field currently sponsored by the Office of African Programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (see Tab 2).

Several other issues are touched upon in the excerpts of the testimonies by the distinguished witnesses which led to the Subcommittee's recommendation on page 11. One is the problem of aiding financially-distressed African students who came to the United States to study on their own resources or under sponsorship which proved to be inadequate. This is implicit in the recommendation itself. Another is the provision of graduate-level and professional training for well-qualified African students destined to become staff members of the newly developing academic institutions in Africa or take up positions of responsibility in other fields.

Both the Agency for International Development and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs are very much concerned with these problems and have, through the establishment of a staff working group, made coordinated efforts to meet them within the limits of their funds. Both agencies have contributed significantly to the Phelps-Stokes Fund for the emergency relief of African students in the United States who are not sponsored by the United States Government.

Both agencies will continue to provide selective higher education opportunities in the United States for qualified African students. The selection process reflects the staff working group's understanding reached some months ago on an appropriate division of fields of scholarship interest between the two agencies, and is designed to reduce to the minimum possible duplication or overlapping of scholarship opportunities. The emphasis of these scholarship programs will shift to graduate study and related training in step with the planned expansion of undergraduate opportunities in Africa.

Given the critical shortage of trained manpower in Africa, most Africans with bachelors' degrees earned in the United States should prove immediately useful to the development of their respective countries. AID is exploring new ways of encouraging African students to return home upon completion of their United States undergraduate education and already is financing a survey of all African students in United States higher education. Host governments will be provided with this information in order to assist them in better planning to meet their manpower needs. The objective is to stimulate the development of increased home placement opportunities for African graduates upon completion of their college work in the United States.

AID also has offered to assist African governments in the development of more efficient placement mechanisms. One pilot effort in this field is particularly significant: a Kenya public service team, with authority to hire on the spot, recently visited American college campuses, interviewed 135 Kenyan students and recruited 61 of them for government jobs, including 20 for teaching positions. The team also estimated that appointments later would be confirmed for an additional ten of those interviewed. Joint financing of this trip came from the Government of Kenya, USAID/Nairobi and AID/Washington. Total costs of the pilot project were on the order of $12,500.

If the Department can provide any additional information with regard to the Subcommittee's recommendation, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES POSITIVE APPROACH TO POLLUTION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, I have developed an extensive familiarity with the problem of water pollution in this country, and with the approaches that have been invoked to solve this problem. As we all know, water pollution, although it has been with us a long time, has only recently become a major public concern.

Through hearings that I have participated in around the country with the subcommittee, including a particularly worthwhile session in Rochester, N.Y., last month, I have become somewhat concerned that many well-meaning people who are interested in this problem are approaching it from a negative standpoint. I am speaking of people who are quick to point the finger of blame for the bulk of our pollution situation at a few large industries, and cities, who because of their size or location or the nature of their waste output, are responsible for a large percentage of pollution in certain areas.

While the pollutants produced by these large facilities are considerable, they should bear no more stigma than others in our Nation, who have been unwittingly contaminating our waterways for decades. For many cities and industries, proper waste treatment and pollution control is an immensely expensive undertaking—one which cannot be easily accomplished within a short timespan.

I am not attempting in any way to justify or defend the major polluters of this country. On the contrary, I think those municipalities and plants which are responsible for large quantities of pollutant material must be among the first to correct and improve their waste treatment inadequacies. But I do not think these few should be pointed to as the scapegoats of a problem for which every citizen bears some degree of responsibility. A better way of calling attention to the role of cities and industries in the pollution fight is to grant public recognition to those exercising initiative and expending large sums of money in order to improve waste treatment facilities and pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely this kind of a program that I am proposing to my colleagues today. I am introducing a bill to establish a program whereby industries and cities which have demonstrated excellence in pollution control would receive official recognition from the Federal Government, under regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior. Those qualifying would receive a flag and certificate as evidence of this recognition, and would be permitted to display publicly and through advertising or broadcast the fact that they had earned this award. In this way, I hope to encourage a high level of responsibility among our Nation's cities and industries, and to focus public attention on those at the forefront of the pollution fight on the local level and in the private sector.

Surely all of us recall the recognition that was conferred on highly efficient industrial facilities during the Second

World War. The familiar "E" flags that flew over these sites were a source of renewed morale and determination for all Americans during that crisis. It is my hope that the award program I propose will serve a similar purpose in the war against pollution of our resources.

In a second bill I am submitting today, the President is authorized to proclaim the last week in October of each year as Clean Water Week. This week could provide a focal point for antipollution programs in progress and for research which is being done under Federal, State, and private auspices to improve our ability to remove contaminants from urban and industrial waste products. Also, Clean Water Week would be an appropriate time to present awards to those industries and cities which have demonstrated considerable competence or improvement in their pollution control programs.

These are two steps, neither of which would require any significant expenditure of Federal funds, which the Congress should take in order to harness a positive public attitude toward pollution abatement. The longer we continue to point the finger of blame at each other for bringing about this natural resource crisis, the longer our fight will be a divided one. We must, instead, point the finger of shame at our waterways, and at our civilization as a whole, which has to date failed to provide safeguards against this crisis. As we look into the murky waters around us, we would do well to give credit to those who have taken it upon themselves to pioneer our fight to overcome pollution.

The idea for a pollution recognition awards program was in fact born on the shore of a polluted bay of Lake Ontario. Mr. Leonard Schlee, county clerk of Wayne County, N.Y., discussed the concept with me during one of the stops on our subcommittee's helicopter inspection tour of pollution in the eastern Great Lakes.

In a recent communication, Mr. Schlee expressed his idea for a pollution-abatement award program as follows:

> During the war years in order to promote efficiency and production various manufacturers and producers who met certain requirements were awarded the "E" flag or pennant and flew it proudly over their plants. They were also allowed to display this fact on their stationery, advertising, and products. Naturally the industries and their employees were very proud to receive this award, and the consumers appreciated their contribution toward the war effort.
>
> It would seem that some tangible recognition for industrial plants meeting the state's requirements regarding the disposal of sewage and other waste materials would prove an efficient aid in our fight against pollution of natural resources. It has been proven many times that conservation clubs, garden clubs, audubon societies, service clubs, 4-H clubs, and other organizations interested in our natural resources are a powerful consumer group. Soon industries would find it to their advantage to be able to display their support for the pure water campaign.

It is his positive approach to this problem which I am urging on my colleagues today. I hope that the House will give serious and prompt consideration to both of these proposals.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON LEADS SALUTE IN U.S. CONGRESS TO EAST ROCHESTER, HOME OF SENIOR LITTLE LEAGUE 1966 WORLD CHAMPIONS

Mr. HORTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 20, in Des Moines, Iowa, the 1966 world champions of the Senior Little League were crowned. They are the All-Stars of East Rochester, N.Y.

The community these fine young men represented in carrying their diamond skill to the very pinnacle of achievement is located in the 36th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. Its more than 8,000 residents are people of diligence and determination. In fact, those qualities are enshrined not only in the athletic championships that have been brought home to East Rochester by her sons and daughters, but also by the community's ability to rally citizen support for programs of civic progress.

I would like to share with my colleagues, then, a report on the All-Stars and how they became world champions and also discuss other champions from East Rochester. And, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I shall make some personal remarks about the pride I have in East Rochester and the men, women, and children who give the community its outstanding reputation.

A HAPPY HISTORY

Little League and East Rochester have been partners for many years. As a matter of fact, East Rochester fielded in 1950 one of the very first Little League teams in New York State.

The quality of the young men who play Little League baseball in East Rochester and of the adults who so freely give their time and talents to all aspects of coaching and administration is told in the record books.

In the East Rochester Little League major league, which is open to boys age 9 through 12, East Rochester has won the District 5 championship 5 out of the last 7 years. In 1963, these Little Leaguers not only won in the district and section, but went to the semifinals of the New York State Little League playoffs. And, it was in 1965 as well as 1963 that East Rochester Little Leaguers captured the Section I championship.

The Senior Little Leaguers of East Rochester, this year's world champions, have an equally illustrious history. This division was started in East Rochester in 1960. It is open to boys age 13 through 15. Last year the All-Stars from the Senior Little League went all the way to the New York State finals, and they came home with the State championship.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this year, 1966, was the "year that was."

STAIRWAY TO THE STARS

After the regular Little League season, 14 boys were selected from the 60 Senior Little Leaguers who made up the 4 teams of this division. They were the All-Stars, and at this point in the RECORD, I take pleasure in naming each of these world champions and his parents:

Dean Becker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Becker.

Larry and Ross Brothers, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Brothers.

James Carli, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Carli.

Vince Carrozzi, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dom Carrozzi.

David Consaul, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Consaul.

Paul Duffy, son of Dr. and Mrs. Paul Duffy.

Mark Florack, son of Mrs. Ruth E. Florack.

Richard Herb, son of Mrs. Leona Herb.

Richard Joseph, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Joseph.

John Kokinda, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Kokinda.

Bill Kreger, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Kreger.

Brian Manns, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Manns.

Joseph Toomey, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Toomey.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I also would like to recognize in my remarks the manager of the East Rochester Senior Little League All-Stars. He is Jacques Brothers. And his pride in the All-Stars world championship is made even more meaningful by the fact that two of his sons were players on the championship team.

Equally deserving of praise is the coach of the All-Stars, another man who has devoted his time and effort so willingly, Mr. Lionel Courtemanche.

These All-Stars began their climb to greatness with competition in District 5 of the Little League in New York State. In the semifinals they took a 9 to 3 victory over Penfield and then met Canandaigua in the finals. The score was 9 to 1.

Next it was playoff action in Section I. First, the East Rochester All-Stars met and defeated Burlington, Vt., 14 to 2, in the semifinals. In the finals, pitcher Bill Kreger went to the mound for his only playoff appearance and hurled a no-hit, no-run game while his teammates were crossing the plate six times against Buffalo.

At the State playoffs, East Rochester drew a bye in the semifinals and then met Massapequa for the State championship. This was their tightest game, but they made it with a 3 to 2 final score.

Now in the upper echelons of championship play, East Rochester overcame Rhode Island, 8 to 2, in the semifinals of regional play at New London, Conn. A shutout, 6 to 0, gave East Rochester the regional championship over Plymouth, Pa.

The moment of truth was at hand. The scene shifted to Des Moines, Iowa, and the world championship. East Rochester first met Monterey, Mexico, in the quarter finals. Another shutout, 6 to 0, moved East Rochester into the semifinals and a game with Canada where the All-Stars came out on top, 5 to 3.

At the end of the long road was last Saturday's game for the world championship, and it was East Rochester versus La Habra, Calif. When it ended after the seven regulation innings of Little League play, the All-Stars of East Rochester emerged as world champions of the Senior Little League on the strength of their 4 to 2 victory.

COMING HOME

Of course, the news media quickly communicated the word, and, throughout East Rochester and beyond, an electric feeling could be felt in the air. The boys had done it.

The welcome accorded the returning victors was the finest and most sincere I ever have seen. It began with more than a thousand people yesterday afternoon at the Rochester-Monroe County Airport.

East Rochester Village Mayor Paul N. Bower, Monroe County Sheriff Albert Skinner, and I were at the airport to greet the team and express the official thanks of the community for bringing so much glory to East Rochester.

After this welcome, a caravan of at least 500 cars left the airport, providing a triumphal escort to the community of East Rochester where it had all begun.

Somewhere between 8,000 and 10,000 villagers were on hand—no one can say for certain because the excitement and enthusiasm made an accurate count impossible.

There was a band and a drum-and-bugle corps. There were village of East Rochester officials. There were parents, brothers, sisters, cousins, uncles, aunts, and others of good will who came out to say "well done."

I was honored to take part, and I pledged that my first order of business on returning to the House of Representatives today would be this salute to the All-Stars and the great community of East Rochester which they represented in victory.

THE MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. Speaker, probably the only sure way to recognize all those who helped make this world championship possible would be to name every citizen of East Rochester. Of course, since that is not possible, I would like to include the names of those in an official capacity who are associated with the All-Stars.

There is Frank Lanning, president of the East Rochester Little League. He and his co-volunteers are responsible not only for the 60 boys who played in this year's Senior Little League division of 4 teams, but also the major league of Little League with 8 teams of 120 boys, and the minor league of Little League with 10 teams of 150 boys.

Frank has an outstanding group of men and women working with him. George Joseph is vice president, Mrs. Marie Neumann is treasurer, and Mrs. Ellie Kopp is secretary.

Dick Skuse is director of the Senior League, and worked endlessly to shepherd the All-Stars from victory to victory. Director of the major league Little League is Peter Quinzi. It is to Pete that I am deeply indebted for so much of the history I have been able to recount for my House colleagues on how the All-Stars went on to the world championship. Pete is East Rochester's superintendent of public works. His Little League activities are many and ambitious, for in addition to being a director on the executive board, he heads the banquet and finance committees.

Also helping Frank Lanning with his Little League administration are Dom Carrozzi, player agent; and John Pardee, board director at large. Past officers of East Rochester Little League presently serving on the advisory staff are Alfred Goodwin, Nick Urzetta, and Herb Corkish.

Village officials also were very much a part of the continuing inspiration given to the All-Stars. In addition to Mayor Bower, I want to salute Vice Mayor Louis Providence and Trustees Nicholas Urzetta, Nicholas J. Palermo, and Lawrance D. Clark, Jr. Village Clerk Frances R. Cimicatta, Police Justice Nicholas Morabito, and Chief of Police Vincent Kreyer also have earned the gratitude of their fellow East Rochesterians.

Also, credit must be given to the local school officials who have given aid and support to this team, in particular, the members of the school board, Mark Harloff, David Topp, Mrs. Jean Doremus, and Ronald Spring. Additionally, much support and encouagement came from Louis O'Bourn, superintendent of schools; Frank O'Donnell, principal of the high school; and Nicholas Verzella, principal of the junior high school.

A special word of tribute belongs to Fire Chief Robert Bagley, his men and the ladies' auxiliary. At yesterday's welcome in East Rochester for the All-Stars, the fire department provided an official escort and honor guard. It was an impressive sight to witness these firefighters in their full dress, showing the community's appreciation and approval. The fire department sponsors a Little League team and has fed the champion All-Stars on two occasions after their return from victories.

Therefore, I want to give credit to various officials in the fire department who, in addition to Chief Bagley, have made this activity possible. I first want to salute the elected officers of the department: Leamon Williams, president; Bob Connolly, vice president; Walt Brewer, secretary; Earl Bechard, treasurer. Praise should also be given to the work of Frank King, first assistant fire chief, and Ed Van Thom, second assistant fire chief. All of these individuals deserve a vote of thanks for the support they have given to the East Rochester Little Leaguers.

I also want to note the parents who gave their enthusiastic backing to the All-Stars. Some 10 carloads of people from East Rochester traveled to Des Moines for the games and then shortly after the All-Stars had won the final game, these 50 people immediately left by car, drove all night and were present Sunday afternoon to join in the welcome for the team when it arrived by plane at the airport. No finer expression of family feeling can be found, in my opinion.

There are many others, Mr. Speaker, whom I would like to mention such as Tom Winfree and his very capable civil defense organization. His crews were very helpful in yesterday's welcome. Also, I know East Rochester is especially thankful to the newspapers, television, and radio for the fine news coverage given to the All-Stars. But, because there is not time to include everybody, I want my colleagues to know that everybody in East Rochester was part of this great event.

HOME OF CHAMPIONS

With this new championship in East Rochester, there is more reason than ever to award the village the title, "Home of Champions."

Golfers will recall that East Rochester gave the Nation Sam Urzetta, winner of the National Amateur and member of two Walker Cup teams, and Mike Ferentz, holder of the National Public Links Crown in 1948. Jack Dianetti, the great track star, was an East Rochesterian, as was Arthur Ritchie, former State 440 champ. The 1951 National Peterson Classic in bowling was rolled by East Rochester's Johnny Quinzi, brother of Pete Quinzi whom I mentioned a few moments ago. I also want to note that one of the young men now at West Point as the result of his success in competing for one of my service academy appointments, Ken Rice, was a standout athlete at East Rochester High School and has been a welcome addition to athletic teams at the U.S. Military Academy.

The athletic teams of the East Rochester High School have long been highly respected for their sportsmanship and their winning ways. Perhaps the most telling example of their consistent high performance is the fact that the basketball team has participated in post-season Section 5 tournament play in 19 of the past 23 years and has been victorious in 7 of these competitions.

EAST ROCHESTER—AN HONOR TO REPRESENT

My personal pride in East Rochester grows not alone from the All-Stars and their world championship, the other great athletes who have brought fame to the community, and the character of its officials and civil leaders; it also relates to the fine sense of good citizenship which is so much a part of its people.

One illustration of this feeling is to be found in the way in which the community put together all its resources a few years ago when it faced the loss of one of its major industries: the car shops. I worked closely with the men and women who led this fight. It was uphill all the way, but somehow we knew the decision could be reversed and the car shops would stay open. We were successful and the economy of East Rochester and its people is healthy today.

There is a lesson for other communities in the story of East Rochester. It is that champions are made not born. The All-Stars have a world crown today because they worked hard to win. East

Rochester will continue to grow and prosper tomorrow because its people know how to achieve victory no matter what the contest.

WHEAT PRODUCERS NEED ASSURANCES

Mr. DOLE. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, most wheat producers feel that the recent 32 percent wheat acreage increase for 1967 is no guarantee of greater profits. If the price drops, they say, it will be the wheat producer who takes the risk and plants additional acres at great expense, who will stand to lose money.

In my opinion, Secretary Freeman should assure farmers here and now that there will be no efforts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to control the market price. There should be no "dumping" stocks of wheat held by Commodity Credit Corporation or any arbitrary cutback in the food-for-peace program. For cooperators in 1967, price-support loan will be 1.25 per bushel, and wheat marketing certificates will be issued on about 520 million bushels. This is only about one-third of total anticipated production. Therefore, on the other two-thirds of the 1967 crop, they will get only what the market offers or the Government loan of $1.25 a bushel. It could mean a loss for many farmers to produce additional wheat, and many of them may plant only a portion of their allotments.

If the USDA lays its cards on the table, farmers will cooperate, but they have every right to be skeptical. As an example, wheat producers should have received approximately $180 million more from the 1965 wheat crop.

As late as October 27, 1965, the Wheat Situation—an official U.S. Department of Agriculture publication—stated:

> Total disappearance in 1965–66 is placed at somewhat over 1.4 billion bushels with carryover stocks on June 30, 1966, now estimated at 750 million bushels.

According to the Stocks of Grains in All Position Report, issued by USDA on July 25, 1966, the actual carryover was 536 million bushels—214 million bushels less than forecast earlier. In October of 1965, the wheat price was $1.35 a bushel. By July of 1966, when the real figures became available, the price of wheat had jumped to $1.74 a bushel—an increase of 39 cents a bushel. From the 1965 crop, farmers sold 1.2 billion bushels of wheat. There is no question that if the true demand figures had been made available to farmers and others, all wheatgrowers—cooperators and noncooperators alike—would have received at least 15 cents a bushel more for their crop, or about $180 million, or between $30 and $40 million for Kansas wheat producers.

If the wheat farmer is expected to risk his time and money to meet growing foreign demand, USDA officials should be expected to cooperate with him—not conspire against him.

DISPOSITION OF PATENT RIGHTS ARISING FROM FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DADDARIO. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would spell out a Government-wide system for the disposition of patent rights in regard to inventions arising from federally sponsored research and development.

In general philosophy and content the bill is similar to S. 1809—the Federal Inventions Act—which has just been reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee after several years of intensive study.

My interest, and that of the Science and Astronautics Committee, in this subject goes back to patent problems which arose in 1959 in connection with the space program. From 1959 through 1962 I was a member of a Special Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions which worked on patent legislation affecting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—and I chaired the subcommittee in 1961–62. Twice our subcommittee issued comprehensive reports on this subject, and twice the full committee reported legislation based on these reports.

The bill which our committee devised after lengthy hearings in 1962—H.R. 12812, 87th Congress, 2d session—attempted, for the first time so far as I am aware, to set up standards for determining the relative equities in patent ownership as between the Government and contractors. While that bill did not become law, its formula was influential in helping to develop the outlines of the Presidenital statement of patent policy issued by President Kennedy in October 1963. That statement is in effect today and generally governs Federal patent policies.

I am pleased to see that this same type of approach has been followed in S. 1809—the McClellan bill—to which I have referred.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would make a number of changes in S. 1809 as reported by the Senate committee. Some of these are minor; some I consider important. The major sections my bill would amend and the reasons behind the change are as follows:

PROPOSED CHANGES

SECTION 2(c). The language of S. 1809 protects the equities of contractors, but not subcontractors. The proposed amendment would make it clear that in order to be subject to the provisions of the act, the subcontract must be for "the conduct of experimental, development or research work." This would eliminate the difficulty in negotiating subcontracts for such items as supplies and services and make the provisions of the act equally applicable to contracts and subcontracts of any tier.

Section 2(e). The definition of "invention" is amended to emphasize that those "inventions" to which the various provisions of the act apply are discoveries, innovations or improvements which can be patented under title 35, United States Code. The language is intended to eliminate from the operation of the reporting and other requirements of the act, clearly noninventive innovations, unpatentable proprietary information, trade secrets, and the like which are not among items contracted for even under research and development contracts. Unless amended, the practical result will be to flood Government agencies with reports on trivia. Contracts will cease making even proforma determinations, designed to eliminate noninventive material which must then be evaluated by the contracting agency. When coupled with the penalty provisions of section 3(b)(9) the present definition will cause contractors to take the "safe approach" and report every slight modification or change, whether or not of inventive merit. While adding to the administrative burden of both contracting agencies and contractors, the all-inclusive definition will actually delay reporting and dissemination of scientific and technical information that could otherwise be protected.

Section 3(a). This amendment is made to assure that once a contract is signed by both the contractor and the contracting agency, the patent clauses contained therein will be binding upon both parties and no different ones will apply. Under the original provision there is apparently no time at which either party can rely on there being a final binding contract since higher authority may later determine that, in accordance with administrative regulations, a different set of patent clauses should have been included in the contract. The inability of parties to negotiate final and binding contracts is not in the best interests of either industry or government.

Section 3(b)(3). Under the provisions of section 4(a)(1) and 4(a)(2), the Government acquires principal rights under specified conditions. In these cases, the Government, having principal rights, can extend licenses to any level of government. If the right to extend licenses to State and municipal levels is retained in every case, the criteria for distinguishing between Government and contractor retention of principal rights are ignored or frustrated.

Section 3(b) (5) and (6). The proposed amendment eliminates the power of the Government to license directly. This power appears to be neither necessary nor desirable from the Government point of view. President Kennedy's 1963 memorandum—on which the legislation is based—contains nothing to suggest the need for the Government to interject itself as a licensor, and did not so provide. This added power adds nothing to the act in terms of achieving the desired results. It merely changes the mechanics of licensing and could result in serious problems for both the Government and the contractor.

Patent license agreements are highly complex legal documents. If the Government is to be licensor of someone else's patent, this would submit the Government to unnecessary burdens both in negotiating the terms of license agreements and in administering the agreements. Patent license agreements generally require filing of quarterly cross-reports between licensor and licensee—not to mention sublicenses. In addition, there are involved recordkeeping requirements to enable the determination of royalties which can of itself be a complicated matter depending on the form in which the licensed invention reaches the market. In some cases the invention may constitute the marketed product. In others it may be only a minor component of the marketed product. In addition, license agreements frequently impose arbitration obligations on licensor and licensee.

Moreover, the Government would be in the position of licensing rights it does not own and might become subject to legal liabilities to the owner on account of its activities as licensor. The Government might also find itself in the uncomfortable position of guaranteeing performance by the owner of the owner's various duties under the license agreement.

In addition to the foregoing needless complications which the Government would face as licensor, there is the practical problem of enforcing the obligations of licensees under license agreements. Clearly, the owner of the rights has the direct interest in seeing that the obligations of a licensee are strictly complied with. He should not have to depend upon the Government to act to enforce those obligations. Nor should the Government assume this burden.

Certainly, in the absence of offsetting benefits to the Government and the public, the Government should not interject itself into the mare's nest of complexities it would face by becoming a licensor. The authority to require an owner to license others under terms determined to be reasonable by agency head, as contemplated by the Kennedy memorandum and S. 1809 as introduced, seems adequate to enable the Government to achieve the objectives of subsections 3(b) (5) and (6) of S. 1809, and the words "license or" should, therefore, be deleted from those subsections.

Section 3(b)(9). Inserting of "negligently" after "contractor" is necessary because the question of whether a particular invention has been made under a Government contract, and should therefore be reported, is often difficult to determine and is a question on which reasonable men may differ. If a contractor diligently considers a particular invention and decides not to report it to the Government as a result of a well-considered opinion that it was not made under a Government contract, he should not be penalized if he should later be persuaded that his judgment was erroneous. The language has been changed to limit the penalty to a case of negligence, rather than an erroneous judgment reached in good faith.

The change in section 3(b)(9)(iii) is suggested simply so that the law will not apply to inadvertent errors which are not material to the representation.

Section 6. The amendment—in the nature of a substitute—to section 6 (b) (c) is offered in the interest of achieving the basic objectives of the original provision—the prompt and full utilization of Government-owned patents—while, at the same time, protecting the limited rights granted the contractor.

As in the bill reported by the Senate committee, the nonexclusive royalty-free licensing is specified as the norm, with exclusive licensing being limited to situations in which nonexclusive licensing is ineffective in bringing about the desired useful application. Whereas the Senate bill would permit any exclusive license to be granted on a royalty-bearing basis, the substitute language provides that any such license granted to a U.S. citizen would be royalty free. If the Government continues to acquire inventions, it will be under pressure to set up some form of patent administration. The primary objective of the administration of Government-owned patents should be to stimulate the further development and useful application the underlying technology in the civilian economy. To this end, it seems better that the risk taking involved in the further development and promotion of unproven concepts be undertaken by private interests with private funds, so that the costs and any losses will occur in the private sector and not needlessly add to public expenditures. Likewise, the gain, if any, will affect the private sector and provide employment and taxable revenue.

To add a royalty burden to the investment of risk capital sought to be encouraged would compromise these objectives.

To add any impedance to the further development of these inventions for civilian use is in my view too high a price to pay for whatever royalty dollars could be gained for the U.S. Treasury. I submit that the basic objectives would be better achieved by obtaining from an exclusive licensee a commitment to expend an equal amount of his own funds in further developing and promoting the invention involved. In this way, the patent incentive could be used directly to achieve the desired purpose.

Foreign licenses—exclusive and nonexclusive—would be available royalty-free to U.S. citizens on the same basis as domestic licenses. The bill reported by the Senate committee provides for differing licensing approaches, depending upon whether the license is effective in the United States or a foreign country, but makes no differentiation based on the citizenship of the licensee. Licensing within the United States would normally be on a royalty-free nonexclusive basis, regardless of the nationality of the licensee, whereas foreign licenses would be granted with or without the payment of royalties "as the agency head may determine to be in the public interest." It is submitted that the basic considerations discussed above apply to foreign licenses as well as domestic. With the current concern with the problems of this country's international balance of payments, it seems especially important to avoid imposing royalty burdens on U.S. citizens in the competitive struggle to develop foreign markets.

Exclusive licensing would be permitted if after a reasonable time it appears that nonexclusive licensing will be ineffective to bring about utilization of the invention. The bill reported by the Senate committee would permit exclusive licensing immediately upon issuance of a patent "if it initially appears" that exclusive licensing will more effectively promote utilization. Exclusive licensing can be effective to stimulate the development of technology that would otherwise languish. This should be done, however, only in cases in which it has been clearly established that this situation exists. Since initial appearances can often be deceiving, it is suggested that, as a safeguard, there should be a requirement to at least offer nonexclusive licenses for a reasonable period of time—which may actually be quite short in appropriate cases—prior to undertaking the grant of an exclusive license.

The exclusive licensee of a Government-owned patent would be empowered to enforce the patent to protect his proper interests without the necessity of making the United States a party to the suit. Existing statutory law requires that in order for an exclusive licensee to bring suit against an infringer of the licensed patent to protect his exclusive interests, the owner of the patent must be made a party to the litigation. As mentioned above, the grant of an exclusive license can in appropriate circumstances be effective to call forth risk capital from the licensee to develop or promote an invention in the knowledge that the fruits of his investment can be protected by the exclusive position afforded by his license under the patent. The theoretical exclusive position afforded by the license is meaningless, however, unless adequate provision is made for the enforcement of the patent against unlicensed infringers. In this respect, it is felt that the licensee himself should be given full power and responsibility to protect those interests at his own expense—without the necessity of incurring governmental expense or involvement. I would therefore provide a statutory basis for permitting this result.

Exclusive licenses would be subject to a nonexclusive license to the contractor as well as to the Government.

The Senate bill provides that should the Government grant an exclusive license under a Government-owned patent on a contractor-originated invention to a party other than the contractor, the royalty-free license initially reserved to the contractor may be extinguished and the Government may require the contractor to pay royalties with respect to any future use he may make of his own invention. It is submitted that such an arrangement would provide a definite disincentive to the exercise of a contractor's inventive skills in the performance of research and development under certain Government contracts. By confronting a contractor with the prospect that the more innovative he is in performing a contract under which the Government would acquire title to inventions

conceived or first reduced to practice thereunder—the greater is the likelihood—no matter how remote—that he may eventually have to pay someone else for the privilege of using the fruits of his innovative effort. Thus, there is created, in the mind of the contractor at least, the apprehension of an inverse relationship between the successful exercise of a contractor's creative skills and potential reward—a penalty.

I feel that the disincentives thus created would be further reaching in terms of their effect on a significant segment of contract performance than whatever losses might result from subjecting exclusive licenses to a royalty-free license reserved to the contractor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to imply that the approach to this whole problem should be precisely as set out in either S. 1809 or in the changes to which I have here suggested.

I do believe it important, however, that the House continue to develop discussions and exchange thoughts on this extremely complex problem. That is why I have introduced my bill at this time. Hopefully, it may provide some additional grounds for inspection of the matter and thus prove useful to the membership and to the committees affected.

MORE UNSOLVED MURDERS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the California Highway Patrolman is a magazine dedicated to safety on the highways and the various problems of law enforcement. It is the official publication of the California Association of Highway Patrolmen, the organization of that State's dedicated skilled and efficient highway police force. The issue for August 1966, contains a revealing article by the noted authority and writer on law enforcement, William L. Roper, regarding the roadblocks to law enforcement imposed by recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions. This article is so knowledgeable and of such general interest that I have received unanimous consent to have it reproduced below.

MORE UNSOLVED MURDERS

(By William L. Roper)

At 4:35 a.m., Sunday, May 24, 1964, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Morris were awakened by a pistol shot and screams just outside their fashionable La Canada home, near Los Angeles. Hastily pulling on a robe, Morris ran out. He found their 22-year-old English housemaid, Miss Patricia Moulden, lying in the street by her roadster, unconscious, a bullet wound in her head. She died seven hours later in a Glendale hospital without regaining consciousness. No gun was found. A neighbor said he saw a car race away following the shot.

This case has been recorded as an unsolved murder. There are many more of these unsolved mysteries among the 9,000 murders committed in the United States every year. California has a growing backlog of them. Here are a few:

Early on Thanksgiving morning, 1963, Karyn Kupcinet, a 22-year-old actress from Chicago, was murdered in her Hollywood apartment. Her family offered a $5,000 reward for clues leading to her slayer.

Little 11-year-old Dorothy Gale Brown of Torrance was kidnapped and murdered July 3, 1962. Her body was found a few days later in the ocean near Corona del Mar, her dress discovered, stuffed in a beer can in a nearby slough. Another girl living in this same area, Karen Lynn Tompkins, 11, vanished a few months earlier.

Mrs. Lillie Pasch Berkov, 66, of Pomona, was found strangled to death August 26, 1962.

In Eagle Rock, a young mother was fatally mangled when she picked up a box placed at her front door, and a bomb inside exploded.

These are but a few of California's recent, unsolved killings. Other murders have gone undetected, erroneously listed as suicides or accidental deaths.

Now, as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's latest ruling on June 13, further restricting police questioning of suspects, an increase in the number of these unsolved murders can be expected. For not only is crime-detection hampered, more criminals will go free for lack of convicting evidence.

Of course, interrogation of suspects is only one phase of police investigation customarily used in solving murder cases and other major crimes. But it has long been considered one of the most essential procedures.

In fact, the very nature of a crime often is such that the police must rely largely upon questioning of suspects and witnesses in order to find a solution. Consequently, there are many valid reasons why law enforcement officers regard admissions and confessions as absolutely essential to effective crime detection. The new ruling severely curtails the power of the police to obtain evidence of this kind.

By its five to four ruling of June 13, the Supreme Court held that police may not question a suspect if he is alone and "indicates in any manner that he does not wish to be interrogated." The decision also laid down other restrictive ground rules, designed to protect the suspect's rights against self-incrimination.

(1) Police must tell the suspect he has the right to refuse to answer any questions, and warn him that anything he says may be used against him.

(2) The suspect must be informed that he has a right to have an attorney present at the questioning, and that, if he cannot afford to employ an attorney, one will be provided for him at public expense.

(3) If the suspect says that he wants an attorney, there must be no questioning until the attorney is present.

(4) If while without an attorney, the suspect indicates in any manner that he does not wish to be interrogated, the police may not question him.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, who wrote the Court's majority opinion, said a defendant may waive his rights to remain silent and to have an attorney with him, "provided, the waiver is made voluntarily, knowingly and "intelligently." But notice the "escape word," "intelligently." If the suspect can convince an appeal court that he acted stupidly and not intelligently in making a confession, then his confession becomes invalid. So the new ruling is tantamount to barring all confessions or nullifying them, since a defendant can claim, upon appeal, that even though he acted voluntarily in making a confession, he did so unknowingly and unintelligently. Thus ignorance becomes a way out, despite the old saw that ignorance of the law is no excuse.

Imagine what a boon, what a protective shield this provides for the vicious killer, who realizes he can escape punishment by cleverly posing as a dumb oaf. Even before the arresting officers can finish booking him, he begins babbling: "Go ahead and ask me why I killed him? Sure I'll talk. Go ahead and ask me. Sure I'm a nut and don't know what I'm doing. But I don't need a lawyer."

He knows that any confession that he makes cannot be used against him, since he was not acting "intelligently" when he made the waiver.

Still instead of babbling out a confession that will be nullified by the new ground-rules, he may clam up and refuse to say anything on advice of counsel. Either way, he knows that the legal cards are stacked in his favor.

Actually, the killer, the rapist and the robber have never had it so good, and we can expect those who want to get away with crime to make the most of the new ground-rules. And we can likewise expect an increase in our unsolved murders.

Moreover, Mr. John Taxpayer, the law-abiding citizen, is going to have to come across with more money to pay the increased costs of employing attorneys for the poor, impoverished bank robbers and other criminal suspects—not just for trials—but from the day of their arrest, if said suspects claim they do not have funds for that purpose. In the past, the suspect was not required to have counsel until he was charged with a crime. Considering the rate at which crime is growing, this new and additional expense can become a staggering burden on the already oppressed taxpayer.

Undoubtedly, the new ruling will make the task of law enforcement more difficult and uncertain. But it is the danger that this ruling poses for the public and the rights of the lawabiding citizen for equal protection under the law that needs emphasis.

In his dissenting opinion, Justice John Marshall Harlan sharply pointed up this danger when he denounced the decision as "dangerous experimentation" at a time when a "high crime rate is a matter of growing concern."

He added: "The Court is taking a real risk with society's welfare in imposing its new regime on the country . . . I believe the decision of the Court represents poor constitutional law and entails harmful consequences for the country at large. How serious these consequences may prove to be only time can tell."

Justice Harlan said that "The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but a hazardous experimentation. While passing over the costs and risks of its experiment, the Court portrays the evils of normal police questioning in terms which I think are exaggerated."

Justices Byron R. White and Potter Stewart joined with Justice Harlan in dissenting from the Warren opinion in all four of the cases before the Court. Justice Tom C. Clark dissented in three of the four cases.

Justice White, who was appointed by the late President John F. Kennedy and who has stood staunchly behind law enforcement, pointedly commented "in some unknown number of cases the Court's rule will return a killer, a rapist or other criminal to the streets and to the environment which produced him, to repeat his crime whenever it pleases him. As a consequence, there will not be a gain, but a loss of human dignity."

Justice White added: "More than the human dignity of the accused in involved; the human personality of others in the society must also be preserved. . . . Moreover, it is by no means certain that the process of confessing is injurious to the accused. To the contrary it may provide psychological relief and enhance the prospects of rehabilitation."

Pointing out that rehabilitation was a factor that needed attention, Justice White said that FBI statistics show that of the

192,869 offenders processed in 1963 and 1964, 76 percent had prior arrest or charge records. He, like Justice Harlan, questioned the constitutionality of the majority opinion, declaring "that the Court's holding today is neither compelled nor even strongly suggested by the language of the Fifth amendment, is at odds with American and English legal history, and involves a departure from a long line of precedent . . ."

Countless courts from time immemorial and many outstanding legal scholars have staunchly affirmed the proposition that "Questioning of suspects is an indispensable arm of law enforcement." Two of the country's leading criminologists, Fred E. Inbau and John E. Reid, contend that many criminal cases, even when investigated by the best qualified police departments, are capable of solution only by means of an admission or confession from the guilty individual or by means of information obtained from other criminal suspects.

It might also be pointed out that such confessions, properly obtained by careful interrogation, have frequently cleared innocent persons suspected of crime. So the protection of the innocent is one of the advantages provided by confessions.

Statistics, based on a study recently conducted in California, show conclusively how important the confession is in solving crime. Prof. Edward L. Barrett, Jr., author of "Police Practices and the Law," recently reported a survey in several California cities. It showed that confessions or admissions were obtained from over 50 per cent of the persons arrested during the sample period, and from more than 75 per cent of those eventually formally charged. A national magazine writer making a somewhat similar study found that prosecutors contend that between 75 and 80 per cent of all crimes are solved by means of confessions.

"In murder cases," this writer concluded, "the percentage is even higher . . . because there are seldom any witnesses to murder."

It is interesting to note in this connection that a confession could have helped solve the murder of Supreme Justice Warren's own father, Methias H. Warren. The elder Warren was slain in 1938 in Bakersfield. Seventy-three years old at the time, Warren was sitting in the living room of his home reading a newspaper on a warm summer evening, when some one hit him on the head with a piece of iron pipe. Although Justice Warren, then a prosecutor in Alameda County, was inclined to blame the slaying on "a prowling tramp," this fact was never established, and the murder remains one of the State's unsolved crimes.

In the thirteen years that Earl Warren was District Attorney of Alameda County, "no complaints were lodged against his methods by the American Civil Liberties Union." So wrote Irving Stone in a friendly biography published in 1948. Significantly, the Civil Liberties Union also endorsed the Court's recent decision, striking a death blow at confessions.

Stone in his friendly biography also wrote: "He (Warren) prosecuted only when he had to, and when his evidence was complete."

He quoted the Chief Justice as saying: "I never heard a jury bring in a verdict of guilty, but that I felt sick at the pit of my stomach."

This sympathy for the convicted criminal and an obsession for the alleged constitutional rights of the accused have been demonstrated time after time in decisions rendered by the Supreme Court since Warren became Chief Justice. The Mallory rule, which had such a crippling effect on law enforcement, and the more recent Escobedo decisions are examples of this exaggerated concern for the civil rights of convicted criminals.

"All decisions from the Supreme Court recently always favored the accused and are greatly concerned with their rights," commented New York City's police commissioner, Howard R. Leary, when interviewed by U.S. News & World Report. "How far and how long are the rights of the accused to be considered, with little regard for the rights of the victims?"

"The innocent people of our community are going to pay for this foolishness," declared John J. Droney, district attorney of Middlesex County, Mass., in commenting on this latest ruling against confessions.

"I guess now we'll have to supply all squad cars with attorneys," commented Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

"This decision deprives us of the cooperation of the person who knows the most about the crime—the one who committed it—and puts the handcuffs on the police instead of the criminal," said Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles.

Arthur Krock, writing in The New York Times, expressed the opinion that the recent decision by a one-vote majority "added enormously to the difficulties the Court already has imposed on police questioning of persons taken into custody on substantial evidence of crime."

He pointed out that the decision came at a time when there was a dangerous increase in crimes of violence, and that many law enforcement officers attribute the crime growth in a large degree to the criminal-favoring rules handed down by the Court.

The Washington Evening Star commented: "The Supreme Court's ruling on police questioning of criminal suspects will be received with rejoicing by every thug in the land. For without a doubt it is a ruling which will grievously handicap the police and make it much easier for a criminal to beat the rap."

Philadelphia's Police Commissioner Edward J. Bell was quoted as saying: "It is my humble opinion the Supreme Court is now not interpreting the Constitution, but amending it. I respectfully submit the police are now limited. The thorough, complete and comprehensive investigation and interrogation of suspects is next to impossible.

"The present rules and interpretations—whether or not so intended—in fact protect the guilty. I do not believe the Constitution was designed as a shield for criminals."

Philip Kurland, professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago law school said: "It will have some evil results the Court did not contemplate. Society will be hurt by criminals getting off because their confessions couldn't be used—and this will apply to what up to now has been considered voluntary confessions."

Undersheriff Robert Presley of Riverside, Calif. spoke for many California law enforcement officers when he said: "The only ones who will gain by it (the latest decision on confessions) will be the criminals. This just means that more criminals will be walking the streets than ever before to prey on us. There seems to be far greater emphasis on the rights of violators than for the safety of the vast majority of our law-abiding people. The solid citizens of our communities are the losers."

Influential members of both houses of the United States Congress were also quick to comment on dangers to society posed by the five-to-four ruling. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (Dem. Ark.), himself a former prosecutor, said the decision requires an early and thorough "examination with a view to ascertaining just what legislation can and should be enacted to alleviate the obvious damage it will do society."

Rep. SAMUEL L. DEVINE (Rep. Ohio) was one of the first to propose a remedy. He proposed amending the Constitution to require a two-thirds vote by the nine Justices before the law of the land can be completely reversed.

"Decisions effecting 190 million persons," he said, "might well merit a consensus of at least six out of nine Justices," he said.

Representative DEVINE's suggestion for halting the judicial rules that are making the law a shield for the criminal deserves the consideration of all lawmen. Pointing out that "for over ten years, the U.S. Supreme Court has been rendering landmark decisions vastly altering the foundations of what was believed to be the law of the land," DEVINE said too many of these changes had been made by "five-to-four split" decisions. These, he said, "clearly demonstrates the complete lack of unanimity if not the uncertainty of the Court on key matters of law."

"It seems to me," DEVINE continued, "where the Court is called upon to rule upon constitutionality, it should be required that at lease two-thirds, or six of the nine Justices must agree before the law of the land can be completely reversed. This, in itself, would require a constitutional amendment.

"Acts of Congress are the result of long, arduous hours of legislation study, testimony of witnesses, deliberation, debate, and vote by both House and Senate, as well as approved by the Executive.

"This process now can be and is nullified by a determination of 'unconstitutional' by not more than five men, often with four dissenting."

Representative DEVINE's proposal may be only a part of the solution needed. But it is becoming increasingly apparent to many of the nation's outstanding legal scholars as well as to the lawmen, who are on the front line in the war against the country's growing crime, that some checks on wild judicial rulings are essential. Despite our traditional boast that our government by three powers—the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial—provides for "checks and balances," the United States is now endangered by a Judicial Oligarchy, in which one Justice can cast a decisive vote that will change the law of the land, almost by whim.

The legal escape from punishment for murder and other crimes of violence has been made too easy. And every ruling that restricts thorough police investigation encourages crime. Until a remedy is found, we can expect more unsolved murders.

THE LATE FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a great American died. Fulton Lewis, Jr., whose words and whose actions inspired a generation of Americans to look behind the shiny facade of the welfare state and there to see its shoddy back pinnings.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., was gifted with a rich and impressive voice. In this age of mass communications, he could have lent this voice to his own cause and adopted the prevailing liberal opinions of his time. Had he done that, the rewards to himself would have been great indeed. But he chose instead to fight for the right as he saw it. He bucked the mass hysteria fanned by the demagogs of liberalism; he called the shots as he saw them, and the great majority of times he was proven right by subsequent events. For this he

was punished by his liberal enemies, who prattle about the freedom of speech but believe only in the freedom to agree with them.

By his firm adherence to principle, Fulton Lewis, Jr., denied himself the popularity that would have been bestowed upon him had he lent his gifted voice to the trivialities and chicanery that marks so much of broadcast journalism in this age. He walked a lonely road but his adherence to principle won him admirers throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., departs from this earth as many of the dire consequences of liberalism against which he warned are coming to pass. I thank God that he has been spared the final horror this Nation faces if it does not turn away from the doctrines to which it has lately adhered. And I trust that a merciful God will now grant to him the rewards of a life well lived.

JUDICIAL MISJUDGMENT AND INDECISION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, last week a number of my colleagues in the House shared my concern for what appeared to be a hasty, ill-considered order by a Federal district judge. Judge Corcoran of the District Court for the District of Columbia undertook to issue a temporary restraining order to prevent a duly constituted committee of the Congress from proceeding about its legislative business. The rapidity with which that order was dissolved by a three-judge panel was interpreted by many as indicative of the want of judgment of the issuing judge. It was received by many more as recognition by the judicial branch of the danger patent in the collision course upon which the original order had placed the judicial and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

I am sure that many will be amazed to hear that this cause is still pending before a three-judge district court. And far from resolving the controversy, that court seems unable to determine the single basic question posed by the existing case law, the question of whether it even has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the suit.

Mr. Speaker, I am frankly appalled at the indecision demonstrated by an order of the court issued on August 17, 1966, postponing a hearing set for that date. The order calls for memorandums from the parties "to consider whether or not this case should proceed before this specially constituted three-judge court or be remanded to a single district court judge."

Under unanimous consent, the entire order will be included in the RECORD following my remarks. As the Members will see, the order contains no indication of what questions the court wishes briefed, or what purposes are contemplated by the court in remanding to a single judge.

Certainly a three-judge district court is empowered to determine its own jurisdiction. It should not avoid having to make that decision by the transparent stratagem of returning the case to the judge who originally convened the special panel. It should not thus delay rectifying the overreaching of that judge in taking jurisdiction of the case in the first instance.

Accordingly, I call upon the judicial branch to take affirmative, decisive action to set this needless controversy to rest and end as well a disquieting spectacle of judicial misjudgment and indecision.

The court order follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

DR. ALLEN M. KREBS, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, *v.* JOHN M. ASHBROOK, ET AL., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION 2157-66

(Before Bazelon, Chief Judge, and Charles Fahy, Circuit Judge, and Howard F. Corcoran, District Judge)

ORDER

In order that this court may have sufficient opportunity to consider whether or not this case should proceed before this specially constituted three-judge court or be remanded to a single District Court Judge, it is

Ordered by the court *sua sponte* that the hearing now scheduled for 2:30 p.m., this date, be postponed until further order of this court. Counsel are requested to submit memoranda of law on this issue on or before Monday, August 22, 1966.

Dated: August 17, 1966.

CREATING A NEW DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15963 would establish a new Department of Transportation—making the 12th Department of Cabinet rank in the executive branch. It would bring together major Federal agencies and programs relating to transportation promotion and safety, but not economic regulation, which remains with the regulatory agencies.

As you know, President Johnson sent his transportation message to the Congress on March 2, 1966, strongly recommending the creation of a Department of Transportation. His message highlighted the urgent, contemporary problems in the transportation field and emphasized the pressing need for solutions.

A Department of Transportation is not a panacea for all the transportation ills of the Nation. It is an organization measure and a new organization does not signify, by itself, a new transportation policy. Rather, it signifies a new framework and a new posture of Government, a willingness to look at many interrelated transportation problems in a comprehensive way, and a readiness to grapple with them. A new department, in other words, lays a broad and enduring foundation upon which national transportation policies can be built.

I introduced the administration's bill in the House of Representatives as H.R. 13200. It was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, on which I am the ranking member, and the chairman asked me to take charge of the hearings in the subcommittee which handles reorganization measures. We heard many witnesses from Government and industry, and received statements from all those who wished to be recorded. By the time we finished the hearings and completed our staff studies of the technical ramifications of the bill, there were many changes to be made, some of a technical or minor nature, but others of real substance.

Redrafting the bill, let me assure you, was not an easy job. We were anxious to take account of serious objections or concerns of industry groups, but we did not want to lose sight of the objectives of the bill. We could not defer to all those who wanted to be "included out"—those who said, in effect, "A new department is fine, but leave me out of it." Understandably, there is a reluctance, in some cases, to disturb existing relationships, and a concern that the agency or function to be transferred might be "swallowed up" in a great new department.

Let me say to those who have this concern that through this bill, transportation affairs will acquire higher status and greater recognition in the councils of Government. For the first time we will have a Cabinet officer concerned solely and exclusively with transportation, who will have the ear of the President, and who will be giving full time and attention to improving the transportation systems of our country. The major modes of transportation—air, rail, highway, and water—so far as Government responsibilities are concerned—will have administrators appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and these administrators will have a direct line to the Secretary of Transportation.

We want every transportation mode and segment to thrive and prosper. All are important to the national economy and to the well-being of our people. Therefore I ask those who are preoccupied with this or that segment of transportation to put aside their fears, to keep their sights on the higher national interest, to have confidence in the future. Our economy is highly interdependent. New transportation technologies are closely linked. Government investments in the transportation sector are heavy and growing. Transportation is one field in which we must hang together, if we are not to hang separately.

Industry groups who appeared before our committee were not exactly in agreement, either internally or among the different transportation interests. Some Members of Congress and chairmen of committees had reservations about one

provision or another. Considering all the recommendations put before us and all the problems we had to face, I believe we did quite well.

I introduced a new clean bill, H.R. 15963, incorporating many changes, and the committee approved the clean bill on June 29, 1966, with several additional amendments. In the committee, as in the executive branch of the Government and in industry, there was not complete agreement on every single item. I am pleased to report, however, that there was unanimous agreement on the basic concept of a new department and on most of the provisions. The committee report, beginning at page 15, explains the committee amendments to the clean bill and, beginning at page 18, explains the difference between the clean bill and the administration-drafted bill which I initially introduced.

H.R. 15963 is progressive and forward-looking in that it creates a major new Department of Government—which makes a round dozen Cabinet Departments—they do not come too frequently in the history of this Nation. When a Department of Transportation was proposed in the 1880's, perhaps there were those who were not quite ready to enter the 20th century. Now we are recording our readiness to enter the 21st century. By the year 2000, less than 35 years from now, the population of this country will be considerably more than one-third of a billion. We have weighty problems in transportation to solve today, but many more to solve tomorrow. A nation which will add 160 million more people in 35 years must look beyond contemporary problems to the welfare and happiness of its children.

At the same time, the bill is conservative, preserving the status quo in certain important essentials. By this I mean that we provide explicit safeguards to protect the rights of parties in administrative and judicial proceedings and in every other respect now guaranteed by law; and we reaffirm congressional prerogatives in relation to the executive. We want progress in transportation and a vigorous Government champion of transportation in the new Secretary of the Department, but we also want every party at interest to have his day in court, so to speak—to have every procedural right and privilege he enjoyed before.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill will be found in the report, beginning at page 29. Let me run through briefly, in broad terms, the essential features of H.R. 15963. I will follow the sequence elaborated in more detail in the committee report, beginning at page 7.

First. It brings together in one Department major transportation agencies but avoids rigid consolidation. Transferred to the new Department are the major transportation agencies: Federal Aviation Agency, Bureau of Public Roads, Coast Guard, Maritime Administration, Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and the safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission. Other agencies, such as the Alaska Railroad and the Inland Waterways Corporation, will be transferred later by Executive order. Of course, every Federal department or agency has transportation activities of one kind or another. It was not our purpose to have a highly rigid, overcentralized consolidation of all transportation activities in the Government. Where transportation activities are mere adjuncts of agency missions, they are left where they are. Only the major civil—nonregulatory—agencies in transportation are included.

Second. The organizational identity of the major transportation modes is assured. Rather than leave all internal organization to the Secretary's decision, we provide for major organizational components in air, highway, maritime, and rail transportation. Each of these four administrations will have a Federal administrator, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Coast Guard will be a separate entity within the new Department.

Third. Emphasis is given to the continuity of operations. There is language in the bill which enjoins the Secretary to consider fully the need for operational continuity of the functions transferred, as well as the need for effective and safe transportation systems for national defense. We expect that, by and large, the agencies and functions to be transferred will go over with their existing personnel and resources. Of course, as the new Department becomes established, we expect that many opportunities for economy and efficiency will emerge.

Fourth. The transportation regulatory agencies remain independent. The economic regulatory functions of the ICC, CAB, FMC, and the FPC are not absorbed by the new Department. The only things detached from the regulatory agencies, as in the case of the CAB and ICC, are safety and accident investigation functions, which are transferred to the new Department. Indeed, a big feature of the new Department is the emphasis on safety in transportation, as I shall mention in a moment.

Fifth. Car service functions stay in the Interstate Commerce Commission. We heard strong opposing arguments as to whether car service functions should remain in the ICC or go to the new Department. In the sense that they are administrative or operating functions, they could have been assigned properly to the new Department. At the same time, they do have a bearing on the economics of railroad operations, which makes a case for keeping them joined with the regulatory functions. The committee decision at this point in time was to let these functions remain in the ICC, together with the responsibilities for fixing demurrage and per diem charges. Rather than split these functions up, as the bill originally provided, we thought it best to leave the bundle together in its old home, the ICC. Future experience possibly may dictate a transfer.

Sixth. The Department of Defense's transportation resources are excluded from the new Department. The Department of Defense has, of course, great resources in transportation and none of these resources, nor the responsibilities for their procurement, deployment, or use are transferred to the new Department. Nor will the Secretary of Transportation control design features of civil transportation required for defense. We do expect, as the bill provides, that there will be close consultation between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense, and indeed, close consultation with all agencies having transportation requirements. The bill requires such consultation and also authorizes the Secretary to draw upon the military services for personnel assistance in discharging his many technical duties. The only actual transfers from the defense sector are certain minor functions of the Army Corps of Engineers, more related to civil than to military transportation affairs.

Seventh. Special attention is given to safety functions and the development of techniques and measures for accident prevention. The bill creates, as you know, a National Transportation Safety Board, which is an independent entity within the Department. We give it important duties and responsibilities beyond those provided in the original bill. The Board not only will determine the cause of accidents and hear appeals of certain kinds, but will be empowered to conduct special studies, require specific investigations, have participants in accident investigations, require reports, make recommendations to the Secretary, and report annually to the Congress. We envisage the National Transportation Safety Board as a key agency for energizing the departmental offices and agencies engaged in accident investigation and prevention work. The bulk of the routine accident investigation, as well as research in safety techniques and measures, will continue to be done by the four administrations provided in the bill for air, highway, rail, and water transportation.

Eighth. Organizational arrangements are made to preserve the pattern of air accident investigations. Since aviation presented a somewhat special case, it was necessary to create an additional entity within the Department—the Office of Accident Investigation, independent of the FAA. Unless such an office were created, either the FAA would be required to investigate all accidents, which Government and industry do not sanction; or else the accident investigation role would have to be transferred to the National Transportation Safety Board, which then might be dominated by aviation concerns to the exclusion of other safety matters.

The Office of Accident Investigation, in essence, absorbs the CAB's Bureau of Safety, which will continue to investigate fatal or large aircraft accidents, leaving investigation of nonfatal accidents involving smaller planes to the Federal Aviation Administration. Determination of probable cause of air accidents would be made by the National Transportation Safety Board, much as the CAB does now.

Ninth. A staff secretariat is provided to insure full attention to matters which

cut across all modes of transportation. The bill provides for the Secretary to head the Department, an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel, and an Assistant Secretary for Administration. All these officials, except for the Assistant Secretary for Administration, would require Senate confirmation as well as Presidential appointment. In keeping with reorganization measures of this nature, and to afford the Secretary flexibility in deploying his staff resources to deal with important or emergent problems, the bill does not tie down the functions of the secretariat by specific statutory language. However, the committee expects that the Assistant Secretaries will be charged with staff areas of responsibility of crucial importance to transportation.

A case in point is research and development. While the modal operating agencies will be responsible for research and development in their respective areas, an Assistant Secretary can be instrumental in coordinating their research efforts, in stimulating new areas of research, and in making sure there no serious gaps or omissions. The committee anticipates that there will be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, whose concerns will be departmentwide and intermodal.

Tenth. Federal investment standards will be developed for balanced progress in transportation. The Secretary of Transportation would be required to develop standards and criteria, subject to Presidential approval, to be used in the formulation and economic evaluation of proposals for the investment of Federal funds in transportation facilities or equipment. This is the famous section 7 which was so much in dispute during the hearings on the bill.

To allay many concerns, we have narrowed the Secretary's responsibility in formulating investment standards, excluding such matters as water resource projects and grant-in-aid programs. These exemptions make it clear, for example, that Corps of Engineers projects or highway projects financed by the highway trust fund, will not be affected. Of course, the President, in exercising his own constitutional and statutory responsibilities in this field, will be able to call, without restraint, upon the Secretary for advice and recommendations.

To reaffim congressional prerogatives, the committee has written language into the bill which makes it clear that any standards prescribed by the Congress itself in existing or future acts must be observed by the Secretary in developing standards and criteria for economic evaluation of transportation proposals and projects. And to remove any doubt on that score, the bill provides, one, that the Secretary cannot promulgate investment standards or criteria contrary to or inconsistent with acts of Congress relating to this subject, and two, that the standards and criteria must be consistent with national transportation policies. The Secretary is enjoined from adopting or revising a national transportation policy without apropriate action by the Congress. Finally, the Secretary must give public notice with time for presentation of views, and coincidentally time for review by congressional committees, before he can even submit standards and criteria for Presidential approval.

Eleven. Existing procedural rights and privileges are safeguarded. As I have already mentioned, the committee has taken pains to insure that all procedural rights and privileges authorized in existing law are carried over to the new Department. There is no loss or diminution of procedural safeguards, and all permissible channels for administrative or judicial proceedings are kept unimpeded. Any orders or actions of the Secretary or of the National Transportation Safety Board are subject to judicial review to the same extent and in the same manner as they would have been in the departments or agencies from which the functions are transferred. Statutory requirements relating to notice, hearings, actions upon the record, or administrative review, apply to the new Department. All orders, contracts, rules and regulations lawfully issued before the reorganization, and all proceedings, continue in effect after the reorganization, until they have run their course or have been changed or terminated by appropriate procedures.

Twelve. Certain important transportation matters are left open for future organizational decision. A case in point is urban mass transportation. The Congress by a recent enactment has assigned Federal functions in this important area to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is itself a new and still developing Department. To shift urban mass transportation responsibilities from one new Department to another, at this early stage, would only delay the program. More experience is necessary to decide intelligently whether urban mass transportation, which is intimately bound up with other problems of community growth and development, more logically belongs in HUD or DOT.

The President has said he intends, upon the creation of the Department of Transportation, to ask the heads of the two Departments concerned to study and report within 1 year on a logical and efficient organization of urban mass transportation functions. It may well be that these functions will be lodged in the new Department. The committee considers that the President's proposed course is reasonable and that the final organizational decision on urban mass transportation should be deferred.

In conclusion, I will say again that the Department of Transportation is not a panacea for the transportation ills of the Nation. It will, however, set the framework for a concerted and comprehensive attack on the many transportation problems that must be solved. Our committee has worked long and hard to develop a good bill, a reasonable bill, one I believe all Members of the Congress, all agencies, and all organizations in the transportation field can legitimately support. Indeed, we have letters in support of the new Department from the Transportation Association of America, the American Railroad Association, and other organizations. There are still a few who have reservations on one point or another, but I hope that in the interests of the whole country they will submerge their differences and join with us to help make the new Department a reality, and after it is created, to help make it work well.

We need to make it work if this country is to prosper and grow and to move its people and its goods from place to place with safety and convenience, with economy and efficiency. Transportation ties together the Nation, extending its frontiers, connecting its communities, enlarging the opportunities and horizons of its people. As stated so aptly in President Johnson's message:

In a Nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONS

Listed below are the major programs and functions of the organizations portrayed on the attached organization chart of the Department of Transportation. (Some minor functions are not listed pending establishment of the Department and final decision at that time.)

Federal Highway Administration will perform the following functions transferred from Bureau of Public Roads (truck safety from Interstate Commerce Commission):

a. Maintain the schedule for the completion of the Interstate System.

b. Carry out the Federal-aid primary and secondary system.

c. Highway safety activities (will also include the new Traffic Safety Act responsibilities).

d. Study future highway needs.

e. Implement the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

f. Continue construction of the Appalachia development highway system.

Federal Maritime Administration will perform the following functions transferred from Maritime Administration, now in Department of Commerce:

a. Subsidy of U.S. ship construction and operation, ship construction loan, and mortgage guarantees.

b. Operate ships in emergencies.

c. Promote use of U.S.-flag liners.

d. Provide technical and research and development services.

e. Preserve the merchant reserve fleet.

f. Train cadets to become merchant marine officers and assist State academies.

Federal Aviation Administration will perform the following functions transferred from the Federal Aviation Agency:

a. Control navigable airspace, and regulate both civil and military operations in the interest of safety and efficiency for both.

b. Operate a common system of air traffic control and navigation for both civil and military aircraft.

c. Conduct research and development for air navigation facilities, and their installation and operation.

d. Register civil aircraft.

e. Federal-aid airports program.

f. Civil supersonic transport program.

Federal Railroad Administration will perform the following functions:

a. High-speed Ground Transportation programs (from Commerce Department).

b. Promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads (from ICC).

c. Inspection of locomotives, signal systems, and train brakes (from ICC).

U.S. Coast Guard will continue in the new Department essentially as at present and be responsible for:

a. Search and rescue operations.

b. Merchant marine safety.

c. Military readiness for time of emergency or war.

d. Aids to navigation for marine commerce.

e. Port security program.

f. Icebreaking.

g. Enforce or assist in enforcement of Federal laws.

Office of Accident Investigation will perform the following functions transferred from Bureau of Safety (CAB):

a. Investigation of major accidents involving civil aircraft occurring in the U.S. and its territories.

b. Such other major transportation accidents as may be directed by the Secretary.

National Transportation Safety Board will perform the following functions:

a. Determination of cause or probable cause of transportation accidents and reporting the facts, conditions and circumstances relating to such accidents (from CAB, Coast Guard, ICC).

b. Reviewing, on appeal, the suspension, amendment, modification, revocation, or denial of safety certificates issues by the Secretary (from CAB, Coast Guard).

Assistant Secretaries. The Assistant Secretaries will be available for assignments which cut across departmental programs and require officials of Assistant Secretary status. The Assistant Secretaries could be used by the Secretary in such matters as the following:

a. Long-range planning and policy development.

b. Transportation technology and research.

c. Public and congressional relations.

d. Interagency and intergovernmental affairs.

e. International transportation affairs.

f. Transportation safety.

Assistant Secretary for Administration.

a. Principal adviser for managerial and administrative matters.

b. Supervise administrative offices which are established at the departmental level, i.e., personnel, audits, administrative services, etc.

General Counsel

a. Legal adviser to the Secretary on all matters pertaining to transportation.

b. Chief legal officer of the Department.

APPENDIX B

Method of calculation of assistance to the merchant marine for fiscal year 1966

[In millions of dollars]

I. DIRECT ASSISTANCE

Operating subsidies (new obligational authority for 1966 as shown in 1967 Budget of United States (appendix, p. 257))	190.0
Construction subsidies (new obligational authority for 1966 as shown in 1967 Budget of United States (appendix, p. 256))	132.0
Cargo preference	160.0

(a) Military and Eximbank costs estimated at $70 million. The rates for these cargoes are negotiated. We have developed a crude estimate of $70 million, of which approximately 90 percent is military.

(b) Public Law 480 and AID cargoes. Cost to the United States of shipment of 50 percent of Public Law 480 cargoes on U.S. ships amounts to $85 million in fiscal year 1966. These are shipping costs under titles I and IV net of reimbursement in foreign currency at rates if cargoes had been carried in foreign ships

Method of calculation of assistance to the merchant marine for fiscal year 1966—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

I. DIRECT ASSISTANCE

Excess costs for the AID program were estimated at $5 million. Updated 1966 data indicate that the AID costs amounted to $15 million which would increase the total cargo preference cost to $170 million.

Other assistance	41.0
(a) Free medical care (estimated share for Merchant Marine of the total Public Health Service costs for seamen's medical care, including fishing industry, of $23.4 million)	16.7
(b) Merchant marine training:	
(1) Merchant Marine Academy—1966 appropriation was nearly $4 million (1967 budget, appendix, p. 260)	5.6
(2) State marine schools—1966 (1967 budget, appendix, p. 260)	5.6
(c) Research and development (1966 obligations (1967 budget appendix, p. 258))	8.9
(d) Administration (administrative expense portion of the 1966 appropriation for salaries and expenses (1967 budget appendix, p. 254))	9.8

II. INDIRECT ASSISTANCE

Cabotage* differential	135.0

The cabotage provisions of law restrict the carriage of coastal and intercoastal domestic waterborne cargo to U.S. ships. As in the case of foreign trade, U.S.-flag shipping costs are substantially higher than foreign-flag costs. The protection given U.S. shipping in the domestic trades therefore provides a subsidy just as surely as do the explicit subsidies paid in foreign trade. The only difference is that the foreign trade subsidies are paid by the taxpayer while the cabotage subsidies are paid by the consumer.

(NOTE.—This calculation is conservative insofar as it omits the implicit subsidy which is involved in the requirement that all ships in the domestic trades be built in U.S. yards.)

Cabotage allows operators to set higher rates on domestic cargo than would otherwise be the case. This differential has been estimated as though it were the equivalent of operating subsidies provided ships in competition with foreign operators. Estimate is on the basis of approximately 100 ships at $500,000 annual rate ($50 million) and 200 tankers at 5/6 of this rate, to account for smaller crews ($85 million).

Tax advantages and mortgage insurance	15.0

(a) Without ship mortgage insurance, borrowers would pay higher interest rates. Estimated at one additional percentage point, this would amount to $4.2 million on $421 million of outstanding mortgage balances and commitments as of June 30, 1965.

(b) Tax deferrals are granted for certain funds deposited in capital or special reserve funds. Estimated that these deferrals in 1966 amounted to $11 million of a total of $80 million deposited in or earned by these funds.

*Cabotage here means the restriction of transportation of goods between U.S. ports, to U.S. ships. Hence there is no foreign competition and transportation charges are higher. The difference is eventually paid by the U.S. consumer.

APPENDIX C

Statement showing the estimated operating differential subsidy payable and the construction differential subsidy payable from inception of the 1936 act, by years and cumulative to date

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Operating subsidy (A)		Construction subsidy (B)	
	Net payable	Cumulative to date	Payable	Cumulative to date
1937	2,637			
1938	6,217	8,854		
1939	4,269	13,123	107	
1940	2,159	15,282	9,143	9,250
1941	1,300	16,582	34,751	44,001
1942	20	16,602	36,424	80,425
1943		16,602	45,250	125,675
1944		16,602	19,968	145,643
1945		16,602	32,854	178,497
1946		16,602	75,949	254,446
1947	3,210	19,812	74,272	328,718
1948	13,571	33,383	6,841	335,559
1949	29,682	63,065	1,677	337,236
1950	48,626	111,691	16,722	353,958
1951	46,040	157,731	18,887	372,845
1952	63,548	221,279	9,008	381,853
1953	93,340	314,619	[1] 896	[1] 380,957
1954	104,510	419,129	5,538	386,495
1955	103,191	522,320	5,659	392,154
1956	105,652	627,972	16,014	408,168
1957	120,378	748,350	17,479	425,647
1958	140,557	888,907	27,338	452,985
1959	159,483	1,048,390	28,862	481,847
1960	163,352	1,211,742	73,018	554,865
1961	168,996	1,380,738	103,319	658,184
1962	181,777	1,562,515	141,061	799,245
1963	194,899	1,757,414	94,723	893,968
1964	209,243	1,966,657	78,934	972,902
1965	208,578	2,175,235	87,688	1,060,590

[1] Credit resulting from an adjustment reducing subsidy paid on SS *United States*.

NOTE.—Operating subsidies and construction subsidies are shown above on a calendar year and fiscal year basis, respectively, since this is the manner in which these accounts are maintained for record purposes. The construction subsidies also include reconstruction subsidies for fiscal years 1955 through 1965 amounting to about $43,700,000.

APPENDIX D

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Secretary.
Under Secretary.
Office of Accident Investigation.
General Counsel.
Assistant Secretary for Administration.
Assistant Secretary.
National Transportation Safety Board.
Assistant Secretary.
Assistant Secretary.
Assistant Secretary.

OPERATING AGENCIES

Federal Railroad Administration.
Federal Highway Administration.
Federal Maritime Administration.
Federal Aviation Administration.
Coast Guard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, shortly within the next couple of days, we will be facing a bill to establish a new Department of Transportation. One of the principal, if not the most controversial areas in this bill is whether we shall have, as part of the Department of Transportation, the Maritime Administration along with the Highway Administration, the Railroad Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration and the Coast Guard, or whether it shall be stricken from the bill. I understand the Republican policy committee has taken a position to strike this from the bill along with other amendments which they will offer.

I want to speak at this time on the principle of why the Maritime Adminis-

tration should be placed in the Department of Transportation.

WHY THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE PLACED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

My State of California has three major harbor cities and a number of smaller ports. The three major cities handle more than 72 million tons of cargo a year. So we are talking about a maritime interest in California which is probably second to no other State than New York in tonnage. The three major harbor cities are Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. Los Angeles ranks third in U.S. harbor cities.

For 24 years in the House I have voted for and supported merchant marine legislation and appropriations.

So, I do not speak today as an opponent to an adequate, efficient U.S. merchant marine for transportation in times of peace and war.

I believe that the shipping interests and the maritime unions are making a colossal blunder in their desperation over the present deplorable state of their sick industry.

Why is it sick? It is sick because free enterprise in the United States cannot meet foreign competition. It has not been able to meet competition even after receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal subsidies. Any Member who has studied this problem must come to two conclusions:

First. The U.S. merchant marine is a sick industry.

Second. On a free-enterprise basis it cannot meet foreign competition.

Then, if that Member is honest, he will admit that such shipping as we have now in the U.S. merchant marine depends, and has depended for the past 30 years, on direct and indirect Federal subsidies that have totaled almost $3 billion since World War I.

The calculation of Federal assistance, direct and indirect, totaled $673 million for the fiscal year 1966.

These figures are from the Bureau of the Budget.

The breakdown was:

Direct subsidies—$482 million.

Indirect assistance—$191 million.

Now let me make it very clear at this point that the merchant marine has not been the only transportation mode which has been subsidized by the Federal Government.

Railroads, highway transportation, and air transportation modes have received billions in subsidies, direct and indirect.

We all remember that every other section of public land was given to railroads along with thousands of miles of right-of-way.

We are now engaged in a 10-year program costing $50 billion in Federal subsidies for highways for the benefit of private and commercial automotive transportation.

The Federal Government has spent billions in the development of airplane engines and airframes for national defense purposes primarily, but the benefits of this technology have been presented on a silver platter to commerial airlines. In addition, we have given hundreds of millions in direct subsidies to the airlines through airmail, airport construction, and the operation of FAA facilities. As a matter of fact, the FAA operation is costing the taxpayers $750 million per year. Now to be deducted from that amount is the figure of $200 million, which comes back as a result of taxes on the airline tickets and other deductible income that the Government receives. So that leaves a taxpayer subsidy of $550 million for the operation of the airport facilities and the subsidies to air traffic pattern controls, feeder lines, and so forth.

So let no one point the subsidy finger at maritime subsidies without considering the comparative subsidies of rail, highway, and aviation.

Let me emphasize that I am not fighting these maritime subsidies which, as I have said, have totaled over $3 billion since World War II, including $673 million in fiscal year 1966.

Maybe it should have been $10 billion instead of $3 billion. I am not passing judgment on it.

Various Presidents, various Congresses had the opportunity to double, treble, or quadruple that amount.

But they did not.

What this President, this Congress, and future Presidents and Congresses in the next 30 years will do, I do not know. But this I do know—and I want to get this point over very clearly, if I may—the retention of the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce, or its establishment in the Department of Transportation, or its establishment as an independent agency will not guarantee a magic cure for this sick industry.

It is going to take more than placement in Government structure.

It is going to take the combined action of the Congress and the executive branch to develop and fund a national transportation policy which will include within it a great and dynamic shipping policy based on national need and national security.

Until that policy is established and implemented by Congress and the executive branch, the placement of the Maritime Administration in the structure of Government does not and will not be the magic cure-all solution.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I will strike this if the gentleman does not want it to come in the middle of his remarks.

I meant to ask the gentleman to yield when he was talking about the airline subsidies. I was just afraid that the RECORD would not show the trunkline airlines today are off subsidy. The only subsidies we are paying now are to the feeder lines.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct. Currently that is the situation. However, in years gone by there have been direct subsidies running into hundreds of millions of dollars paid to the regularly scheduled airlines, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. I am not commenting on that. I know the gentleman is not attacking that particular subject. But I did think the RECORD ought to show it, because we have had a lot of discussion in the last 2 days or 2 weeks about airlines.

I have been surprised that many people did not know these airlines were off subsidy and have not been receiving a subsidy for several years. The feeder lines are hoping to get into a financial condition to get off subsidy also.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. I am glad the gentleman has brought out the point.

The gentleman will also agree with me that Federal funds have financed billions of dollars worth of research and development for airplane engines and airframes for our national defense, which were immediately made available to the commercial industry without investment on their part. Is that not correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not trying to portray anything here except the exact facts. When people point the finger of subsidy at the merchant marine I want them to know they can also point the finger of the subsidy charge against the railroads and against aviation as well as shipping, and against highway transportation, because every contribution which the Federal Government makes to the great roads system we are building goes to private users of the highways as well as commercial users.

I am also aware, of course, that gasoline tax money comes back in to defray some of that subsidy over the years.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is quite correct. I will agree that many of our activities are being subsidized today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman will read my remarks carefully tomorrow.

The purpose of my remarks today is to point out that the placement of the Maritime Administration where it is, in the Department of Commerce—which, of course, is a department with many interests—or as an independent agency will not solve the problem.

Neither will it be solved completely by putting the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation, but by putting it in the Department of Transportation we will upgrade it from its present isolated position in the Department of Commerce, since it will be with the other modes of transportation in the department of government involved, with a direct line to the Cabinet Secretary to plead its case with the respective committees of the Congress, and with a direct line to the President.

This is the point I hope to get over today. I recognize there has been a tremendous amount of pressure put on Members of Congress. I have had it put on me. I come from a State which has a tremendous maritime business. I know what the unions are doing. I know the pressure they are putting on.

I say to the maritime unions that they are standing in their own light in resisting the moving of the Maritime Administration out of a relatively unrelated Department, the Department of Commerce, which has many interests, and putting it into the one department with the only purpose of improving modes of transportation and coordinating all modes of transportation so that this Nation can have a really coordinated national transportation policy, something which it has never before had. Transportation modes have grown up piecemeal. It is time to put all modes together in one Cabinet-level Department.

The transportation industry amounts to about 20 percent of our gross national product. I suppose there are many hundreds of thousands or even millions of people hired in the various ramifications of transportation.

In fact, it ranks as fourth in importance from the standpoint of funding—moneys, subsidies, and capital investment. It ranks fourth among all the departments, of the 12 departments which would be Cabinet-level Departments.

I say to my friends who seek a more dynamic merchant marine, and I seek that same objective, that the key to progress lies not in an isolated placement nor in an isolated fight for one mode of transportation.

It lies rather in the overall attention to transportation on land, air, and sea which a Department of Transportation is charged in H.R. 15963 to promote and develop.

It lies in the purpose of this bill and the charge of responsibility which this Congress will place on the new Cabinet-level Secretary and his staff.

Listen to the declaration of purpose in this bill. It is the mandate of duty and responsibility which Congress places upon the Secretary of Transportation:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare, the economic growth and stability of the Nation and its security require the development and implementation of national transportation policies and programs conducive to the provisions of fast, safe, efficient, and convenient transportation at the lowest cost consistent therewith and with other national objectives, including the efficient utilization and conservation of the Nation's resources.

The Congress therefore finds that the establishment of a Department of Transportation is necessary in the public interest and to assure the coordinated, effective administration of the transportation programs of the Federal Government; to facilitate the development and improvement of coordinated transportation service, to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible; to encourage cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments, carriers, labor, and other interested parties toward the achievement of national transportation objectives; to stimulate tehcnological advances in transportation; to provide general leadership in the identification and solution of transportation problems; and to develop and recommend national transportation policies and programs to accomplish these objectives with full and appropriate consideration of the needs of the public, users, carriers, industry, labor, and the national defense.

Now let me say to my friends who have been attracted by the proposition that the ills of the maritime industry will be cured by creating an independent agency.

Do not fall into the trap of isolation.

You cannot solve your problems in an isolated, fragmented position.

Fragmentation of transportation is opposed by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Commerce, the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, Federal Maritime Administration, the Association of American Railroads, American Trucking Associations, Inc., National Brotherhood of Teamsters, the United States Chamber of Commerce, National Freight Traffic Association, Transportation Association of America, Airport Operators Council, New England Council—organization of five New England States—American Waterway Operators—Inland Waterway—National Defense Transportation Association, Grocery Manufacturers Association and many other groups—all of these entities have testified in favor of most of the provisions of this bill.

It is my sincere judgment that the merchant marine has a better chance to win more chips in the game where the chips are being distributed than by playing solitaire in a side room.

I say that as a friend of the merchant marine industry.

I hope that the friends of the merchant marine program will keep this fact in mind. Independent agencies—and listen to this—independent agencies have no preferred position in the budget process. All funding proposals are adjusted to the final level of total expenditures in the fiscal year budget. That budget, which is sent to the Congress, has been approved by the President. The Congress can exceed the President's budget level, but it cannot force the President to expend the funds.

Now I want to pose this question to the friends of a dynamic merchant marine program. I hope they will read my remarks and I hope they will think about it before this bill comes to the floor. Do you really believe that the merchant marine industry will fare better standing off by itself in a corner? Or will it fare better as a coequal administration in this great new Department of Transportation? That is where the Secretary wants it. That is where the Budget Bureau wants it. That is where the President wants it.

That is where more attention will be given to transportation problems—Cabinet-level attention—not an adminstrator down below on a subprestige level. That is where the chips are going to be. The Secretary of Transportation will be the President's principal adviser on all major transportation policies. Will the President listen more closely to his principal adviser, a member of his Cabinet, or to the administrator of a relatively small, independent agency? The answer is obvious. We in the Congress should not delude ourselves. I know that there has been strong pressure exerted. I have felt that pressure, too, even to the point of a threat to defeat me in the coming election. But what we are trying to do today is to build for the future of the people of the United States. We are looking forward to a growth in population by the year 2000 from 195 million today to 362 million people. We are going to have to move those people and we are going to have to move the goods that they use. We are going to have to take care of the traffic congestion on the land, in the air and on the water.

We are trying to lay the groundwork, the organization to develop national transportation policies and programs which will deal with the staggering problems ahead.

The Department of Transportation is in the mainstream of transportation progress.

No part of the industry will prosper by complaining from the sidelines, by standing aside and trying to go it alone.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will yield to the distinguished Speaker, from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made a very amazing statement a few minutes ago that he had been threatened by defeat. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and two other Members, because of the exercise of their judgment and their conscience in connection with this bill, have been threatened with defeat. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to put the name of the labor leader in at this time who made the threat, but I suggest that he had better reconsider that. He had better realize the implications of what he said in threatening anybody in public life. It is one thing to try to convince people by logic and argument. It is another thing to threaten them, no matter who they are, whether in the field of labor or management or any other field. As one whose progressiveness has been consistent for 38 years in this House, as one who is Speaker, it is my duty, I feel, to express my resentment of threats against anyone, against any Member. I strongly suggest to this particular gentleman that he reconsider the threat. I hope he made it emotionally, but I suggest that he reconsider the threat. While he might disagree with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and the other two Members, whose names I will not mention now, he should disagree without being disagreeable. He certainly should realize the significant implications and the result of what he said. I hope what he said was emotional and I hope that the few remarks I make on this occasion might cause him to pause and to realize that the remarks he made were intemperate and emotional and did not represent the settled feelings of his mind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the distinguished Speaker for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I alluded to this rather casually, because, of course, as many

other Members of Congress have experienced, we have all had threats to defeat us in the forthcoming election.

And, Mr. Speaker, I might say that these threats kind of run off my back like rain off the back of a duck. I do not pay a great deal of attention to them.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this statement was an emotional statement. This entire problem of Maritime Administration location is in the field of emotion. It is no longer logical. It is emotional. It is a desperate expedient to try to solve a problem in transportation in the maritime industry which is caused by a complete lack of ability to compete economically with foreign shippers even when our ships are subsidized up to 50 percent and the operation of those ships are subsidized to the extent of 75 percent, and when there are various other indirect subsidies such as insurance, cabotage, training of seamen, and other factors involved, Public Law 480 under which we ship grains to foreign countries in American ship bottoms imposed a Federal subsidy of $75 million on our wheat shipments.

Mr. Speaker, all of those things exist. It builds up to a cost of shipping position which is not competitive with foreign competitors and, therefore, has to be subsidized by the American taxpayer if we operate our ships.

Mr. Speaker, I am not thinking about so much of the problem as to whether we should have a merchant marine or not. I subscribe to the policy that we should have a merchant marine and I subscribe to the policy that we should have a subsidized merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making and to which I address myself today is how do we reach our goal of a dynamic merchant marine? Do we reach it through conferences held in the side room or do we get into the mainstream of transportation, where the attention of a Cabinet-level officer will be devoted to their problem?

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of this new Department is charged with wide transportation responsibilities, and let me read to the Members of the House the provisions contained in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I read as follows from the declaration of purpose of this legislation:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare, the economic growth and stability of the Nation and its security require the development and implementation of national transportation policies and programs conducive to the provision of fast, safe, efficient, and convenient transportation at the lowest cost consistent therewith and with other objectives—

It does not have to be competitive. We may have other national objectives that are overriding; and, of course, this has been the claim of those who have supported a dynamic merchant marine—

including the efficient utilization and conservation of the Nation's resources.

The Congress therefore finds that the establishment of a Department of Transportation is necessary in the public interest and to assure the coordinated, effective administration of the transportation programs of the Federal Government; to facilitate the development and improvement of coordinated transportation service, to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible; to encourage cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments, carriers, labor, and other interested parties toward the achievement of national transportation objectives; to stimulate technological advances in transportation; to provide general leadership in the identification and solution of transportation problems; and to develop and recommend national transportation policies and programs to accomplish these objectives with full and appropriate consideration of the needs of the public, users, carriers, industry, labor, and the national defense.

Now that is the purpose of the bill. That is what the Secretary is charged with. That is his responsibility. His attention is going to be given to this Department of Transportation. I ask each and every Member that has been importuned by the maritime shipping interests—and some of them are for and some of them are against going into the Transportation Department, and by the maritime unions—to consider very seriously whether the position they have taken is a wise position for their progress, or whether they want to get out by themselves in a separate agency. They think they can get more attention out there and that they can get more appropriations for subsidies, more appropriations for the program.

It is my considered opinion that the only way we are going to get a better American merchant marine is by the Congress and the executive branch working together and industry working together and the unions working together.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to play the game of fragmentation, they take the responsibility of future programs in their own hands.

The Merchant Marine Committee does not have the power of annual authorization. The power of appropriation is in the House Appropriations Committee based on general authorization contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. Are they going to ask for a $2 billion or a $3 billion authorization annually to build a great merchant marine? I do not know. If they bring it in and prove to me that it is in the interest of the Nation to do this, I will vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against the merchant marine. But what I am for, is to try in this legislation to concentrate the attention of the Government and the Congress on the Department of Transportation whether it is in highways, rails, shipping, or aviation, and to solve all of the problems and to coordinate all of it together so we can develop a great national transportation system.

We in the Congress should not delude ourselves in the consideration of this matter. We are trying in the Department of Transportation to lay the ground work. The structural organization in the Government at the highest level, the Cabinet level, to develop our national transportation policy and programs which will deal with the staggering problems ahead.

The Department of Transportation will be in the mainstream of transportation progress.

No part of the industry will prosper by complaining from the sidelines or by standing aside and trying to go it alone.

Mr. Speaker I hope that when H.R. 15963 is considered on Tuesday or Wednesday that the Members of this House will feel that your Committee on Government Operations has done a good legislative job and that they will be able to support the bill.

A REVIEW OF SPAIN'S CASE ON NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have addressed the House on the important additional contributions Spain could make to the defense of the North Atlantic area if admitted to membership in NATO. I say additional because Spain, for the past 13 years, has been making very significant contributions to Western defense in many ways and especially through the bilateral defense agreement with the United States. I have been assured Spain has fulfilled its responsibilities on defense cooperation with the United States under the 1953 defense agreement in an outstanding manner. The agreement was renewed for 5 years in 1963 and today we continue to receive Spain's loyal cooperation.

In the current difficult period of transition when European defense is undergoing study and revision, a step made necessary by the disappointing actions of the French Government, it is natural that the question of Spain's role in NATO should again arise. It is because of the importance of European defense to our own security that I again wish to speak of a possible new role for Spain in Atlantic and Mediterranean defense.

It should be noted that Spain has never formally applied for membership in NATO and probably would not do so unless acceptance were assured. Spain nevertheless participates in the Western defense system through bilateral defense agreements with two members of the NATO alliance—the United States and Portugal.

The Congress of the United States has long been aware of the value of the contribution Spain would make as a full NATO partner. This awareness is evidenced by the resolution favoring Spanish membership in NATO passed by the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress; by a similar joint resolution approved by both Houses of the 85th Congress, and by the two resolutions which were introduced, one by Congresswoman KELLY, and the other by Congressman Walter, in the 86th Congress. Many Members of the Congress continue

to view this subject as one of considerable importance to this country and to our allies. I am one who holds this view.

In my own case, I have made known my interest in greater Spanish defense participation to the executive branch, which assures me that it is the policy of this Government that Spain belongs in NATO. I have reviewed the problems which complicate the attainment of this policy goal. The same obstacles have delayed Spanish NATO membership all these years. Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty states:

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty.

There are some members of NATO who remain opposed to extending an invitation to Spain to join NATO. Their opposition is based on ideological grounds. Because of the rule of unanimity, Spanish membership can be accomplished only with the consent of all the member nations. The problem is therefore essentially one of persuading the member nations concerned to review the situation as it relates to Spain in the light of today's realities and not on the basis of old rancors.

As the governments of Europe review and weigh the problems of assuring their own security through a joint defense system, I feel confident more and more Europeans, when they think of Spain and Europe, will focus less on ideological considerations and more on Spain's unique strategic location, on the actual and potential strength of the Spanish armed forces, on the firm anti-Communist stand of the Spanish Government, on the rapid evolutionary changes taking place in Spain, and on the wisdom of hastening Spain's full integration into Europe. It is at this point that stronger insistence on the part of the United States is essential. Our Government knows these things. The European governments know them. Vigorous efforts on the part of the American Government can serve as the catalyst which brings about full agreement on the need for Spain and NATO. Once the problem is seen in the proper light I feel certain that the long delay in making full use of Spain's potential contribution to the security of the North Atlantic will end.

Presently, U.S. Armed Forces in Spain do not come under NATO command and are not available for use in the NATO area. With the inclusion of Spain in NATO, the Atlantic alliance could count on a member whose geographic location is of particular strategic importance to the defense of the West; where already constructed military facilities would contribute greatly to NATO's defense infrastructure; and where over one-quarter million military and naval forces—army 201,000; navy 46,000; air force 38,500—would be an effective boost to the military strength of the NATO area.

When I speak of Spanish integration into the military structure of Europe, I refer also to the importance of integrating Spain fully into Europe in other ways as well. Our 1953 economic agreement with Spain stated in its preamble that—

Individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence in all countries, as well as defense against aggression, rest largely on the establishment of a sound economy.

The able, young government officials now directing Spain's economic renaissance are anxious for Spain to enter fully into the economic system of the European Common Market. The Common Market has taken major steps toward true economic integration. But the fulfillment of its great promise will require the addition of other nations of Europe.

I am convinced that Spain's eventual adherence to the Common Market will serve European unity and economic and political stability. Spain's economic integration into Europe will certainly speed the notable social, economic, and political evolution that has already taken place in Spain. The question of Spain's relationship to the EEC is again current and I will follow with great interest the outcome of the coming deliberations on this subject.

Then finally, let me return to the fact that U.S. base rights in Spain expire in 1968. Because of the changing defense picture in Europe, the renewal of those base rights is probably more essential today than at any time during their existence. The presence of U.S. forces in Spain is important both to Spain and to the United States. But it takes no particular stretch of the imagination to realize that the principal advantage is to the United States, as long as we must maintain our commitments for the defense of Europe. There is no more certain way to assure a renewal of our fine alliance with Spain than to work more realistically toward the admission of Spain to NATO and to the European Common Market.

Remarkably enough, Europe in this case would be the principal beneficiary and it is strange indeed that there is reluctance in any quarter on the Continent to make Spain a full-fledged partner.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for the final vote—roll No. 232—on the Highway Safety Act of 1966, H.R. 13290. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this measure.

At the time of the vote, I was enroute to hearings of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, on which I serve as ranking minority member. The subcommittee held hearings in upstate New York to investigate water pollution problems there.

CLEAR STRONG CALL FOR LEADERSHIP IN NATION'S ECONOMIC LIFE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Henry C. Wallich, distinguished member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has pointed up the critical importance of government leadership in the Nation's economic life. Writing in the August 22 issue of Newsweek magazine, Mr. Wallich says:

Now the logic of the guideposts has wilted in an overheated atmosphere. The Administration could have prevented this last winter by cooling off the economy with a tax increase instead of letting it go into a super-boom. Thus, the root cause of the inadequate behavior of labor and business is an inadequate government performance. Every country ultimately gets the inflation it deserves.

The administration and the Congress should lose no time in designing a workable way of dealing with the new problems of the economy of the sixties. We can no longer rely on the shibboleths of the thirties. The effective use of guideposts by our National Government, together with flexible fiscal weapons—these are the crying needs of the day.

I include Mr. Wallich's full text at this point, and urge my colleagues to read and heed:

DESERT GUIDEPOSTS

(By Henry C. Wallich)

The guideposts on wages and prices recently have been the subject of unlamenting obituaries. They died, it is said, from a lack of support by the Administration in the airline machinists' strike. The steel price increase put the last nail into their coffin.

These death notices are exaggerated. Road signs can be disregarded, but that does not make them disappear. The guideposts point the road to stable prices. If now we take the turnoff marked "Inflation," that being the line of least resistance as well as ultimately most trouble, how does that alter the guideposts? One cannot repeal economic arithmetic.

The guideposts say, broadly, that the price level will be stable if union gains do not exceed *average* productivity increases and if businessmen keep their profit margins constant. To the airline machinists, therefore, the guideposts say that their wage increases should not be determined by the 6 per cent or so productivity gain in the industry, but should be limited to 3.2 per cent. To the airline operators the guideposts say that their above-average productivity gains should be passed on to the public through lower fares. Because the operators have not done this, their profits have skyrocketed. Because the machinists see these profits, they can hold out for their pound of flesh with every hope of success.

In some industries productivity gains are small or zero. Since they cannot deny their workers wage increases when others are getting them, they must raise their prices. The guideposts find nothing wrong with this.

But to keep the price level stable when some prices go up, other prices must come down. This essential part of the mechanism business has largely failed to implement.

PROFITS TOO HIGH

The evidence is on the financial pages every day. Profits have been rising rapidly, faster than the GNP. Their relation to the GNP is now higher than at any time since the middle '50s. Prices keep going up. Meanwhile, high profits have pushed investment in plant and equipment to unsustainable heights and are now provoking excessive wage demands.

Thus, though it is labor that is most ostentatiously turning its back upon the guideposts, it is business that has done a large part of the damage. And within business, the damage has been done by the high-profit industries that would not cut prices. It has not been done by the hapless steel industry whose profits have been squeezed and whose securities go begging.

BUSINESS NOT CONSISTENT

Businessmen plead that in today's superboom, prices are forced up by strong demand. This gratifying attachment to the laws of the market would carry conviction if it were preserved also when demand is weak. But in recessions, large firms use their market power to keep prices up. They then argue that they must do so to cover their costs. Business cannot consistently have it both ways: to use market power in recessions and act like barefooted little competitors in booms. If price maintenance is justifiable in recessions, in violation of the laws of supply and demand, then price restraint is called for in booms. In this view, the guideposts are consistent even when demand is strong.

Now the guideposts will be doctored somein an overheated atmosphere. The Administration could have prevented this last winter by cooling off the economy with a tax increase instead of letting it go into a superboom. Thus, the root cause of the inadequate behavior of labor and business is an inadequate government performance. Every country ultimately gets the inflation it deserves.

Now the guideposts will be doctored somehow, to give them greater "flexibility." If that means anything, it means to build inflation into the system. It will make business and labor believe that their behavior is not inflationary when in fact it is. It will confuse people about the elementary fact that wages must be based on natonwide productivity gains and not those of particular industries. We shall end by trying to make ourselves believe we don't have much inflation so long as we can find another country that has more. Far better to leave the guideposts as they are, an honest standard, and by their help try to find our way back to stability knowing that for a time we shall be wandering in the desert of inflation.

THE PAPERS AND LABOR

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who mourn the passing of the New York Herald Tribune. This was a distinguished and historic newspaper, for which I had the honor long ago to be a kind of roving correspondent, and it is a tragedy that it should be leaving the New York scene.

In a remarkable article in Sunday's New York Times, Mr. A. H. Raskin describes the complex series of events in the current strike which led to this result. The article is worth reading because of the light it casts on the truly staggering difficulties that militate against a prompt settlement in disputes such as this.

Mr. Raskin observes that:

Since the termination notice, the unions have been informing their members that the publishers never had any genuine thought of bringing out the Tribune and were merely seeking an opportunity to blame its death on the strike.

He goes on to say, however, that the evidence "points strongly in the opposite direction."

In some of our most renowned unions, the leadership has over the years given great consideration to the economic difficulties facing hard-pressed employers. In New York City today, many good newspapermen face the loss of their jobs because their leaders—perhaps because of internal political difficulties—chose to ignore the dangers. It all goes to show that, in labor relations, as in many other fields of activity, it pays to recognize realities.

Mr. Raskin's article follows:

THE PAPERS AND LABOR—CLOSING OF TRIBUNE FAILS TO CLEAR WAY TOWARD A SOLUTION OF UNION PROBLEMS—VARIED PROBLEMS REMAIN IN MERGER—EXTENDED NEGOTIATIONS BRING FEARS OF RECURRENCE OF A CITYWIDE CRISIS IN 1967

(By A. H. Rashkin)

"Neither side has yet learned a thing. Both the unions and the publishers can tell you everything the other guy is doing wrong, but there is still no sign they'll ever get together—even to the point of knowing what it is they're fighting about."

That was the somber comment of one of New York's most sophisticated labor leaders after the death last Monday of The New York Herald Tribune, the latest casualty in four years of running warfare between the city's newspaper publishers and the 10 unions with which they deal.

The decision never to reopen The Herald Tribune, announced on the 113th day of a strike against the merged corporation of which it had become a part, has failed to bring any hint of a swift breakthrough toward publication of the afternoon and Sunday papers the new company still hopes to issue.

Nine unions have indicated that they expect little trouble in retailoring the tentative pacts they had made before The Herald Tribune's demise. But Printing Pressmen's Union No. 2, the lone holdout, is still exercising what the head of a brother union calls a "Gromyko veto" over the desire of all the others to end the tie-up quickly.

The pressmen got to the lip of an agreement two weeks ago on a bonus of $10 to $11 each week as a buy-out of the union's key demand—a cut in the standard Saturday-night work shift from eight hours to six and a half. But the negotiations blew up in a dispute over whether the payment should apply for the duration of the immediate contract or forever.

Now the union has reverted to its original insistence on shorter Saturday-night schedules, and the situation is back in the deep freeze. No matter how the conflict is finally resolved, it seems likely to entail concessions so far beyond those embodied in the other prospective agreements that its announcement will bring clamor for more money from all the unions now theoretically ready to sign.

The danger of such a chain reaction raises the possibility that the new Sunday World Journal Tribune may be added to the death list without ever getting its first edition on the newsstands. "There is that risk," a company executive warns.

The rancorous course of the negotiations and the uncertainty about when they will end have added heavily to fears of a new labor-management crisis when union contracts covering all major metropolitan dailies expire next March 30, less than eight months away. Some mediators in close touch with the situation are worried that the talks with the new corporation may stretch out so long that they will telescope into the citywide negotiations. Others are apprehensive lest the entire new venture "go down the drain."

TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS

In his weeks of frustration as Mayor Lindsay's special representative in the strike, David L. Cole's thoughts have often turned to writing a book about his trials and triumphs in a quarter century of industrial peacemaking.

Only one chapter has taken clear shape in his mind. It will be entitled "Strikes I Have Hated," and it assigns first place to his marathon engagement with the merged corporation and the newspaper unions.

The sense of helplessness that enveloped Mr. Cole as the 10 sets of negotiations limped along in what he came to consider "a race to be last" has been shared by virtually all of the country's top mediators, including Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, since this city's newspapers and the unions began their series of power struggles with the 114-day printers' strike of 1962–63—a strike now eclipsed in length by the shutdown of the new company.

So widespread is the defeatist feeling that when the Mayor explored, early in the World Journal Tribune tie-up, the possibility of bringing in Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds to seek a settlement, the word that came back from Mr. Reynolds was: "I'm not coming in unless LBJ orders me to."

The record of the latest conflict combines most of the familiar elements of miscalculation, fumbled peace opportunities and internal divisions on both sides that have become standard in New York newspaper labor relations. What differentiated this one, however, was that it represented the first time in the country that a war of economic attrition had grown out of publisher attempts to build a solvent enterprise through the consolidation of papers that were drowning in red ink.

NO SENSE OF URGENCY

In other major cities in which fading circulation and advertising have prompted mergers, arrangements for integrating staffs and protecting displaced employes have been agreed upon without strikes. Here the danger that a prolonged shutdown might raise the death toll in newspapers and jobs failed to kindle any evident sense of urgency on either side.

The underlying factors are important both as explanations of why the tie-up has already lasted nearly four months and as portents of the difficulties that may cause a new test on a citywide basis next March 30. The new publishing concern will have to go through another set of negotiations then, along with the other members of the Publishers Association of New York City—The New York Times, The Daily News, The Long Island Daily Press and The Long Island Star-Journal.

The aim of the consolidated company when it started bargaining with the unions

after the merger announcement March 21, was to issue one morning, one afternoon and one Sunday paper with 2,235 fewer workers in all union categories than the 4,728 then engaged in putting out three daily and two Sunday papers.

The merging units—the morning and Sunday Herald Tribune, owned by John Hay Whitney through the Whitney Communications Corporation; Hearst's afternoon and Sunday Journal-American and Scripps-Howard's afternoon World-Telegram and The Sun—had been operated at a combined loss of about $10-million a year. Economies were proposed to cut the direct wage bill by upward of $15-million a year; reductions in obligations for pensions, vacations and other fringe benefits would bring the over-all annual saving to roughly $20-million.

The new partners realized at the outset that they faced three major union hurdles.

The first was the resistance of the New York Newspaper Guild, a semi-industrial union made up of editorial, business office and maintenance employes, to any major departure from seniority in deciding which of its members were to be kept. In the mechanical departments the merged company raised no question about adhering to the seniority principle. But it feared that many of the most talented young reporters, copy editors, photographers and advertising salesmen would have to be sacrificed in favor of deadwood if it could not negotiate substantial exceptions with the guild.

So apprehensive was the guild about the probable extent of these breaches of seniority that it had refused for a year to sign contracts with any of the three papers. In that way it kept its freedom to strike if they did fuse on terms the guild considered harmful.

The second big union hurdle was the dissatisfaction of the mechanical crafts over the disparity between the severance payments to which their uprooted members were entitled under their old contracts and those that would go to guild members. The pacts covering printers, pressmen, drivers and other craft groups uniformly provided three weeks of separation pay; the guild standard was two weeks' pay for each year of service.

The third problem stemmed from the new company's eagerness to institute a "one-hook" operation in its consolidated composing room as a means of avoiding costly reproduction of type for news and ads. What the merged group wanted, in effect, was authority to conduct all its typesetting and other printing activities as if it were putting out just one paper. The typepsetting would thus figuratively take the material to be set from one "hook," rather than several.

On that basis, the morning paper would be free to use sports box scores, stock tables or other matter that had been set for use in the afternoon paper. The same interchangeability would apply to the Sunday paper.

TURN FIRST TO POWERS

Comparable flexibility was desired in all other mechanical departments in the interest of economy and efficiency. The importance of these arrangements, of course, rested on having a morning as well as an afternoon paper. Without The Herald Tribune their value became virtually nil.

The owners decided that the best approach to settling all their problems in the month before April 25, the date they picked to bring out the new papers, was to seek their first agreement with Betram A. Powers, president of New York Typographical Union 6. This decision did not spring from any belief that the Powers union had the most valid case; on the contrary, the publishers were convinced that the printers had no legitimate claim—under their old contracts or the rules of their parent union—to any extra benefits for either severance or reproduction of advertising.

However, the plain lesson of all the recent conflicts in New York has been that Mr. Powers is the dominant force among the 10 newspaper unions and that any effort to bypass him winds up in expensive complications for the employers.

In the 114-day strike he broke the follow-the-leader pattern through which all the mechanical unions had been obliged to accept pay packages fixed in earlier negotiations with the guild. In March of last year the Publishers Association papers gave him a veto over the introduction of computers or other automated equipment. Then, angry over their own miscue, the publishers shifted direction and initiated tentative money settlements with the guild and four other unions providing $10.50-a-week increases over a two-year period.

The sole effect of their diversionary tactic was to jack up Mr. Power's settlement price. The papers finally gave the printers $12 a week. In the process they raised the ante for all the other unions.

ONE CHILLING ISSUE

The World Journal Tribune talks got off to a brisk start. All but one of the 22 issues on the negotiating table, including the full range of questions connected with a "one-hook" operation, were agreed upon nearly two weeks before the strike deadline. The only unsettled matter was that of additional severance pay, and on that management froze under circumstances that had a chilling effect on the whole dispute.

The chief employer negotiator is Matt Meyer of The World-Telegram and The Sun, president of the merged corporation, whose skills in substituting moderation and rationality for emotional embattlement have caused him to rise steadily in publisher and union regard during the four years of city-wide labor turmoil. Mr. Meyer enlisted the help of John J. Gaherin, president of the Publishers Association, as a kind of all-purpose expert even though the association was not officially involved.

At a private breakfast conference soon after the negotiations began, Mr. Powers told Mr. Gaherin that he felt it might speed things along to bring in a mutually acceptable mediator. Mr. Gaherin agreed. "How do you feel about Kheel?" the union chief asked. Theodore W. Kheel, who was former Mayor Robert F. Wagner's principal labor troubleshooter, had played a pivotal role in settling the earlier newspaper conflicts. Mr. Gaherin said Mr. Kheel seemed the logical selection, but he would have to check with the new corporation.

The three owners agreed, though not without some private grumbling that Mr. Kheel was "too friendly to the unions." Mr. Gaherin then talked with the mediator in behalf of both sides. Mr. Kheel did not leap at the opportunity. He emphasized that the importance of newspapers to the community made it desirable that any mediator be named by Mayor Lindsay. Finally, however, he accepted with the understanding that his activity would be off the record.

At that time, the company had agreed to payments totaling $550,000 as a lump-sum settlement with the printers. The bulk of the money was intended as a buy-out of the union's claims for reproduction pay in the composing room, thus assuring the publishers the operating freedom they needed.

Most of the rest was intended to compensate the union's pension and welfare fund for employer payments that would be lost through the elimination of 400 printers from the total of 900 on the old papers.

It had been assumed on both sides that something more would be added to take care of the union's demand for more than three weeks of severance. However, when Mr. Meyer sought guidelines from the three proprietors, he got a rude jolt.

From an owners' conference came word that $550,000 represented pretty much all the cash they believed ought to go into a final agreement. The view inside the corporation was that, under the "me-too" principle that governed interunion relations in the newspapers, anything that Mr. Powers got would have to be multiplied by five before contracts could be concluded to cover all other unionized groups.

The owners believed also that Mr. Powers had "outfoxed" Mr. Meyer by creating the impression that setting a high figure on the buy-out of reproduction rights would take most of the heat out of his drive for extra severance. The suspicions created on the corporate side were matched on the union side when it became evident that Mr. Meyer's hands had been tied.

Mr. Kheel started a two-pronged peace offensive to break this deadlock. One prong was directed at bringing down the union's asking price, the other at convincing the employers they could draw a line between benefits for the printers alone as a quid pro quo for the "one-hook" deal and those, like severance and pension supplements, that would obviously have to go to all other unions, too.

ON THE RECORD—AND OFF

For the record, Mr. Powers would not agree to less than 11½ weeks of extra separation pay. Each week represented a potential cost to the new company of $64,000. When added to the original $550,000, this brought Mr. Powers' formal price to slightly under $1.3-million. However, through the arcane sign language of collective bargaining, he made it known to Mr. Kheel that he would go along with a settlement based on six weeks of extra severance and a total cost of $1-million.

Under the complex arithmetic the two men evolved, $600,000 would apply to all unions and $400,000 to the printers alone. Through this dickering, Mr. Meyer was kept under wraps by his principals. However, he indicated that if Mr. Powers would chop the printers' aggregate demand to $750,000 he would battle for management acceptance.

Mr. Kheel hammered away at the argument that the company would get a "cheaper" settlement on an overall basis if it took the double-column approach and gave Mr. Powers the $1 million he had privately signified willingness to accept. The Kheel reasoning was that application of the five-time multiplier would transform the $750,000 into $3.5 million in above-contract payments by the time the last union signed.

If the Kheel-Powers theory of separability of benefits held good, the price of a final accord for all unions would be $3 million in general payments, plus $400,000 for the printers alone. This would cut $100,000 from the sum Mr. Meyer had indicated he was prepared to pay.

Mr. Meyer and Mr. Gaherin were far from sure of the theory's validity. Their experience had left them with little doubt that each union would find a basis for conjuring up specialized demands to get every penny the printers got. Nevertheless, they were pleased that Mr. Powers was giving them the flexibility of composing-room practice they deemed vital to economical operation.

Again, however, the employer negotiators found themselves blocked by the directors when they sought authority for bargaining based on the Kheel proposal. The chief foe inside the corporation was Walter N. Thayer, president of The Herald Tribune. He had long been an articulate exponent of the view that all the city's publishers were letting

themselves be pushed around by Mr. Powers and that it was time to demonstrate that they knew how to fight.

The intensity of the feelings that he and Mr. Whitney held on this score had been an underlying factor in The Herald Tribune's decision to quit the Publishers Association in the middle of a 24-day guild strike against The Times last fall. In the World Journal Tribune situation Mr. Thayer suspected that Mr. Kheel and Mr. Powers were in league to tempt the company into concessions that would finally get the settlement up close to the $1.3 million figure that still remained Mr. Powers' official asking price. The Thayer view prevailed.

The corporation executives, in a secret meeting with Mayor Lindsay, urged his intervention to head off a strike. They expressed willingness to submit the entire dispute to fact-finding, but they emphasized that they did not want Mr. Kheel as fact-finder. They explained that they had accepted him as mediator only because he enjoyed Mr. Powers' favor, and they feared that any recommendations he put forward as fact-finder would be "too expensive." Mr. Thayer, who had been the Mayor's finance chairman in the 1965 municipal campaign, acted as principal spokesman, but no dissent was voiced.

MAYOR ENTERS SITUATION

On April 22, just 48 hours before the scheduled posting of guild pickets, Mr. Lindsay stepped in publicly by calling management and union negotiators to City Hall. He did not invite Mr. Kheel to attend. The Mayor's only proposal was that the merger's effective date be postponed, but the three papers responded that their decision was "irrevocable."

The next day the Mayor was joined in his peace efforts by Governor Rockefeller and New York's two Senators, JACOB K. JAVITS and ROBERT F. KENNEDY. They issued a collective plea for avoiding a shutdown through acceptance by both sides of settlement recommendations from "some impartial person or persons familiar with the facts and issues in dispute."

That sounded like a prescription for Mr. Kheel, the only outsider who could be considered "familiar with the facts and issues in dispute." But soundings by Senator JAVITS disclosed that while the company officials still favored fact-finding, they would consider it "extremely unfriendly" to have Mr. Kheel in that role.

Mr. Kheel, unaware of the publisher veto of him, told the Senator that it would "stop everything" to appoint a fact-finding panel without intimate knowledge of the controversy. Mr. Powers made it plain that he would not object to proposals by Mr. Kheel, but that he had no intention of entrusting the power of recommendation to a stranger. The nine other unions were cool to fact-finding on any basis.

SUSPENSION EXPECTED

At 4 p. m. on April 24 the guild, the only union clearly without contractual commitment to stay at work, established its picket lines. Instead of adding urgency to the search for a settlement, this development had the paradoxical effect of easing the pressure on most of the unions to reach a settlement. The explanation lay in a publisher action that came as a surprise to both Mr. Kheel and the unions.

They had taken for granted that the other papers in the Publishers Association would shut down in sympathy with the World Journal Tribune. Such shutdowns had become an almost automatic tactic of collective defense by the newspapers against the "blood brotherhood" that the 10 unions had formed in a guild strike at The World-Telegram and The Sun in 1950.

A week before the strike deadline, the new corporation had been admitted to the association. The statement announcing its admission encouraged the belief that the other papers would rally 'round if the new papers were kept from publishing, although it was emphasized that no definite decision would be made until after an "11th-hour look" at the circumstances surrounding any stoppage.

Suspension by all the association papers would leave the afternoon New York Post, which quit the association during the 114-day strike, as the only newspaper of general circulation in the city and would vastly increase the unions' burden of unemployment and strike benefits. Mr. Kheel used the "imminence" of a general tie-up to stimulate union interest in a swift agreement.

What neither the mediator nor any of the unions knew was that the other papers had already informed the new corporation that there was virtually no chance of a sympathy shutdown. Their lawyers had advised that the legality of a general lockout in these distinctive circumstances was far less clear-cut than when citywide contract patterns were at issue.

When the publishers did meet for their "11th-hour look," Mr. Meyer did not even ask for a suspension.

NO PERCEPTIBLE WORRY

Whatever imperativeness most of the unions had felt about a prompt settlement oozed away as soon as it became clear that the other papers would keep publishing. Tension eased still further when it developed that, except for editorial employes in the guild, most of the strikers could work three, four or even five days a week in other jobs.

There was no perceptible worry on the union side that an extended shutdown might kill the new papers before they ever got out their first issue. Yet it was an open secret that, in the corporate discussions preceding the merger, the Hearst and Scripps-Howard representatives had argued vainly for discontinuance of The Herald Tribune and concentration of all the new company's resources on dominating the afternoon field.

Mr. Whitney won what amounted to a two-year veto over any decision by his partners to suspend the morning paper.

They gave in chiefly because they feared that The Tribune, if left outside the combine, might eventually switch to the afternoon field in competition with them. A kidney-stone attack that hospitalized Mr. Whitney two weeks before the strike appears to have stripped him of much of his interest in continuing the morning paper, even though the management decision he had fostered was by then irreversible except by unanimous vote of all three owners.

Friends who talked with him after his recovery said he had expressed a desire to cut down on the range of his activities. A signed front-page statement two days before The Herald Tribune's last appearance as a separately owned entity had the tone of a requiem. "We are trying to make a new start and we find that we can't," Mr. Whitney declared. "The unions won't let us."

Against this backdrop of apathy, gloom, intrigue and inner corporate struggle, post-strike progress was maddeningly slow. Mr. Kheel bowed out soon after the strike, and the Mayor named Mr. Cole, former director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as his personal representative in seeking a settlement with all 10 unions.

KHEEL ENDORSES COLE

At a private meeting the union heads told the mediator they considered the Mayor a "stooge" of Mr. Whitney and Mr. Thayer. They voiced a suspicion that Mr. Cole had been brought in to make recommendations favorable to the publishers. He assured them that his sole mission was to get the strike over as quickly as possible through direct agreement.

Mr. Powers still unconvinced, telephoned Mr. Kheel to inquire about Mr. Cole: "Can I level with him?" he asked. "Absolutely," said Mr. Kheel.

Mr. Cole's next problem was to persuade the owners to take the bargaining handcuffs off Mr. Meyer. That required another private meeting, this time with the company's top officials.

The final agreement with the printers, reached on the 23d day of the shutdown, was essentially the same one that Mr. Kheel had proposed, except that it provided five extra weeks of severance pay instead of six. The total cost of the package was $913,000, against the Kheel figure of $1-million.

When the terms were revealed, Mr. Kheel observed:

"With one night of hard bargaining at City Hall before the strike, we coud have come out with pretty much the same figure—and put tremendous heat on everybody else to settle in a hurry."

Mr. Powers agrees that the difference between what he got and what he would have taken before the shutdown was "negligible." He adds that he would have been perfectly content with another mediator if the company had signified its coldness to Mr. Kheel right away.

Inside the corporation there is still division on whether the big chance for a strike-free settlement was tossed away in that early stage. The negotiators tend to believe it may have been, although the subsequent complications with other unions make them wonder whether anything would really have made much difference. Those who blocked exploration of the Kheel plan are still sure the price of peace would have been far higher and the limits on management freedom greater.

The only thing on which there is total agreement is that, by the time the pact was concluded, all the momentum had run out of the general negotiations.

"The whole situation," one World Journal Tribune official said just after the printers' accord, "was a case of Powers with a gun at your head and ready to use it. We handled this by recognizing that you had to make your first deal with Powers. When you agree with him you know you are going to have nine other union presidents sore because you didn't make the first deal with them. They want what Powers got, plus whatever else they can contrive to make an issue."

Four small unions quickly fell into line on the Powers formula, but from then on each contract was an adventure. The delegation from the photoengravers' union stalked out of one session because its leader objected to a grimace on Mr. Cole's face. It took a week to get things back on the track.

The negotiations with the Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union introduced "the 26 phantoms that rode the Arizona Territory." The description was Mr. Gaherin's, adapted from a television Western his children used to watch. He applied it to a union demand for a special fund based on severance pay for 26 workers whose jobs on The Journal-American had been eroded through the shrinkage of circulation in the last 10 years.

The men were no longer on the paper, but the union insisted that it was entitled to payment for the positions they should have held. The fund was established, with its uses to be determined by the union.

SENIORITY A BIG FACTOR

In the guild dispute over layoffs that breached seniority—the most serious issue in any of the negotiations—Thomas J. Murphy,

the union's executive vice president, proposed a month before the strike that management reduce the problem by offering severance pay to any guild member who wanted to leave voluntarily.

Mr. Meyer and Mr. Gaherin accepted the desirability of such an offer as a means of establishing how many departures from seniority would be worth fighting for, but they could not get upper-echelon concurrence until after the strike had been on for a month.

Again the objections came from the Herald Tribune, which had a group of nearly 200 people on what Mr. Murphy called the "dingleberry" list—reporters and others it wanted to keep without regard for seniority.

In the end, 40 per cent of the 400 who did take voluntary severance were from the Tribune. The "dingleberry" list was finally whittled down to only a half dozen editorial workers.

The most excruciating struggle arose with the pressmen after everyone else had settled. Technically, there no longer was any strike in progress. The guild had withdrawn its pickets and management was theoretically free to call everyone back to work. However, the new company feared wildcats, press breakdowns and other harassments if it attempted to operate without a pressmen's contract.

These fears were heightened by a bitter political cleavage inside the pressmen's local and by a vendetta between its officers and the Powers-led printers. The pressmen's annual election, held during the negotiations, had resulted in the ouster of the local president by William J. Kennedy, who had built his campaign on complaints that the printers had done much better than the pressmen in previous negotiations.

In the hope of tamping down the local feud, Mayor Lindsay invoked the direct aid of the union's international president, Anthony J. DeAndrade. He told the local that its key demand—the cut in the Saturday-night work shift to six and a half hours—properly belonged in the Publishers Association negotiations next March because the change would put the new Sunday paper at a disadvantage with The Times and The News. Both operate on a standard 8-hour shift on Saturday nights.

Mr. DeAndrade promised the New York unit unstinting support from the parent union if it pressed the shorter-hours issue in the citywide talks, instead of making the new company an immediate target. The local's response was to tell him it did not need his advice.

Before bowing out, the international president told Mr. Cole the local could "hold out forever" because the other New York newspapers were subsidizing the strikers by providing them all with work. Overtime is normally so general in the tightly controlled ranks of the pressmen that the union was able to maintain a full 5-day schedule for the 300 "idle" strikers.

The situation was made doubly ironic because the issues of working hours and starting times involved in the pressmen's dispute were the only ones in the entire conflict with citywide implications.

The other publishers urged the World Journal Tribune not to cave in on these issues, but they ignored suggestions by Mr. Gaherin that a shutdown of all association papers was the only way to end the "privileged sanctuary" they were providing for the holdout union. Worries about legal complications inhibited any move toward a sympathy blackout by The Times or The News.

The management negotiators found themselves in a two-way trap. Any capitulation would saddle them with permanent increases in pressroom costs and thus nullify many of the advantages of merger; it would also expose them to fresh demands from the nine unions with which they had settled on a less expensive basis.

Despite this squeeze—and with knowledge that it might upset every other agreement—the new company decided two weeks ago to make a supreme effort to get the pressmen in line. It authorized Mr. Cole to tell the local that the corporation was ready to "buy the pressmen out" by offering an extra payment of $10 or $11 each week in lieu of the shorter Saturday-night shift. The sole condition was that the arrangement last only until the new citywide negotiations next March. When the union said it wanted the payment to be permanent and followed up by rejecting a Lindsay fact-finding proposal, the talks broke off and the owners voted to kill the morning paper. Eight hundred more jobs died with it, bringing the total job loss for all the unions to roughly 3,000.

Leaders of the pressmen's local explain the adamancy of their stand in favor of more overtime work on the Sunday paper by noting that on the old Journal-American the practice was to "doublehead" pressmen on shifts that ran from 6 A.M. Saturday to 2 or 3 A.M. Sunday. Their total earnings in straight time, time-and-a-half and double-time came to as much as $130 for the long day. This is about two-and-a-half times as much as they would get for a straight Saturday-night shift of eight hours.

Now the long trail has begun all over again with every union. The extra payments that were agreed to for "one hook" operation in the composing room have become valueless. So have most of the costly special arrangements for consolidated operations in other blue-collar and white-collar departments. Mr. Powers already has informed the new company that he has no intention of arguing for retention of the $333,000 his union was to get for reproduction rights that are of no present use.

"We now will have more unemployed and less money to help them with," the printers' chief declares. "But I consider that this must be looked at as a salvage operation, not a negotiation."

THE GUILD'S APPROACH

A somewhat similar attitude seems to characterize the current approach of the guild and most other unions. However, there is little willingness to entertain the idea that any substantial sweetening of the pot for the pressmen would not have to be matched by comparably high additional payments to the rest of the unions. "If the W-J-T capitulates, it will have to do it across-the-board for everybody," one key unionist said.

Some union chiefs are urging a strategy based on the negotiation of quick agreements with nine unions, in the belief that the pressmen will not be able to stand for a second time as the sole obstacle to a return to work. "It will be like the airlines mechanics," one leader said. "They could turn down one contract offer, but not two."

However, few really believe that the pressmen would be swayed by outside pressure or that effective operation of the new papers would be possible without a signed agreement. "The pressmen are hung by their own election slogans," is one unionist's despairing conclusion. "Their officers are incapable of turning back for fear they will all be thrown out next year."

A poignant aspect of the tangle is that all the union problems would have been infinitely less difficult if the negotiations had centered from the start on plans for what will now be essentially an afternoon paper with a Sunday edition, rather than an around-the-clock enterprise under one roof. Since the termination notice, the unions have been informing their members that the publishers never had any genuine thought of bringing out The Tribune and were merely seeking an opportunity to blame its death on the strike.

The evidence, however, points strongly in the opposite direction. Hearst and Scripps-Howard officials, who had argued originally for The Tribune's discontinuance as a morning paper, switched sides. Insiders report that they grew increasingly enthusiastic about the potentialities of all three units in the new company, despite the cooling of Mr. Whitney's own personal interest after his hospitalization.

Mr. Meyer told Mayor Lindsay when the subject of scrapping The Tribune came up in one of their conversations early in the strike: "We're all in this together. It's one show. It can't be dismembered. If one quits, we all quit." The Tribune became an integral element in the corporation's hopes for building its prosperity on offers of tempting combination rates for advertising and subscriptions.

Several hundred thousand dollars, according to executives, was spent on advance promotion for The Tribune, on redoing the sixth floor of the old World-Telegram building for use by the morning paper's staff and on establishing a consolidated advertising department in The Tribune's old plant. This will now be moved downtown to The Telegram building.

Salaries for editors and writers the corporation did not want to lose came to $60,000 a week, or roughly $1-million up to the time The Tribune was buried. The joint venture reportedly started its affairs with $8-million in new capital put in by the three partners. How much of this has been eaten up by the strike and by all the preparations for the now vanished morning paper is a corporate secret.

"There has never been a more serious attempt in history to put out a paper than we made with The Tribune" is Mr. Meyer's epitaph. The new afternoon and Sunday papers, whenever they get past the union blockade, will begin their life with staffs denuded of many of their ablest people and with a sharply depleted market for circulation and ads. While the new papers were waiting to be born, an average of 140,000 readers a day got used to going without a morning paper. The afternoon circulation void was 600,000 and on Sunday 900,000.

On the citywide newspaper front, the outlook for peace when the current contracts expire next March is bleak. The extent to which the unions were able to capitalize on job opportunities at The Times and The News in forcing their will on the new papers has injected fresh bitterness into relations among the publishers.

"We have shown the unions once again that we won't back one another up in a crisis," says one of the association's moderates. "That means every union will play 'king of the hill' next time, and we will pay through the nose for every contract."

However, the employers do intend to try soon to reknit their battered front in the hope of providing some insurance against union whip-sawing. The creation of the new corporation has brought into being a third force to match the strength inside the association of The Times and The News, the city's two most prosperous papers. But its effectiveness as a counterweight has been diminished by its prenatal contraction and by the split personality it derives from its troika ownership.

UNIONS SEEK SOLID FRONT

One reform the new unit intends to urge is reorganization of the association through

elimination of the veto power under which a single publisher can now block any association action. Such a shift away from "rule by veto" might induce the printers and other unions to continue bargaining with the association, instead of insisting on dealing with them individually. A recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals, now awaiting possible review by the Supreme Court, gives the unions the option of deciding which way they prefer to bargain.

On the union side, there is a growing recognition that unity is needed to replace the every-man-for-himself spirit that has helped drag out the World Journal Tribune tie-up.

"The odds are now 10-to-1 against a peaceful settlement every time we get into negotiations," Mr. Powers acknowledges.

He and Mr. Murphy, once bitter enemies, are working together to seek revival of the coordinating body the 10 unions set up briefly as an outgrowth of the 1962–63 strike. However, there is no present prospect that the pressmen will come into such an alliance, and their abstention could wreck the whole project.

One specific problem already threatens trouble at the bargaining table and in the attempts to achieve interunion unity. That is Mr. Powers' insistence on abandonment of the present system of identical across-the-board pay increases for everybody in favor of percentage raises. The change would mean larger dollar-and-cents increases for the skilled crafts, such as printers and photoengravers; the drivers and other low-rated groups have hinted at strikes to stop the percentage approach.

Despite this and other potential irritants in the citywide negotiations, one ranking union leader declared: "I doubt after this one that any union will be anxious to strike next spring. It wouldn't surprise me to see negotiations go on for seven or eight months after March 30."

Others are equally resolved to find "a better way." But there is no receptivity to advance acceptance of fact-finding or arbitration as a means of breaking deadlocks. And the invariable end of every appraisal is an expression of pessimism about enlisting the pressmen's cooperation in any centralized bargaining committee.

The whole challenge of freedom to automate remains unmet. Radical new developments in printing technology cannot be used in New York composing rooms without a specific union O.K., and no formula for approval has yet been evolved.

Mr. Cole, who retains the respect of both sides for his perseverance and ingenuity in the current dispute, awaits a call back to the conference room whenever signs of movement develop. But he has already let Mayor Lindsay know that this is his last—as well as his first—assignment in the New York newspaper field. He will not be on tap next time, no matter how agonized the negotiations get.

That leaves press management and labor in the nation's communications capital with a more solemn obligation than before to manifest some independent capacity for cooperation in mutual survival.

OVERTIME PAY FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide that substitute postal employees shall receive overtime pay of one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of 8 in any one day.

Justice to substitute mail carriers and clerks requires that they be paid at the same rate as regular postal employees and, indeed, on the same basis as workers in private industry.

Regular, hourly postal workers are paid overtime at the rate of time and a half not only for work in excess of 40 hours per week but also for work in excess of 8 hours in any day (39 U.S.C. 3573(1)). This provision for regular postal workers proceeded from the judgment of Congress that we owe a higher rate of pay to a man in this kind of work who gives to his duties more than the standard number of hours out of his day.

And Congress has expressed this judgment not only with respect to postal workers but also in regard to employees in private industry. The Walsh-Healey Act limits the regular working day of those employed by Federal contractors to 8 hours (41 U.S.C. 35(C)), and the payment of time and a half for overtime—meaning any hours in excess of 8 in 1 day—has become general in private industry.

Last September, the House passed the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965. It did so by a vote of 370 to 7. I think it fair to say that the act represented the nearly unanimous view of the House. And the act provided not only for increased pay rates for classified and postal employees, but also for overtime pay for substitute postal workers. The latter provision gave substitute postal workers the right to overtime pay for hours worked "(A) in excess of 8 hours a day or (B) in excess of 40 hours a week."

The Senate amended the House-passed bill by eliminating the provision for overtime pay to substitute postal workers for hours in excess of 8 in a day. Substitute postal workers can presently receive overtime pay only if they put in more than 40 hours in a week.

I think that elimination of this overtime provision contradicted the sense of justice of most Members of the House, expressed in the vote on passage of the Salary Act. And I believe that elimination of this overtime provision contradicted the judgment of Congress expressed in the statutory provision for overtime pay for regular postal workers and in the Walsh-Healey Act.

And I think that Members will be convinced of the necessity for restoring this overtime pay provision if they place themselves for a moment in the position of the substitute mail carrier or postal clerk. Will he not suffer a disturbing sense of being unfairly treated when he puts in more than 8 hours in a day side-by-side with regular postal workers doing the same kind of work, and when he realizes that they are being paid time and a half for their overtime hours while he is being paid only at his regular rate? And this sense of injustice is likely to be intensified by the knowledge that his friends working for private businesses and corporations also get time and a half for work beyond 8 hours in a day.

For the good of the postal service, and in fairness to individual workers, I urge Members to support this bill for overtime pay.

CHILD NUTRITION LEGISLATION

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I offer a comparative description of the three versions of school lunch program legislation now pending. I note from the program that H.R. 13361 is scheduled for action later this week. H.R. 13361 is similar to S. 3467, passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor after amendment.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATION NOW PENDING TO IMPROVE CHILD NUTRITION

There are now three versions pending before the Congress of the administration's proposals contained in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

S. 3467 was passed unanimously by the Senate.

H.R. 13361, the original administration bill amended was reported out favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3467, referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, was amended by that committee prior to being reported.

All three bills have certain important features in common:

First. The administration proposal for food service for children in group situations other than schools has been eliminated.

Second. Authority is provided for a 4-year extension of the special milk program.

Third. Authority is provided for a 2-year pilot breakfast program in low-income area schools and in schools where the children enrolled travel long distances.

Fourth. Authority is provided for nonfood assistance to low-income area schools.

Fifth. Authority is provided for helping State educational agencies with funds for the administration of the new activities and the strengthening of administration of the special assistance features of the National School Lunch Act.

Sixth. Authority and responsibility for the conduct and supervision of all child

food service programs in schools is placed in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Although these six essential points are carried in each of the bills now pending, there are variations in language and approach. Following is a comparative analysis of these bills with the original proposals submitted by the administration:

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PENDING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE CHILD NUTRITION

CHILD NUTRITION ACT

The Administration's proposal for the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, introduced in the House by Representative COOLEY and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, is H.R. 13361.

This proposal contained the following features:

(1) The National School Lunch Act was incorporated in its present form except that under the special assistance phase for particularly needy schools, the Department would have had authority to pay up to 90 percent of the costs of operating a lunch program.

(2) A permanent milk program was authorized without any specifics included as to funding. The milk program proposal carried its own apportionment formula and priorities as to outlets to be reached first.

(3) A pilot school breakfast program was authorized for three years using the apportionment formula incorporated in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Reimbursement would be provided for all breakfasts served under this proposal—just as in the case of the National School Lunch Program. In addition, there was a provision for the use of Federal funds to cover up to 90 percent of the costs of operation in situations of severe need.

(4) A three-year pilot program was authorized for a food service in non-school activities such as child day-care centers, settlement houses and summer camps. The apportionment formula used was that contained in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and authority was provided for the use of Federal funds to pay up to 90 percent of program operating costs in instances of severe need.

This provision is not carried in any of the three bills now pending in Congress.

(5) Authority was included for a permanent program to provide equipment to schools in low-income areas. The apportionment formula was that of the National School Lunch Act.

(6) The Secretary was authorized to use up to 1½ percent of the total funds appropriated to strengthen State agency administration of child nutrition program.

(7) The term "school" was defined to include kindergarten and preschool programs operated through the school system.

II. S. 3467, THE ELLENDER BILL AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

This bill was introduced and passed as an amendment to the National School Lunch Act. It incorporated the following features:

(1) A four-year extension of the Special Milk Program with an authorization for expenditure of not more than $110 million in fiscal 1967; $115 million in fiscal 1968 and $120 million for each of the following two successive years. The program is to be operated just as it is now.

(2) A two-year pilot breakfast program with an authorization of $7.5 million for fiscal 1967 and $10 million for fiscal 1968. Funds are to be used to provide food for needy children participating.

(3) A permanent non-food assistance program on the same basis as I(5) above.

(4) Authority is provided for funds for State administration only for the new activities and the special assistance phase of the lunch program. There is no specific authorization nor is there an apportionment formula. Any funds appropriated are to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

(5) The Secretary is authorized to extend school feeding programs to pre-school activities operated as part of the school system.

III. H.R. 13361 AS REPORTED FAVORABLY BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(1) This bill is essentially the same as S. 3467 except that it established the new authorities independently and not as amendments to the National School Lunch Act.

(2) Provision is made for a four-year extension of the Special Milk Program on the same basis and with the same authorizations for appropriations as those carried in S. 3467.

(3) Provision is made for a two-year pilot breakfast program with an authorization of $7.5 million for fiscal 1967 and $10 million for fiscal 1968. The apportionment formula differs from that of H.R. 13361 as introduced by Mr. COOLEY and from S. 3467, as passed by the Senate. The formula in this version of H.R. 13361 would give every State a basis grant and apportion the remainder on the basis of the National School Lunch Act formula. The Secretary would be authorized to provide up to 80 percent instead of 90 percent of operating costs in situations of severe need.

(4) A permanent non-food assistance program is provided with an authorization of $12 million for fiscal year 1967; $15 million for fiscal 1968 and $18 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. It is stipulated that equipment provided for private schools shall be used principally for school food service and that if such facilities are no longer so used, that part of such facilities as were financed from Federal funds shall revert to the Federal government.

In addition, it was made clear that in the determination of a school's eligibility for such assistance, all sources of income are to be considered—not simply local tax resources.

(5) Authority to provide funds to State educational agencies is the same as that provided in S. 3467.

(6) The Secretary is authorized to extend the benefits of all school feeding programs conducted and supervised by USDA to include preschool activities operated as part of the school system.

IV. S. 3467 AS REPORTED FAVORABLY BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(1) Provision is made for a four-year extension of the Special Milk Program as in the Senate-passed version *except that* this provision is removed from its position as an amendment to the National School Lunch Program and is attached to the end of the Bill more or less as a rider.

(2) The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is made eligible for the National School Lunch Program, the breakfast program, and the non-food assistance program.

(3) Provision is made for a two-year pilot breakfast program with an authorization of $7.5 million for fiscal 1967 and $10 million for 1968, just as in the Senate version and in the House Agriculture Committee Bill.

However, in the apportionment of funds, this version cites the "low-income factor" determined under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act instead of specifying $2,000.

(4) The non-food assistance provision carries the same funding authorizations as H.R. 13361 as reported out by the House Agriculture Committee. However, in the Education and Labor Committee version, both public and private schools would be required to use food service equipment principally for school food service and if the equipment were no longer so used, it would revert to the United States.

(5) The provision for State administrative funds is the same as that carried in S. 3467 as passed by the Senate and H.R. 13361 as reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week, my distinguished colleague from Arizona discussed the House Republican Policy Committee's views regarding the Rural Community Development Act. The policy statement adopted by the committee is misleading and inaccurate. I have selected eight points to cite today which demonstrate the extent of the Republican distortions concerning this important rural legislation:

1. The Policy Committee charges that "this bill duplicates a number of other federal planning programs."

This is flatly untrue. The bill authorizes grants-in-aid to the states for use of local governments only for those purposes for which existing programs do not provide. The purpose of the bill is to provide for filling the gaps that now exist in federal planning programs. The principal gap that needs to be filled is aid to predominantly rural governments for comprehensive planning for the rural needs and rural development.

2. The Policy Committee charges that the bill "would destroy the incentive for state and local communities to do their own planning."

This is not true. It would increase the incentive, and make it possible for predominantly rural local governments to undertake to do their own planning, by providing grants-in- aid of up to 75 percent of the cost.

3. The Policy Committee charges that the bill "calls for additional non-essential spending."

This is not true. By enabling small, predominantly rural local government to plan ahead for wise and efficient use of their resources and development efforts, it will promote efficiency and economy in local government operations as well as in the use of Federal development aids.

4. The Policy Committee states that grants to predominantly rural districts would "be paid from funds that are now earmarked for urban and suburban communities."

This is only partially accurate. The grants for the use of predominantly rural local governments would be appropriated under present authority in the Housing Act of 1954 for planning grants. But that authority is not restricted to "urban and suburban communities." The difficulty in the present law is that predominantly rural areas and small towns and small cities have not been able to use the grants now authorized as efficiently and constructively as large metropolitan

urban and suburban communities because of their small size, and because planning for rural needs is not authorized. The Community Development District bill would simply make it more feasible for predominantly rural governments to participate more fairly and more equitably in the present planning program, which is now benefiting primarily the larger urban areas.

5. The Policy Committee calls the bill "a make-work project for the Department of Agriculture," and an "attempt to get a piece of the urban development 'action'" for the Department of Agriculture.

This charge is a poorly disguised attempt to set urban areas against rural areas. Thousands of small rural communities are struggling with their own development programs, just as are the larger cities. Because these governments are smaller, have poor financial resources, and lack the full-time professional staff assistance that large city governments have in securing federal help for their development projects, they get less help from aid programs. By encouraging small predominantly rural governments to join together to plan for their development, and by authorizing federal help to plan for meeting rural needs as well as urban needs of such communities, this bill would simply extend to predominantly rural areas, on a workable basis, the same kind of federal assistance that is already available and being used by urban governments.

6. The Policy Committee states that there are "today 232,244 regular full-time and part-time employees, plus 38,920 temporary part-time employees" in the Department of Agriculture.

This is flatly untrue. As of June 30, 1966, employment in the U.S. Department of Agriculture was 118,585, consisting of 84,070 full-time, permanent positions and 34,515 temporary seasonal workers—primarily in the National Forests and research activities.

7. The Policy Committee attacks the establishment of the Rural Community Development Service in the Department of Agriculture.

This Service was established in order to meet the requests of rural residents and rural community leaders for help in securing the services of other Departments and agencies of the government whose services have not reached successfully into rural areas, and to plan and carry out their local economic and social development efforts. Rural residents have not been getting their fair share of benefits and services of most other Departments of the Federal Government. Is the Republican Policy Committee opposed to "parity of opportunity" for rural people to share in federal aids for community improvement and economic development?

The Community Development District bill by enabling predominantly rural local governments to join in employing their own professional planning staffs, will enable rural communities to increase their own capability to make use of these development aids, and will thereby reduce the need for additional services by the Department of Agriculture, or the expansion of field services by the large number of other Federal Departments and agencies whose programs are needed in rural communities.

8. The Policy Committee attempts to create an imaginary threat of excessive power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and control the formation of planning districts.

This is a far-fetched distortion. The bill provides that districts are to be designated by the State government, and that no district may be approved for a planning grant unless it is requested by local governments participating in the district planning activity. In fact, Secretary Freeman's point in stating "there is not a limit of any kind" regarding the size and scope of such districts, was to emphasize that the size, shape, and description of the newly formed district are left strictly to the states and the local communities to decide.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEDS, for the week of August 22, 1966, on account of official business.

Mrs. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. STALBAUM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. SISK), for Monday, August 22, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. FARNUM, for August 22 to 26, inclusive, on account of official business.

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. GRABOWSKI (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO), for 10 minutes, on August 24, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO), for 1 hour, on August 31, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. RONCALIO.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 476. An act to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1596. An act to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 3197. An act to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3446. An act to consolidate and reenact certain of the shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to certain agreements which would necessitate the modification of duties or other import restrictions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8760. An act to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001–1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15456. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 18, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13277. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; and

H.R. 13881. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and certain other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 23, 1966, 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:

2656. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting a report of audit of Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the year ended December 31, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2657. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for payment by handler assessments of part of the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2658. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting a report of review of precautions taken to protect commercial dollar sales of agricultural commodities to foreign countries purchasing the same type commodities for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2659. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting a report of possible dollar savings through expanded use of foreign currencies to transport personal effects abroad, Department of State, and other Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2660. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting a report of need for interservice action when management policies and practices differ for similar supply items, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2661. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2662. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 276, *The Creek Nation, Plaintiff*, v. *the United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2663. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct certain deficiencies in the law relating to the theft and passing of U.S. postal money orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. Supplemental report on H.R. 13161, a bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools (Rept. No. 1814, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 14195. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; with amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 17167. A bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning property rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 17168. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of insurance applicable to bank deposits and savings and loan accounts to $20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 17169. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 17170. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to establish an incentive award porgram for industries, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States which demonstrate excellence in waste treatment and pollution abatement programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 17171. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 17172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17173. A bill to provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any single day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 17174. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Constellation National Historic Site, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 17175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 17176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 17177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local real property taxes imposed on the residence of an individual 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17178. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17179. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widow's benefits, to eliminate the actuarial reduction presently required in such benefits when application therefor is made prior to age 62, and to provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 17180. A bill to provide for the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of a 25 cent per bushel export marketing certificate on wheat for the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 17181. A bill for the improvement of Teche-Vermilion Basins, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 1275. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as Clean Water Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 17182. A bill for the relief of Renato Recine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 17183. A bill for the relief of Ng Way Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 17184. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Bass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 17185. A bill for the relief of Imre Kallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 17186. A bill for the relief of D. M. Dew & Sons, Inc., and Dewey Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 17187. A bill for the relief of Josephine Avecilla; 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 first calendar quarter of 1966 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) $39. E. (9) $7.35.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E. C. 3, England; and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $585.01.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Informal Committee of 16 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $1,630.22.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,175.29.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $310. E. (9) $274.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,365.74. E. (9) $5,365.74.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,966.09. E. (9) $9,966.09.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,756.90.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $478.75. E. (9) $14,536.73.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $585.80. E. (9) $106.40.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,694.30.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $636.40. E. (9) $636.40.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,360.29. E. (9) $567.02.

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.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $18.14.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $31.85.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,050, E. (9) $7,725.10.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $16,255.22.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $510.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $63.26.

A. Roy A. Archibald, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $77.70. E. (9) $648.32.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $485.88.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated With the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,820.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12,499.98. E. (9) $75.62.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,456.56.

A. Atlantic Development Co., Box 3676, Georgetown Branch, Washington, D.C.
B. Puerto Rico Manufacturers Association, First Federal Building, Santurce, P.R.

A. Automatic Car Wash Association, Inc., 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,624.50. E. (9) $1,821.93.

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) $29.40.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $15.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $500.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,250.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,250. E. (9) $318.20.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Colonel A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., 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. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250.01. E. (9) $119.79.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $300.

A. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, 217–19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
E. (9) $3,698.40.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $10,957.50. E. (9) $10,957.50.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. James E. Bryan, Inc., 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,379.17.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, c/o Dreyfuss & Co., 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $119.97.

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) $320. E. (9) $320.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $200.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $591.32.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45,000. E. (9) $15,000.01.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $67.92.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $115.50.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $7,926.25. E. (9) $1,133.86.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $79.60.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $19,880.77. E. (9) $903.20.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $19,880.77. E. (9) $76.61.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $19,880.77. E. (9) $62.

A. William F. Claire, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Navigation System, Inc., Box 7, Agana, Guam.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,531.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $931.40. E. (9) $931.40.

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) $50.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, 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. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. People Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,812.50.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Gift and Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., and Texas Power & Light Co., Post Office Box 6331, Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) $1,024.84.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,618.41.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $158.18. E. (9) $13.87.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $406.89. E. (9) $27.60.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Morley E. Fox, Hotel Congressional, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $245.88. E. (9) $156.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $330.

A. William A. Geoghegan, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Soap and Detergent Association, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,073.79. E. (9) $577.21.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,292.15.

A. Robert Gladwin, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Glean F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $90,696.38. E. (9) $90,696.38.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

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. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. George Gross, 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) $965.90.

A. J. G. Hall, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $50.30.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,947.54.

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. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $656. E. (9) $25.

A. Augustus H. Hewlett, 323 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, 323 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $177.50.

A. J. J. Hickey, 405 Majestic Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $406.89. E. (9) $28.95.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $55.90.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $737.10.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Clo.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $1,607.31.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $406.89. E. (9) $51.10.

A. William J. Hull, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Meryle V. Hutchinson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,634.14.

A. Everett Hutchinson, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,511.80.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18,383.40.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $528.43.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $472.50. E. (9) $17.45.

A. Willis Johnson, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Business Information Service, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $35.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Peace Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Bush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $32.48.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.

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. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. Thomas John Kehoe, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $930.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise and Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers.
D. (6) $2,288.05. E. (9) $2,288.05.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $42.72.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $42.72.

A. Mr. & Mrs. Harry L. Kingmon.
D. (6) $1,860. E. (9) $1,860.

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) $1,200. E. (9) $178.50.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4,972.23.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,387.50. E. (9) $4,258.43.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,752. E. (9) $648.65.

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) $525.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $586.50. E. (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
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) $1,200. E. (9) $27.65.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,059.29. E. (9) $4,059.29.

A. John J. Linnehan, 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) $3,125. E. (9) $523.38.

A. Donald J. Lipsett, 1420 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,107.12.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,988.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

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) $294.75.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,130.02. E. (9) $690.63.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $600.77.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Colca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer, 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,136.73. E. (9) $59.31.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. and its subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,095.29. E. (9) $17.75.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,202.02. E. (9) $189.28.

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, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $206.93. E. (9) $56.71.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $40.48.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $750.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $15.32.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $204.11.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $455.

A. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $227.50.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,800.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,700.

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) $750. E. (9) $1,194.20.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 486, Taos, N. Mex.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,210.43.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 525 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $306.86.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,300.

A. John J. Murphy, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers International Union of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $306.20.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $84.34. E. (9) $144.07.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York. N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,379.17.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,423.11. E. (9) $12,429.27.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $658,367.90. E. (9) $12,471.55.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,981.40.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,288.05. E. (9) $2,288.05.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $4,646.50. E. (9) $901.93.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $444,618.02. E. (9) $13,654.12.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,931.92.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $144.77.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, c/o Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $160.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $142.99.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $868.86. E. (9) $196.71.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $29,767.50. E. (9) $3,465.60.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $124,783.18. E. (9) $11,969.65.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,087.56. E. (9) $21,087.56.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,763.75. E. (9) $28,853.27.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $6,500.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $571.04.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and Washington Parking Association, Jefferson Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,666.65.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $666.66.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,713. E. (9) $1,181.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,737.30. E. (9) $7,891.98.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,083.45. E. (9) $8,291.34.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $466.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $30,935.82. E. (9) $3,997.92.

A. Edward K. Nellor, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $100.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,011.80.

A. Carl E. Newton, 2 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Boston & Maine Corp., North Station, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $84.22.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

A. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,706.85. E. (9) $600.36.

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) $1,200.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,613.66.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,259.48. E. (9) $982.02.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,230.55. E. $1,350.85.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md., and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,269.24.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,340. E. (9) $3,446.78.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $730.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,873.92. E. (9) $11.60.

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) $100.55.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Switchman's Union of North America, 3 Linwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Retail Bakers.
D. (6) $546.13. E. (9) $207.52.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers.
D. (6) $22.64. E. (9) $9.57.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Wholesale Grocers.
D. (6) $37.83. E. (9) $14.38.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $25.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $27.47.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co. Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $142.94.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $244.58.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $17,530.87.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 200 Park Avenue, New York. N.Y.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 200 Park Avenue. New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $538.93.

A. R. Peter Regalado, 2519 Southern Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $213.50.

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) $799.98. E. (9) $97.75.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $80.20.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

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) $600. E. (9) $40.58.

A. Gloria Riordan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

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) $180.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 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) $1,312.50. E. (9) $72.93.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 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) $537.20.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $169.32.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Co., Richfield Oil Corp., Tidewater Oil Co., Union Oil Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Texaco, Inc., all Los Angeles; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Midland, Tex.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,569.30.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,136.73. E. (9) $280.04.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $137.32.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Milna D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. P. Sommer, 31 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. National Columbus Day Committee, 1616 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $185.43.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103-1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $61,005.94. E. (9) $5,088.78.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,562.30.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc. and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Vinyl Goods Manufacturers' Association, 11, 3-Chome, Akasaka-Denmacho, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $500.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unione Industraile Prato, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,000.

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. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $149.63.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $16.60.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,100.34.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,995.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $56.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.05.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $8,057.27. E. (9) $3,816.86.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,619. E. (9) $1,996.25.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,285.05.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $410.60. E. (9) $410.60.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $63. E. (9) $38.65.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $5,242.35.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $680.68. E. (9) $103.86.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $439.64.

A. Water for the West, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,061.29.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $91.35.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $62.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $76.61.

A. The Wheat Users Committee, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $31,235.99.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $881.25. E. (9) $232.78.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $909.08.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,271.53. E. (9) $446.35.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,307.73. E. (9) $625.59.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,998.

A. Mr. Lester L. Zosel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1966:

(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 ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO 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]

PAGE 1 ◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "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. Francis L. Adams.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $29.75.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,442.44.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,361.35. E. (9) $5,361.35.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,838.46. E. (9) $7,838.46.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,215.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tennessee Railroad Association, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
E. (9) $1,126.07.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,019.97.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $36,405. E. (9) $36,405.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $43,480.84.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,129. E. (9) 4,048.13.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $336,851.97. E. (9) $5,845.08.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,275.

A. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,062. E. (9) $6,062.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $572.68. E. (9) $47.50.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13,364.22.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
E. (9) $5,903.32.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $800.21. E. (9) $800.21.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and the Subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Commission for Federal Aid for Public, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.21. E. (9) $800.21.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,753. E. (9) $6,677.

A. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $868.45.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,497.80. E. (9) $2,497.80.

A. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,200. E. (9) $7,716.89.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.85. E. (9) $1,187.85.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, care of E. C. Connor, 224 Ellington Road, Longmeadow, Mass.
D. (6) $22.46.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,536.95. E. (9) $12,536.95.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $17,825.44.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,226.87.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,001.20. E. (9) $2,001.20.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d 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.
D. (6) $150.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $145.02.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $118.40. E. (9) $640.51.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $103.24.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Bros. Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $76.20.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,457.02.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,300.55. E. (9) $2,300.55.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,146.73. E. (9) $20,146.73.

A. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,205.53. E. (9) $1,473.30.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $220.

A. The Association of Western Railroads, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aero Space Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,305.54.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Post Office Box 486, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $673.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Celia Margulis, 50 Belmont Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $10,650. E. (9) $349.85.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $237.75.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Great Northern Railway, St. Paul, Minn., and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $100.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes, Richardson & Colburn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Diamond Conservation Committee.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $16.50.

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) $118.65.

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) $1,000. E. (9) $45.50.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $412.50. E. (9) $158.10.

A. William B. Barton, 632 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., 111 West Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

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) $1,050.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60.

A. John H. Beidler.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,491. E. (9) $575.13.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $5.47.

A. J. O. Bellenger, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $26.38.

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. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

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) $5,265. E. (9) $580.46.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

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) $670.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,837.50. E. (9) $1,540.16.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $342.40.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,487. E. (9) $27.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $431.95.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $28.33.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $450.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $115.15.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.75. E. (9) $27.45.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,263.71. E. (9) $217.93.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich., and C. Burcham Budd, 2700 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $1.50.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, 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) $750. E. (9) $400.

A. Derek Brooks, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $971.03.

A. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, 217–19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
E. (9) $3,915.26.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $10,908.71. E. (9) $10,908.71.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $85.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,437.50.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 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) $1,461.27.

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) $400.

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) $748. E. (9) $614.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $138. E. (9) $31.87.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry M. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Dreyfuss & Co., 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $53.58.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

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) $79.16.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $425.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $20,061.54. E. (9) $758.76.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,531.25. E. (9) $9.50.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $688.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $65.40.

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., Washintgon, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $365.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $37.50.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Roselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,704.50. E. (9) $96.87.

A. Ronald A. Capone, the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $210.31.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire 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) $2,200.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $209.27.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $115.50.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,818.51. E. (9) $236.74.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $41,515. E. (9) $27,505.61.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $37.

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. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $207.87.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,551.25. E. (9) $367.90.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Balderas 36—Primer Piso, Mexico D. F., Mexico.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $35.49.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. George C. Cheek, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
B. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $868.45.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $100.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,295.18. E. (9) $4,169.84.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $33,072.30. E. (9) $805.87.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $33,072.30.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $64.89.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $908.23.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $23.85.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.67.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,885.39. E. (9) $236.76.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $36.57.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Coles & Groner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

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.

A. Marvin K. Collie, 2201 First City National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Arthur Andersen & Co., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $29,000. E. (9) $8,894.20.

A. J. L. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $211.07.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $50.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,400.84.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $192,500. E. (9) $9,632.02.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $71.30.

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. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $206. E. (9) $45.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $2,429.75.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 239, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,486.38.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Penden Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $16.85.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $23.60.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 1145 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.
E. (9) $32.35.

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.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $55.

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. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

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 Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washintgon, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $48.16.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $37.50.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $2,145.87.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $21.38.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $314.58.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d St., Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $977.31.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $183. E. (9) $183.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Admiral Time, Ind., Belair Time Corp., and Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., and Multi-Jewel Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 21 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $223.47.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Car Wash Association, Inc., 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,300.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,762.50. E. (9) $345.61.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $581.53.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,375. E. (9) $769.11.

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) $375. E. (9) $20.45.

A. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,228.60. E. (9) $1,228.60.

A. District Lodge 44, IAM/AW, AFL–CIO, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,113.71.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $615.31.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 612 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Uniform Manufacturers, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

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.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $173.

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) $2,420.43. E. (9) $135.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225.

A. P. Frederick Dryer, 3911 Madison Street, Hyattsville, Md.
E. (9) $74.62.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,715.44. E. (9) $2,236.18.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $260.

A. Frederick G. Dutton, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,280. E. (9) $491.90.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $332.25.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $142.08.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Ely & Duncan, 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, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $60.41.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $35.23.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $6,115.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 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) $768. E. (9) $71.57.

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) $922.

A. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $800.75.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $25.25.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $100.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,940.79. E. (9) $21,466.28.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $103.43.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $170.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Roger Flemming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $7.17.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Cordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,807.14.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,612.50. E. (9) $83.32.

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) $180.

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) $379.44.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. ($6) $3,250. E. (9) $4,483.65.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325.

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. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $5.

A. Joseph B. Friedman, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $29,176. E. (9) $13,090.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cranbar Corp, Ponce, Puerto Rico.
D. (6) $3,905. E. (9) $105.62.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,356.70.

A. Marion R. 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) $5.35.

A. Gas Supply Committee, Post Office Box 631, Amarillo, Tex.
D. (6) $401.98. E. (9) $401.98.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $123.37.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. The Meyercord Co., 5323 West Lake Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Tobacco Distributors, 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $566.35.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Committee, Inc., 209 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $500.

A. Philip M. Glick, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,228.60. E. (9) $310.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,645.59. E. (9) $4,762.19.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $48.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $34,209.68. E. (9) $34,209.68.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $225. E. (9) $372.64.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

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) $600. E. (9) $216.51.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $64.30.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $267.77.

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. Wilfred H. Hall, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,562.50.

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) $6,874.70.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Watkins Products, Inc., Winona, Minn.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.02. E. (9) $164.93.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $196.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1780 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $797.49. E. (9) $360.24.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $64.93.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $321.10.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
E. (9) $33.34.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $18.30.

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) $71.80.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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) $83.96.

A. Robert W. Healy, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $2,274.19.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $404.65.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Hester, Owen & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $39.59.

A. Augustus H. Hewlett, 323 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, 323 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $207.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $468.50.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Norman Hill.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $801.60.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $64.80.

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) $425.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $120.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Product Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $91.85.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., Kaiser Center, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $420.88.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, Clayton, Mo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $108.60.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,900. E. (9) $932.92.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $12.05.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2,078.58.

A. Roland S. Homet, Jr.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $769.11.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $352.50.

A. Mr. James W. Hunt, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Everett Hutchinson, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $891.53.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Hugo W. Zugnoni, Rochester, N.Y.
D. (6) $5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $457.

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. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,663.37.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,227.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,675.12. E. (9) $8,675.12.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,450.89.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,590.22. E. (9) $15,177.42.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $237.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.51. E. (9) $37.19.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicao, Ill.
D. (6) $428.75. E. (9) $28.50.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,284.67. E. (9) $191.85.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Willis Johnson, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Business Information Service, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $74.60.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
D. (6) $634. E. (9) $444.63.

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. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $48.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rockwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $990.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Masachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,112.50.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $109.45.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $635.

A. Peter B. Kenney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John L. Kilcullen, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $826.87.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $2,110. E. (9) $2,110.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $690. E. (9) $83.89.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $337.91.

A. Ralph W. Little.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. John D. Knodell, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1,204.54.

A. Robert M. Koch, 792 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $45.25.

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) $1,200. E. (9) $275.65.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,778.75. E. (9) $3,183.73.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,752. E. (9) $604.35.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,460. E. (9) $6,951.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,699.57.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,858.81. E. (9) $6,850.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations.
D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $763.75.

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) $525.

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) $400. E. (9) $125.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $44.60.

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) $1,200. E. (9) $66.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th 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) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $58.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,337. E. (9) $123.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,365.36.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,830.42.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,249.96.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,039.98.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $412.50. E. (9) $15.30.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,429.36.

A. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
E. (9) $4,147.36.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $362.50. E. (9) $17.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $1,309.94.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,575.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.25. E. (9) $89.63.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

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) $1,950. E. (9) $2,190.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $75.35.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

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) $294.50.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Bankers Association, 1708 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N.J.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 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, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.
E. (9) $313.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,593.75. E. (9) $111.67.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $841.37.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert C. McCandless.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $165 E. (9) $93.17.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,067.28.

A. McCarthy & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Evan Jones Coal Co., Jonesville, Alaska.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. McCarthy & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $166.80.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Guy G. McConnell, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington. D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Richard J. McCooey, 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seventeen Eighty Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.13 E. (9) $153.36.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $777.94.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $556.69.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $118.03.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 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) $3,692. E. (9) $202.65.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,095.29. E. (9) $178.86.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,234. E. (9) $74.49.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,350. E. (9) $50.62.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $174.75.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $5,029.43.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $552.58.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $17.40.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,145.14.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $169.70.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,350.38. E. (9) $142.80.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $1,215.60.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $19.78.

A. Winson W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $4.50.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $214.21. E. (9) $251.49.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $90.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.93. E. (9) $917.43.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $489.71. E. (9) $516.49.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $9.34.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D (6) $2,664. E. (9) $81.70.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $710.

A. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,240. E. (9) $28.65.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,800.

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) $3,952. E. (9) $500.89.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $190.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $1,597.43.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,650.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

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.
E. (9) $4,641.71.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Telephone Exchange, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Vinson, Elkins, Weems, & Searls, First City National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $7,557.02. E. (9) $57.02.

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. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 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 Miler, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $901.84.

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) $436.50.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $840.09.

A. Robert H. Miller, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $44.50.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Co. Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railway Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $118.77.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,538.97.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 525 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Curt Moody, 2244 South Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $672.67. E. (9) $672.67.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $114.49. E. (9) $91.65.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Henry J. Moreschi, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $428.70.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $452.

A. John J. Murphy Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers, International Union of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,775. E. (9) $287.45.

A. John J. Murphy, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

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. William E. Murtha, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7278, Station G, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station G, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $935.30.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11.50. E. (9) $11.50.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,922.57. E. (9) $15,039.17.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $53,486.48. E. (9) $3,263.19.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975,608.06. E. (9) $11,254.40.

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) $2,017.04. E. (9) $2,017.04.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $8,687.58.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $1,337.10. E. (9) $586.57.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,618.21. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
E. (9) $2,666.81.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,367.25. E. (9) $18,367.25.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $489,074.47. E. (9) $13,185.35.

A. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,215.20. E. (9) $1,215.20.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,516.32.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,639.34.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $18,896.54. E. (9) $18,896.54.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,285.60. E. (9) $2,285.60.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,086.25. E. (9) $6,805.51.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $152.25.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.02. E. (9) $546.41.

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 Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $7,231.02.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $986.45. E. (9) $1,081.06.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,471.92. E. (9) $26,117.71.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39.06.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,166.42. E. (9) $4,208.38.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,869.50. E. (9) $1,869.50.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $6,500.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,340.47. E. (9) $11,340.47.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,072.40.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,680.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,166.59.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,651.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $149,704. E. (9) $2,490.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,025.05. E. (9) $7,777.69.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $509.50. E. (9) $509.50.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,650.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,225. E. (9) $6,787.53.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,213.07.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,832.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $503.43. E. (9) $503.43.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. George L. Nichols.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $141.60.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.06. E. (9) $791.10.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $646.18.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $117.66.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $509.70.

A. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,722.41. E. (9) $973.97.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,300. E. (9) $6,268.

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) $148.15.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $220.45.

A. Ira H. Nuna, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $250.

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) $650.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,225.02. E. (9) $204.09.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,500. E. (9) $424.49.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Government of the People, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $467.37.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $151.91.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,370.50.

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) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,885. E. (9) $320.16.

A. Richard C. O'Hare and James H. Rowe, Jr., 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,733.23.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21.75.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,368.59.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $373.80. E. (9) $1,461.25.

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) $150.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,480.78.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $271.51. E. (9) $262.10.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $330.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $124.90.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $126.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $100.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $300.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brig. Gen. John L. Person, U.S. Army (retired), 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 20155, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $8.27.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $28.50.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18.65.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $161.13.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $49.10.

A. Philipson, Lyon & Chase, Brewer Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Recovery, Inc., 116 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $4,259.37.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32.41.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $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) $204.10.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $175.39.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d St., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,360.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $300.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $33,994.41. E. (9) $1,350.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $88.30.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $202.32.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $46.16.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $490.21.

A. Gravdon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25.

A. Marvin J. Powers, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $171.03.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $15.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,167.35. E. (9) $443.60.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, The Arthritis Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and United Cerebral Palsy Association, all New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,449.97. E. (9) $7,908.93.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $222.20.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $136.78. E. (9) $136.78.

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. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $91.86.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,875.04. E. (9) $130.30.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $11.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,652.92.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,555.05.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $249.10.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $234.25.

A. R. Peter Regalado, 2519 Southern Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,684. E. (9) $704.99.

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) $799.98. E. (9) $269.74.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105,882.82.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $1,409.50. E. (9) $1,708.38.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,987.80. E. (9) $9,067.81.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $20.96.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $32.50. E. (9) $123.38.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Earl F. Rieger, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. William C. Doherty & Associates, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William Neale Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $1,500.

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. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $10.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Garden Bay Manor, Inc., 22 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $10.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, care of Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd. (New York), doing business as Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $184.

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) $183.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.41.

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) $437.50.

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. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.32.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $340.57.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $473.57.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 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) $426.08.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District No. 44, I.A.M. and AW, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,749.98. E. (9) $603.29.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; et al.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,489.45.

A. Arthur A. Sandusky, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $48.50.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,067.95.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $89.59.

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. Ashley Sellers, Sellers, Conner & Cuneo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $150.

A. Seventeen Eighty Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41.

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) $221.45.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $243.60.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $528.62.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $968.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores De Azucar, Lima, Peru.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Alvin W. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $594.41.

A. George Shuff, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $800.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John Silard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $95.05.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $747. E. (9) $1,480.33.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $54.85.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,800. E. (9) $6,115.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
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) $1,462.50. E. (9) $30.14.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $27.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,663.37.

A. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank Kingston Smith, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association.
D. (6) $937.50.

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) $75.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $496.91.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Smith, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $223.92.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,598. E. (9) $829.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $390.34. E. (9) $242.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $383.76.

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) $2,423.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,205.55. E. (9) $10,453.52.

A. J. P. Sommer, 31 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. National Columbus Day Committee, 1616 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $394.70.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilhome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $513.97.

A. South Potomac Citizens' Crisis Committee, 8701 Riverview Road, Oxon Hill, Md.
D. (6) $827. E. (9) $499.13.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $26,708.21. E. (9) $5,385.79.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $11.89.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $431.27.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $35.

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. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, Esq., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
E. (9) $22.25.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, Esq., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Seventeen Eighty Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
E. (9) $100.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecicut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unione Industriale Prato, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

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) $3,750. E. (9) $248.49.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, 10 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

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. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,624.98. E. (9) $269.55.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $694.65.

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. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.

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. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $33.75.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,188.76. E. (9) $180.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,712.50. E. (9) $34.70.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $365.66. E. (9) $269.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. D. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Vallejo Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $137.63.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,419.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $207.56.

A. John H. Todd, Post Office Box 23, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David R. Toll, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) 30.52.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,676.43. E. (9) $1,625.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $67.75.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, DC.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $36.75.

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) $2,107.50. E. (9) $92.50.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $450.

A. Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Harry S. Leyman, Deceased, care of Frost & Jacobs, 2310 Central Trust, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $12,000.

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, Suite H, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $105.40.

A. Sherman Unger, 2300 Central Trust Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Estate of Harry S. Leyman, Deceased, care of Frost & Jacobs, 2301 Central Trust Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $989.60.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $395,239.17. E. (9) $98,756.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $34,446.26.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District No. 44, IAM/AW, AFL–CIO, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $133.15.

A. George C. Van Nostrand, 1010 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eaton, Yale & Towne, Inc., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $174. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $79. E. (9) $19.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $175.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $16.69.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161.55. E. (9) $64.69.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,155.72.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.45. E. (9) $1,775.94.

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) $100.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $2.19.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,664.30. E. (9) $385.82.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $13.57.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,786.80.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $316.28.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich., and C. Burcham Budd, 2700 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $5,090.99.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $3.50. E. (9) $605.30.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $881.25. E. (9) $302.03.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $258.62.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $491.70.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.98.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.
E. (9) $0.30.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Safety Administrative Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $536.64.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to the Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $198.56.

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) $1,615.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

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) $389.60.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John A. Wise, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $723.65.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $300.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,026.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692. E. (9) $578.49.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger E. Zylstra, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cole & Zylstra, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1966:

(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 ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO 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]

PAGE 1 ◄

A. Herbert Adelman, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 811, Washington, D.C.

A. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.

A. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 420 South Milwaukee Avenue, Libertyville, Ill.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn., and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.

A. Barnes, Richardson & Colburn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Diamond Conservation Committee.

A. William B. Barton, 632 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., 111 West Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul R. Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Cos., Post Office Box 2975, Raleigh, N.C.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. Carson W. Culp, 4200 Dresden Street, Kensington, Md.
B. Meramec Basin Association, 114 West Madison, Kirkwood, Mo.

A. Louis R. Damiani, 4619 Conshohocken Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, 1336 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Admiral Time, Inc., Belair Time Corp., and Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., and Multi-Jewell Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 612 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William C. Doherty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Uniform Manufacturers, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc.

A. Henry A. Dudley, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dredging Co., 12 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Josiah Ferris, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., and Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1207, Clewiston, Fla.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y., and 140 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Henry J. Gwiazda, 111 Franklin Square, New Britain, Conn.
B. Ambulance Association of America, Palm Springs, Calif.

A. Wilfred H. Hall, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Watkins Products, Inc., Winona, Minn.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Territory of Guam, Agana, Guam.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Waldron E. Leonard, 2612 Fairview Drive, Alexandria, Va.
B. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., New Brunswick, N.J.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Evan Jones Coal Co., Jonesville, Alaska.

A. Richard J. McCooey, 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seventeen Eighty-Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Music Publishers Association, Inc., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Vinson, Elkins, Weems & Searls, First City National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.

A. D. S. Mitchell Associates, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Officers of State Teachers Associations, Baton Rouge, La.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Box 311, Portland, Oreg.

A. Curt Moody, 2244 South Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard Moss, 710 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Government Employees, 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. National Audio Visual Association, 3150 Spring, Fairfax, Va.

A. Ben Paul Noble, 2022 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hallmark, Inc.; Westminster; Time Corp.; Phoenix Inc.; and Stratton Watch Corp.; all of Agana, Guam.

A. Richard C. O'Hare & James H. Rowe, Jr., 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Prestige Public Relations, Inc., 8560 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Youth in Service to Humanity, 15720 Ventura Boulevard, Encino, Calif., and Joshua Enterprises, Inc., 10889 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Earl F. Rieger, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. William C. Doherty & Associates, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ashley Sellers, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Seventeen Eighty-Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Z. Shows, 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wilmac Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Seventeen Eighty-Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kamplman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manpower, Inc., 820 North Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wards Co., Inc., 1705 Brook Road, Richmond, Va.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Parsons & Whittemore, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Braxton Valentine, Jr., 1309 State-Planters Bank Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Theodore A. Mangelsdorf, Cumberland Farm, New Kent County, Va.

A. George C. Van Nostrand, 1010 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eaton Yale & Towne, Inc., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Safety Administrative Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The World Calendar Association, Post Office Box 224, Lenox Hill Station, New York, N.Y.

A. Edmund N. Wise, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washinngton, D.C.
B. American Football League, 280 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corps., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us. Grant us this day the grace to live on the altitudes of our aspirations. As servants of Thine and of the Nation, and of the peoples of this shattered and stricken earth, save us from false choices, and guide our hands and minds to heal and bind, and build, and bless.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 19, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Frank T. Ashton to be postmaster at Preston, Minn., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 3418. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1486).