

feel that the authors of the other amendments—although I have not yet had a chance to talk with them—will be willing for the bill to move forward and the amendment be voted on. I hope we can dispose of this bill next week, beyond all doubt.

I mentioned today that so far as the rate of spending is concerned, the longer the bill lingers here or anywhere else and fails to reach the President, the more money will be spent at the same rate at least as last year, because we have continuing resolutions that not only authorize all the going programs but also automatically appropriate the money at the same time, at the same rate as last year, without any examination; and I do not believe that is a good way for Congress to run a railroad. I urge that we pass this bill next week.

Many questions and points are involved in the amendments that have been filed. The information, however, is available. I visited Secretary Laird before I left for the recess and discussed several matters with him that concerned me. He told me then about his plan for reductions in funds that he was going to make outside this procurement bill. Frankly, I told him that if he had in mind any reductions in the procurement bill, I wanted to know about them, before we continued this debate.

He assured me that he did not have any such reductions in mind. I also told him I was calling on him for additional

material; that I had examined the filed amendments fully as to all the points involved in them; that I had read the arguments made in favor of the amendments, and that we had to have the material ready, on the basic points involved, on my return here before the recess was over. He very readily agreed to furnish the information and material, and when I returned to Washington a week in advance of our reconvening date, the material had been sent to the committee except for one or two items. I called his office requesting these items and they promptly responded. The Department sent the additional material over. I mention this because it is available now for any Senator who is interested, on one side or the other, especially with respect to the amendments that have been filed.

We will proceed next week, I hope, with everyone who wishes to get the information, and we can move right along with the bill. I expressed myself yesterday with reference to how much I thought these proposed amendments cut into the very bone and muscle of our military capability. I believe that, as the debate goes on, this bill will become more and more evident to more and more Members of the Senate and to the young people of the Nation and that all weaponry amendments will be decisively defeated. This conclusion in my speech of yesterday was a conclusion based on my careful analysis of all the amendments while in my home State during the recess.

I have been in touch with Senators this week that I thought wanted to speak. I even called some Senators who are opposed to my position, to talk to them about getting ready. I believe everyone is going to be ready to move next week, that the bill will move along, and that we will dispose of it before the week is over.

I thank the Presiding Officer (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair) and Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 5, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 4, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry J. Tasca, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 4, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Haskell R. Deal, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and almighty God, we Thy servants begin our day by seeking Thy blessing. Grant unto us wisdom and guidance in all that we do. We thank Thee for this great land of ours, with its abundance of all good things. In these days of great challenge, great problems, and great anxieties, give us insight, courage, strength, and patience. Empower us to meet the responsibilities of our Nation, and her relations to the world. Grant to us a due sense of pride, of responsibility, brotherhood, and a desire to live in peace with all men.

Give us clear minds and pure motives, as we face the real issues and obligations of our great Government. Enable us to direct our undertakings with wisdom and to seek the fulfillment of the best we know, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 252

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Daniel J. Ronan, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

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

S. 855. An act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

S. 2056. An act to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to permit unmarried judges of the courts of the District of Columbia who have no dependent children to terminate their payments for survivors annuity and to receive a refund of amounts paid for such annuity;

S. 2502. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof,

when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

THE LATE HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

(Mr. MURPHY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay my respects to the memory of the Honorable Edward A. Kelly, who represented the Third District of Illinois in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1931 to 1943 and again from 1945 to 1947.

Mr. Kelly, who died after a long illness, was born and educated in the city of Chicago. During the First World War, he served as a sergeant in Battery D of the 322d Field Artillery, with 9 months' service overseas. After his return from the service, he became active in the real estate and insurance brokerage business in the Chicago area. As a young man, Mr. Kelly also played professional baseball. After leaving the Congress in 1947, Mr. Kelly returned to his real estate practice. He also served as a member of the planning committee of Chicago and was active in community and civic affairs in the city of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Murphy and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Rosemary, on her tragic loss and ask that

she extend our condolences to the rest of the family in their bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the *RECORD* on the life, character and service of the late Honorable Edward A. Kelly.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD COGLEY BRUCE, FORMER MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM INDIANA

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with a sense of personal sadness I received the news this week of the sudden death of our former colleague and member of the Indiana delegation, Donald Cogley Bruce.

A man of intense energy and great vitality, it is difficult to comprehend his death at such an early age.

Donald Bruce was respected by all who knew him, but particularly by his constituents in the Hoosier State, many of whom are now situated within the boundaries of my congressional district. He served them well, and I speak for these people when I pay respect to the memory of this articulate spokesman for the conservative philosophy of government and his work in behalf of those who share these principles.

Don Bruce was one of the most outspoken defenders of Americanism in the Congress during his years in the House of Representatives. He served but two terms, and although he could have been assured victory for a third term he felt his cause could best be served by moving on to the Senate race in 1964. This opportunity was to be denied him by the State convention, but the action did not dampen the dedication of the man to his beliefs and he continued to work tirelessly.

To his wife and children I offer my sincere condolences and my hopes that their grief will be tempered by their deep faith in God.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Indiana congressional delegation has been deeply saddened by the death of former Indiana Congressman Donald C. Bruce, of Round Hill, Va.

In 1960, Don and I ran together for Congress in Indiana and were both elected as freshmen Congressmen in the 87th Congress.

We served together for two terms until Don gave up his seat to seek the nomination for U.S. Senator from Indiana in 1964.

Don's two terms in Congress were distinguished by his untiring and devoted service on the House Un-American Activ-

ities Committee and the Education and Labor Committee.

Representing Indiana's most populous area, the city of Indianapolis and its surrounding suburbs, Don performed his duties well and was a popular and energetic Member of the House.

Don was gifted with a great oratorical ability and his presence was constantly in demand in his own district, as well as throughout the State and Nation.

Even as a freshman Congressman, Don made a large number of important speeches before the House.

Don was blessed with a wonderful family and his charming wife, Hope, was a great help in his many activities.

Don Bruce carved out an outstanding career in radio, politics, and public speaking, and he will be greatly missed by our State, particularly by those of us who labor in the same causes that attracted Don's allegiance and loyalty.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of our dear departed former colleague, Donald Bruce.

He was a dedicated man and his judgment was always respected even by those who may have differed with him in some instances. I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and family.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to pay my final respects to a former colleague and close personal friend—Don Bruce, who expired of a heart attack on August 31 at the age of 48.

Don Bruce was elected to Congress in 1960 to represent Indiana's 11th Congressional District. He served two terms and was assigned to the House Education and Labor Committee and the Un-American Activities Committee.

Both in and out of Congress, Don Bruce was a dedicated and dynamic spokesman for the conservative philosophy and, on leaving Congress in 1964, he helped form the American Conservative Union. Later, he formed his own management and political consulting firm in Round Hill, Va., where he lived with his family.

When I came to Congress in 1963, I frequently counseled with Don and exchanged ideas with him on how best to advance the conservative philosophy.

Don Bruce was an eloquent and articulate public speaker. His extensive background and 19 years experience in radio and TV broadcasting made him one of the most dramatic speakers in the House of Representatives at that time. He had the unique ability and rare talent to move his audiences and to stir their emotions and his in-depth projections inspired those who were privileged to hear him speak.

With his passing, the Nation has lost one of its most articulate legislative

talents. However, he has left behind a wealth of outspoken views on the conservative philosophy of government.

No doubt there are many, like myself, who will long remember the inspiring thoughts and noble deeds of this great man who loved America and its people so very much.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), yielding to me in order that I may join him in expressing condolences to Mrs. Donald Bruce and members of the family. The news of the death of a friend always comes with the impact of the first chill blasts of a winter storm. When the news concerns not only a friend, but a contemporary and a former Member of this body it strikes an even more telling blow. I was inexpressibly shocked and saddened to receive word of the passing of former U.S. Representative Donald Bruce. I had that special affection for him that we somehow reserve for those with whom we encountered the same familiar experiences in life, for we entered this body together in 1961.

He served his country honorably and with distinction both in peace and war. Gifted with rare eloquence and an extremely articulate and persuasive talent for public speaking he was heard on many platforms. His speech was always carefully reasoned and well documented. Even those who sometimes differed with him on various issues respected his sincerity and intelligence. We will miss his friendship which had continued despite the fact that he left our ranks here in the House of Representatives. He was a distinguished American and we are diminished by our loss of a friend who both loved and served his country. Mrs. Anderson joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Hope and the other members of the Bruce family. We pray that God will sustain them in this very difficult time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, our minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a former Member of this House who was first and foremost a gentleman, an ardent American, and a most sincere and full-time patriot.

With the death of Donald C. Bruce, there has departed from us a man who did not believe there were varying degrees of Americanism. For Don Bruce, a man was either completely devoted to the principles of Americanism or he was not. As for Don himself, no one loved America more and he was not ashamed to say so.

It was because of his outspoken and unabashed Americanism that Don Bruce was given Americanism citations by the Indiana Departments of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and was presented with the Distinguished Service Award of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Don also made great contributions in community service before departing Indianapolis for the Halls of Congress. Besides being named an outstanding young man of the year by the Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce, Don was active in policymaking roles with the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Multiple Sclerosis Society of America.

Those who knew Don Bruce only as a fiery-eyed fighter against communism knew him but little. He was a kind person, a humanitarian, a gentleman, and a man of culture.

Mr. Speaker, Don Bruce's death is an untimely loss. I join my colleagues in extending my condolences to Mrs. Bruce and the members of the family.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Donald Bruce, a great Hoosier Congressman, a great fighter against communism, and a great American.

During his long career as a news commentator in Indianapolis, Don Bruce became very concerned about the menace of world communism to our way of life. Being a man of action, he decided to do what he could about this menace, and so, while still a newscaster, he toured Indiana exposing the evils of communism—at a time when few people were doing so.

As he toured the State, he developed a great following, many of whom asked him to run for Congress. In 1958, he decided to take on the impossible task of trying to unseat a Republican incumbent in Indiana's 11th District. He was narrowly defeated in the Indiana primary by the incumbent, who then lost in the 1958 Democratic landslide.

In 1960, Don Bruce tried again and this time was successful in both the primary and general elections. Immediately upon coming to Washington, he requested and got positions on the House Committees on Un-American Activities and Education and Labor.

In the space of two short terms, Don Bruce became well known as an outspoken leader of conservative causes in the House of Representatives, greatly respected on both sides of the aisle.

In 1964, he did not run for reelection for the House, but submitted his name instead as a candidate for the Republican senatorial nomination. At the Indiana State Convention, he was narrowly beaten on the third ballot.

Don Bruce then became the first president of the newly formed Conservative Union, a group dedicated to electing conservative Members of Congress, regardless of their party affiliation.

I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt sympathies and condolences to Don Bruce's widow and family in their hour of grief.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and service of our departed friend, Donald C. Bruce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

KOCH URGES THAT THE DEATH OF HO CHI MINH BE MARKED WITH A MUTUAL CEASE-FIRE AND A COMMITMENT BY THE UNITED STATES TO WITHDRAW ALL OF ITS TROOPS NOW

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Ho Chi Minh, the leader of a country with which we are now engaged in war, died. There will be those in our country who will take great satisfaction in his death and will think in terms of expanding the war with the thought that his people will lose heart because of the loss of his leadership. We would be better advised from the point of view of world peace and our own national interest to use this occasion to extend the hand of friendship to the Vietnamese people, north and south, at a time when they will be most introspective in thinking of the extraordinary feats of one of their national leaders. To many of them, Ho Chi Minh is George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and John Kennedy. Whatever we may think of him and knowing that he was a tough and dedicated Communist we must recognize that he was above all a patriot in his own country. It is now, when the North Vietnamese are most vulnerable, that we can and should use the opportunity to say to the North Vietnamese, "Let this death of Ho Chi Minh end the war and end it now with an immediate cease-fire." Let us state that we will now undertake through immediate withdrawals the return of the only foreign troops in North and South Vietnam, namely the Allied troops and primarily American soldiers.

Death is a tragedy for the individual family and more than 37,000 families in our own country have suffered that tragedy as a result of the deaths of our fine young men on the battlefield. For the North Vietnamese, Ho Chi Minh's death is a national tragedy.

Let us now undertake to see to it that the greatest tragedy of all; namely, the continuing war is brought to an end.

TAX REFORM BILL

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, I was shocked and stunned to learn that President Nixon's administration opposes the provisions of the House-passed tax reform bill which in the words of Treasury Secretary David Kennedy provide too much relief to the average taxpayer and too little for the corporate sector of our economy.

In this incredible position, the administration underestimates the determination of the average taxpayer who shoulders most of the tax burden for more equitable treatment.

The administration's trade-off deal to reduce corporation taxes by 2 percent wipes out practically all Treasury advantage in the repeal of the investment credit. This deal gives business and industry a tax break in excess of \$1.6 billion.

The administration's recommendation provides tax reform by taking relief away from the average taxpayer and hands it over to corporations.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House and the House of Representatives have gone a long way toward making our system of taxation more just. We must not permit our work to go down the drain by this kind of dealing and manipulation.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ERNEST S. PETINAUD

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives another great honor that has been bestowed on Mr. Ernest S. Petinaud—"Ernie" as he is affectionately known by all of us in the House.

On August 18, 1969, at the Imperial Council Convention annual sessions at Baltimore, Md., Ernie was recommended by the Honorable John H. Hester, imperial potentate of the Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles Mystic Shrine of North and South America and its Jurisdictions, Inc., and presented to the imperial council for the degree of honorary past imperial potentate. This outstanding honor will be conferred on Ernie at the next Imperial Council Convention and sessions at the Oasis of Boston, the Desert of the Great State of Massachusetts to be held August 16 through 21, 1970.

Ernie is a great and noble man who is truly deserving of this great award. We in the House recognize the sterling character of this man and I know that if the Members ever establish a hall of fame in the Capitol of the United States, Ernest Petinaud will be among the top 10.

FIVE PRESIDENTS HAVE REFUSED TO SPEND APPROPRIATED FUNDS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when some of our colleagues rose recently to attack the President's decision not to spend a billion dollars because of its inflationary effect, they must have known their self-righteous indignation did not quite ring true.

For the fact is that the preceding five Presidents before Mr. Nixon refused at one time or another to spend appropriated funds.

The precedent was set by President Roosevelt and carried on by each of his successors—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that there are some who find it expedient to play politics not only with the education of our

children but also with the very real perils of inflation.

The inflationary rate is actually causing us to lose ground in meeting the educational needs of the country.

The shrinking purchasing power of the dollar is a very real thing, and we are not going to solve the problem by merely supplementing local and State tax dollars for education with Federal dollars.

The Federal Government has got to take the lead in setting the tone to get our fiscal house in order, and we should all be grateful that President Nixon has chosen to take the long-range statesmanlike approach to the problems of our times rather than the route of political expediency.

SYRIAN HIJACKING CHARGE UNANSWERED

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State on August 30 issued the strongest possible statement condemning the hijacking of a TWA aircraft and its passengers to Syria. Labeling the act as "piracy," Secretary Rogers called especially for the immediate release of detained passengers, two of whom are still being held illegally in Syria today. As the Secretary pointed out, Syria is a United Nations member, and its condoning of this criminal act in the slightest degree can only have the most serious implications for international air travel.

Almost a week has now passed without any satisfactory reply or action. We cannot and must not allow this situation to continue. United Nations and other international, and United States, sanctions must and should be sought unless there is an immediate satisfactory response through release of the detainees and appropriate criminal prosecution of the individuals responsible.

TO LIMIT DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME TO 3 SUMMER MONTHS

(Mr. SEBELIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would limit daylight savings time to the 3 summer months of the year—in effect from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

Under the present Uniform Time Act, daylight savings time is observed from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October. As a result, many of our farmers, businessmen and schoolchildren in rural and smalltown America are forced to awake, work and travel in darkness.

The effect of this legislation would be to limit the extra hour of recreation time daylight savings time permits to the summer months.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this legislation after receiving a surprising amount of mail from the people in my district. I know many of my colleagues

also receive similar complaints regarding daylight savings time. Traveling throughout my district during the recent congressional recess, I am sure I heard the same constituent concerns as my colleagues, but in addition to the concern over our pressing international and domestic problems, many citizens also asked a simple question, "Congressman, why can't we get this time thing straightened out?"

The farmer asked me why he had to begin and end his working day in darkness; the concerned mother asked why her youngster had to walk or ride to school without daylight; and the small businessman wanted to know why the Uniform Time Act "arranged" the time so that when he opened his business it was dark outside.

It seems to me this issue is very simple. Why keep this extra hour of recreation time during the fall and spring when it forces people to get up, travel, and work in darkness?

That is the question citizens in Kansas are asking me and that is the question and problem I am hopeful this bill will answer.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED RE- PORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ISSUE A PROCLAMATION CALLING FOR A "DAY OF BREAD" AND "HARVEST FESTIVAL"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 851) to request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival," and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving

the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so merely to establish the record.

Neither this resolution nor those to follow will call for any expenditure from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is correct. I have amendments to offer to take out the "annual" provision.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 851

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a token of man's gratitude for the bounty of nature and the annual harvest of farm and field, and in recognition of bread as a symbol of all foods, that Tuesday, the 28th day of October, 1969, be designated as a "Day of Bread" as a part of international observances, and that the last week of October within which it falls be designated as a period of "Harvest Festival," and in succeeding years the first Tuesday following the first Sunday of October each year be designated as a "Day of Bread," and the week itself a period of "Harvest Festival"; and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to join with those of other Nations to observe this "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 9, after the word "Festival" delete the comma and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On pages 1 and 2, delete everything commencing with the word "and" on page 1, line 9, down through and including the phrase "Harvest Festival;" on line 2, page 2.

On page 2, line 3, strike the word "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution 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.

NATIONAL FAMILY HEALTH WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning November 16, 1969, and ending November 22, 1969, as "National Family Health Week" and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 46

Whereas good health is a blessing prized above all others by every citizen;

Whereas the well-being of the Nation depends upon the maintenance of good health among all segments and elements of our population;

Whereas the family physician performs a critical service to the Nation in the maintenance of health and the prevention of disease;

Whereas the Nation's family doctors have a unique responsibility in the American health care system, since they are the individual's primary source of contact with the medical profession;

Whereas the dedication and skill of family physicians have served as the foundation of medical progress in this Nation;

Whereas the family doctor's role as a physician and counselor to the whole person and the entire family embraces the widest scope of basic medical necessity, including advice on subjects ranging from personal health to family planning to emotional well-being; and

Whereas the American Academy of General Practice, national professional association of family physicians is conducting a continuing effort to educate the public in the progress of our health care system and supports measures for its improvement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Members of the Ninety-first Congress request the President of the United States officially to proclaim the week of November 16 to 22 as National Family Health Week as a means of focusing national attention during the year upon the accomplishments of the American health care system and the central role played by the family physician in the maintenance of superior medical care for Americans of all ages and from all walks of life.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On pages 1 and 2, strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GENERAL VON STEUBEN
MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 250) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17, 1969, General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 250

Whereas it is sought to pay homage and respect to the memory and achievements of General Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, who came to our shores on December 1, 1777, to offer his heart and his hand to assist in our struggle for independence, and his heroic deeds are emblazoned in the history of our country; and

Whereas the hero, born in Magdeburg, Prussia, on September 17, 1730, did join with Washington at Valley Forge and devote himself with great resolve and effect to the bolstering up and reorganization of our soldiers, and distinguished himself at Monmouth and Yorktown; and

Whereas the said Major General von Steuben was instrumental in promulgating the drill regulations and regulations for order and discipline of the troops of the United States which were adopted by Congress on March 29, 1779, and in addition he is historically credited with the fundamental idea of the establishment of the United States Military Academy at West Point: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States of America is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 17th of September 1969 as General von Steuben Memorial Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to commemorate the birth and services to the United States of General von Steuben.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support of my bill, House Joint Resolution 250, to proclaim September 17, 1969, General von Steuben Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben.

General von Steuben came to our shores December 1, 1777, to assist in our struggle for independence. He distinguished himself both in battle and in the training of troops. In addition, he is historically credited with the fundamental idea of the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Throughout our Nation's history, German Americans have been deeply rooted in the spirit of America in the tradition of Von Steuben. Their contributions to the United States have been outstanding, both in terms of quality and quantity.

The Steuben Society of America is particularly devoted to keeping alive the memory and lofty principles of General von Steuben. Those principles—duty, justice, tolerance, and charity—are as basic to the survival of American democracy today as they were to the winning of our Revolutionary War nearly two centuries ago.

Each and every person, by virtue of membership in the Steuben Society has assumed responsibility for nurturing the good seeds of dedicated and stanch citizenship planted by past generations. It is only fitting that we join with the Steuben Society and all other German Americans in officially recognizing General von Steuben. I ask my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 250 to commemorate the birth and services to the United States of a man whose fore-

most concern was for the welfare, the happiness, the growth, and the safety of our Nation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On pages 1 and 2 strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the matters relating to the resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 156]

Adair	Fraser	Passman
Anderson,	Garmatz	Patman
Tenn.	Gibbons	Pollock
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Powell
Andrews,	Green, Oreg.	Quillen
N. Dak.	Green, Pa.	Rees
Baring	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Berry	Hansen, Wash.	Reifel
Biaggi	Hays	Riegle
Blanton	Hébert	Rivers
Boggs	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brademas	Hollifield	Rooney, Pa.
Brock	Hosmer	Saylor
Brotzman	Howard	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hungate	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Snyder
Cahill	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.
Carey	Jonas	Steiger, Wis.
Celler	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Clark	Kyl	Sullivan
Clawson, Del.	Landgrebe	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Lipscomb	Thompson, Ga.
Cleveland	Long, La.	Tiernan
Corbett	Lowenstein	Tunney
Corman	Lujan	Udall
Culver	Lukens	White
Dawson	McEwen	Wilson,
Dingell	MacGregor	Charles H.
Dulski	Mailliard	Wold
Edwards, La.	Melcher	Wolff
Esch	Mills	Wyman
Evans, Colo.	Morton	Young
Findley	Myers	
Flynt	Obey	
Foley	O'Konski	
Ford,	Olsen	
William D.	Ottlinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 329 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7621) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7621, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is an expansion of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, which was passed in 1960, and today's bill will be known as the Child Protection Act of 1969.

We thought earlier that we were affording protection and complete coverage, but we found out since that time that this is not true. The National Commission on Product Safety has come up with three categories of articles and toys that are dangerous and which cause injuries and death to children in this country. I congratulate the Commission as well as the subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

This is a bill which I think is very important to the Nation and to nearly every household in the land, especially those who have children. I congratulate the subcommittee chairman, Mr. Moss, and the ranking minority member, Mr. KEITH, as well as all of the members of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, despite the passage of the Child Protection Act of 1966, of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in this land, 15,000 of them met accidental death last year. Many of those deaths can be attributed to the kinds of things we are trying to ban here. More than half of the number of children who died as a result of accidents in 1966, the latest year for which I have figures, were preschool children. Of the 20 million nonfatal accidents in the United States, 10 million of them affected children under the age of 16.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the number of children dying from accidents is higher than the combined number of deaths from cancer, contagious diseases, heart disease, and gastroenteritis for this age group. These striking figures point out the urgency of passing this additional

legislation to protect our children against hazards which are found in various toys and other articles intended for use by youngsters. Too many unreasonably hazardous articles for children are for sale in the marketplace today. We are hopeful that this legislation today will help to correct or eliminate many of these hazards. I am sure that each Member of the House who has children would not want to wake up some morning and find that their children are one of these statistics. May your children not become one. We are hopeful this bill, which in my opinion is a good one, will pass.

The committee thought it was a good one, and it came out of the subcommittee unanimously. It came to the full committee, and it came out of the full committee unanimously. We report it to the House in that way, and we urge that it be passed.

There are some explanations that I should give about the bill, probably. This will be very brief. I am sure that they will be understood by everyone. These are the amendments that have been made to the original act.

Section 1 provides a short title called the "Child Protection Act of 1969."

Section 2 amends the act by adding children's toys and articles which present electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

Section 2(b) amends the Hazardous Substances Act to establish procedures by which items which have mechanical, thermal, or electrical hazards may be designated as banned hazards and thus kept off the market.

Section 2(c) defines electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards.

Section 3 is a clarification to establish that combustible items with a flash point of 80 to 150 degrees will be subject to regulation.

Section 4 requires the repurchase of banned hazardous substances by the sellers and prescribes the procedures by which these repurchases are made.

Section 5 provides that the effective date shall be on the 16th date after enactment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this explains the bill fairly well. As I said, there was no opposition from any witnesses who appeared before the committee. All who appeared before the subcommittee were for the bill. No one opposed it. I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7621, to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

This legislation, recommended by the National Commission on Product Safety in its interim report of February 26, 1969, would close a gap in the existing law which presently defines a hazardous substance as one which is toxic, corrosive, an irritant, a strong sensitizer, flammable, radioactive, or which generates pressure

through heat or other means. This bill before us would enlarge that definition to include electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards as to children's toys and articles.

Hearings conducted by the National Commission on Product Safety in New York and Boston in 1968 revealed shocking testimony of children's toys and articles that present hazards. Some of the toys contain sharp projections which might puncture the eye or the throat, extremely hard or sharp surfaces which could cause cuts or puncture wounds and abrasions. Others have heated surfaces which could give a child a burn while others still may give a child an electric shock. There were other toys identified whose parts could easily be inhaled in the course of use.

I was particularly concerned over testimony that was received by the Commission regarding baby cribs, and particularly the "Kiddie Koop," which is designed with a netted lid or top to keep a child from climbing out. At least two known infant deaths were reported to the Commission, and many more were suspected as a result of the lid falling on the neck of the infant. It was further estimated in testimony before the Commission that more than 200 infants strangle in their cribs as their bodies become caught in the too widely spaced slats. Information about these preventable disasters and the progress being made by the Commission was brought to my attention last year, and I had hoped that private industry would have been more cooperative with the National Commission on Product Safety in its work. Evidently, this was not the case, and the manufacturers of the "Kiddie Koop" declined to testify at Commission hearings, although they were invited to do so.

I firmly believe that gaps in the existing law must be closed, and earlier this year I introduced H.R. 7509 to amend the Hazardous Substances Act and to accomplish primarily what is achieved in the legislation before us today.

The need, Mr. Chairman, for this legislation is great. Of the nearly 56 million U.S. children under 15 years of age, more than 15,000 die each year from accidents, a rate of 28 per 100,000 population. More than half of the number of children who died as a result of accidents in 1966 were preschool children. Of the 20 million nonfatal accidents that occur in and around the home, 10 million affect children under the age of 16.

Hundreds of thermal, mechanical, and electrical hazards are present in the vast array of toys and other articles intended for use by children, and these hazards produce thousands of injuries and deaths annually.

I am confident that this body will overwhelmingly approve this legislation to reduce such injuries and deaths in the future.

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

Mr. Chairman, the need to protect children from hazardous substances and toys which are dangerous has been recognized by Congress for some years. In 1966 the Hazardous Substances Act was amended so that toys which contained anything which was determined to

be such a substance could be rendered unmarketable. At the same time, things to be used around the household which were found to be too dangerous in the course of ordinary use were also so designated. It seemed to us at the time that the necessary authorities had been created to protect the users of such items from unwarranted and unnecessary danger. It now appears that the authority granted was not broad enough.

The 90th Congress created a Product Safety Commission with an assignment to explore the entire practical and legal problems concerned with the safety of consumer products. It was this Commission that looked into the situation surrounding the sale and use of children's toys and discovered that certain hazards do exist and are not covered by present law.

The list of examples of potentially dangerous toys cited in the committee report is enough to convince anyone that somewhat more protection by way of legislation is needed. We know that it is impossible to completely protect all or perhaps any consumer from every conceivable danger. Children particularly are attracted to it. The improvised toys created out of the imagination of children can be at times the most dangerous toys imaginable. Sticks and stones and rusty nails can become playthings in the activities and the games of children. That is no reason, however, that we should fail to protect these same children from unnecessary hazards in toys that are manufactured and distributed in the market.

The fact that a toy is on the market is undoubtedly some assurance to the adult buying that toy that it is reasonably safe for the purposes for which it is intended. It was found, however, that certain toys which generate heat can be very dangerous not only to the child using the toy but to the entire surroundings. Dangers to children or anyone else handling devices whether toys or otherwise which can produce lethal electric shock hardly need exposition here. Mechanical hazards are rather harder to explain and to visualize and certainly harder to regulate. In many instances the answer is in proper and prompt labeling rather than banning, but both must be considered. There are examples of mechanical devices which can shatter, cut or puncture far more easily than should be the case with anything properly put in the hands of children for play.

This bill would grant authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to sort out those items and those substances which present an undue hazard and ban them from the market or require proper cautionary labeling as the particular case may require. The bill does provide for administrative safeguards against hasty and unnecessary action and provides a right to those who would produce, import or distribute toys to present a case to have a hearing and if necessary judicial review. To many people the inclusion of such provisions which are not only proper but traditional in our form of government amount to weakening the protections provided by the law. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In the bill before us today if it appears to the Secretary that an article or device presents an imminent hazard to public health, he can ban its sale immediately. There will still be opportunity for hearings and all of the other protections that the persons affected by them should have a right to expect, but in such a case, while the argument goes on, the product is not on the market. If it is very questionable that the danger exists or is great enough to justify banning the product, the administrative process is followed to determine the proper course of action.

Another feature of this bill which should have a dampening effect on those who would knowingly sell dangerous products is the requirement for repurchase. It starts at the top and extends down to the ultimate purchaser. The buyer of the article may return it to his retailer who must repurchase it. The retailer then may do the same with his distributor, who may in turn make his appropriate claim on the manufacturer.

Since this bill does not create a new program but merely expands one already in being, there is no separate and express authorization of appropriations to be included. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates, however, that over a 3-year period the administration of this act will cost approximately \$4½ million.

This bill is a logical addition to the Hazardous Substances Act and approaches the problem in a positive and evenhanded manner. I recommend it to my colleagues in the House.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I take it that the full committee and the subcommittee which held the hearings on this legislation, feel that protection against chemical substances is adequately handled in the original Federal Hazardous Substances Act; is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Missouri has stated it correctly.

Mr. HALL. This is important. It is also important that the Members realize that that legislation was well enough done in its original concept and implementation, so that no further amendment was necessary. In my opinion the production of toys for children with paint where chemical absorption and so forth is important and conducive at least to plumbism (lead poisoning). If we are adequately protected, we need no further amendment, and adding thermal, mechanical, and electrical is most worth while, and I commend the committee.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his contribution.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, the Child Protection Act of 1969 is both a necessary and desirable piece of legislation, and I hope and trust that the House will adopt it overwhelmingly.

This legislation was not hastily arrived at. In hearings last year, the Commission on Product Safety documented

dozens of cases of strangulation, asphyxiation, electrical shocks, punctures, cuts, and burns—all caused by hazardous toys.

Among the hundreds of cases of dangerous toys, the Commission found such things as—

Archery sets with rubber-tipped arrows. The tips are easily removable and the arrow then becomes extremely dangerous;

Toy stoves, irons, and so forth, that heat up to extraordinary temperatures and can easily burn a child, 600 degrees;

Dolls whose face and hair are highly flammable;

Compressed air guns that could damage a child's hearing if shot off near his ear;

Jequirity beads used in children's necklaces and dolls eyes that could be fatal if swallowed;

Baby teethingers filled with contaminated water;

Baby rattles containing sharp stones; Chemical sets that can be used to produce hazardous mixtures;

Toy space rockets with sharp metal fins;

Cap guns that can shoot projectiles up to 80 miles per hour;

Toy bunnies held together with projecting sharp spikes;

Blowguns in which the projectile can be swallowed if the child blows in instead of out;

Floating baby pool seats that can turn over if the child rocks excessively;

Teddy bears with eyes that are really heads of tacks that can be removed;

Dolls whose parts are held on with pins; and

Toy garden tools with sharp metal edges.

This is not to say that most toy manufacturers are negligent. Quite the contrary: the vast majority of toymakers are responsible and safety-conscious manufacturers whose products are safe and reliable. It is only a few manufacturers and importers, whose products do not measure up to the standards followed by the rest of the industry, who are the suppliers of the dangerous products.

So the vast majority of toy manufacturers concurred in the Commission's recommendations, which are embodied in the bill before us today. It calls for the Food and Drug Administration to survey toys and other children's items on the market to determine if they pose "thermal, electrical, or mechanical hazards through reasonable, foreseeable handling or use."

The FDA must adhere to the rule-making procedures of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. However, there is provision in the act for immediate banning of the sale of a substance which poses an imminent danger to health, subject to later administrative and judicial review.

The bill also provides that in the case of a banned item, the manufacturer would have to repurchase the items from the retailers. This protects the retail store owner from being stuck with unsellable stock, and places the loss where it properly belongs—on the manufacturer of the dangerous toy.

This legislation will, to be sure, cost money—nearly half a million dollars the first year, rising to \$1.3 million in 1972.

But it is a small price to pay for the protection of our children. I believe that the subcommittee and the full committee have done a good job with this bill—I strongly urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, a baby strangles to death on a lidded crib cover, a little girl suffers third-degree burns from a play oven, a boy punctures his eye when a top falls off of his toy. These tragedies could have been and must be averted.

We have before us today a bill that could prevent some of these accidents. It is the Child Protection Act of 1969. I cosponsored a similar bill in February to protect children from toys and other products intended for their use which might constitute an electrical, mechanical or thermal hazard.

I also testified before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in favor of the Child Protection Act in May of this year.

Mr. Chairman, it is inexcusable that more than 15,000 children die in the United States each year from accidents. Over 50 percent of these are preschool children.

The Senate realized the importance of this Child Protection Act and passed it, June 30. It is now time for this body to act.

Dangerous and deadly toys flood the market each year. This situation cannot be allowed to exist.

Certainly, toy manufacturers are not intentionally negligent, but children do not always use toys as they are intended.

The National Commission on Product Safety has recommended an amendment to strengthen the Child Protection Act of 1966. The bill before us today authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to ban hazardous substances and remove them from the interstate market.

It attacks a number of hazards such as sharp or protruding edges, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, electrical shock, and heated surfaces.

It also requires the repurchase of banned hazardous substances by manufacturers, distributors, or dealers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Child Protection Act of 1969.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT was allowed to speak out of order.)

THE SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the situation in Northern Ireland, which has resulted in much bloodshed and destroyed much property, has saddened many a face and heart here at home. It is most unfortunate that the grand folk of the Old Sod have found it necessary to turn to the streets, particularly since such actions have never settled anything. The situation is another smolder-

ing ember from which a flame can ignite people of differing religious beliefs in many countries.

It is my fervent hope, and I am certain that of my colleagues, that cooler heads will prevail to settle the internal problems of Northern Ireland. We not only hope and ask for peace and tranquility between religious groups in Northern Ireland, but the establishment of love and affection for all the peoples throughout the world.

We also hope that Great Britain will interpose in Northern Ireland to see that all peoples have equal rights and the right for each to serve God in his own individual way.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

I am concerned about some of the language that was added to subsection (s) of paragraph 7 which says that an article may be determined to present a mechanical hazard because the article—or any part or accessory thereof—may be aspirated or ingested.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clarify a point about the language which is being added to the act. It is my understanding that no toy shall be considered hazardous simply because it is small. It is possible to get that from the language because anything that is small might be aspirated or ingested.

From reading the committee's report on the bill it is my understanding that the committee did not intend that something should be determined to be hazardous just because it is small.

Am I correct on that?

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman that that was not the intent of the committee, because the article or toy must "present an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness," so that the size alone does not necessarily constitute a hazard.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman. In other words, I assume, then, that what was referred to here as small relates to a toy with tiny parts which might break off, and therefore could become an unreasonable risk.

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe the language in the bill is the right language, and I believe it is self explanatory, and I again assure the gentleman that size is not a controlling factor.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, I think probably the thing that the committee did have in mind, as I recall the discussion, was the fact that in bubble gum machines sometimes they had very small items that would qualify under the unreasonable risk. In that respect size might become important in connection with a dangerous or hazardous risk. I think we should not leave the impression that size has absolutely nothing

to do with it, because size might be one of the factors that would go to determine whether it was reasonable or not reasonable, and I believe that would be the feeling of the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield further, the language says "which presents an unreasonable risk," and that would have to be within the discretion of the Department. Small or large, the design or manufacture of an item must present an unreasonable risk of personal injury.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think that that is true, but I also think that smallness could be one of the factors.

Mr. STAGGERS. It could be.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Of unreasonableness.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I understand perfectly well what the committee is attempting to do here, and of course something needs to be done because there are hazardous substances and materials utilized in the manufacture of these toys.

On page 9 of the bill, subparagraph 2, we talk about the distributor of any such article or substance repurchasing from a buyer of an article under certain conditions.

I want to make it perfectly clear for the Record just exactly what we are talking about. We are talking about a distributor, because in our scheme of manufacturing in the United States sometimes a distributor can be a manufacturer, but it is not necessarily always so.

Am I correct in assuming that where an article is manufactured in the United States and is distributed by some broker, for example, if the distributor or the dealer then repurchases an unsatisfactory item, this dealer can in turn go back to the distributor, and the distributor who then repurchases can demand a refund from the manufacturer?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. WAGGONER. Am I correct as well, Mr. Chairman, in assuming that under the language as contained in the legislation a distributor or dealer who markets a foreign product has no comeback on the foreign manufacturer because, of course, we cannot legislate in that direction, but runs that risk himself?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct; he takes this risk when it is brought in and it would have to be either a dealer or a distributor or whoever imports the product.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished chairman and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing this legislation to the floor to protect children from certain hazardous toys and articles.

I have been very much concerned about the problem of lead poisoning among children which is particularly prevalent where children living in dilapidated housing eat bits of old lead based paint which peels and chips off.

I have introduced three bills intended to combat lead poisoning.

H.R. 9191, which is also H.R. 13256 with 18 cosponsors, has been referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have discussed it with the chairman and had hoped that its provisions could be included as an amendment to the pending Child Protection Act of 1969. However, I am advised by the Parliamentarian that it is not germane to the pending bill. Therefore, I will not offer it as an amendment, but I urge the committee to hold prompt hearings.

H.R. 9191, the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Elimination Act of 1969, would establish a fund in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from which the Secretary could make grants to local governments so that they could develop programs to identify and treat individuals afflicted by lead poisoning. These grants would not exceed 75 percent of the cost of the development and execution of the approved program during a 3-year period.

The local programs would be aimed at tackling the problem in one of several ways:

It would be educational and explain the dangers and prevalence of lead poisoning to parents, educators, and local health officials.

It would include a community testing program to detect the presence of lead poisoning and insure immediate medical treatment for those affected.

There would be a followup program to prevent those who have had lead poisoning from being reexposed.

The program would also have to involve residents of the areas who would be trained, educated, and given the necessary information so that they could be employed, to the maximum extent possible, in the program.

Largely ignored in the past, only recently has the nature and effects of lead poisoning, one of the most widespread diseases afflicting children in our urban centers today, become known.

Recognizing the danger of lead-based paint, many localities have outlawed its use on the interior surfaces of housing. But where old coats of lead-based paint remain, it peels and falls off. In the dilapidated housing in our inner cities, children easily get their hands on the pieces of paint and plaster that have fallen from the walls and ceilings and eat it—this is how they get lead poisoning.

Children living in substandard city slums are exposed daily to this health hazard. It has been estimated that between 25,000 and 30,000 New York City children a year suffer from lead poisoning. Recent studies in Cleveland, Chicago, and Baltimore show that 5 to 10 percent of the children tested had lead levels serious enough to qualify them as poisoned.

The New York Times of September 1, 1969, carried an article about a survey

done in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn by Brooklyn College and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Evidence of lead poisoning was found in some 45 percent of the families interviewed. Of the 400 families reached in this door-to-door survey, 182 cases of lead poisoning were found; 94 had to be hospitalized.

To make the problem worse, lead poisoning cases are seldom reported. For example, in New York, cases of the disease are reported only after it has reached its most critical stages.

When it has gotten this far, lead poisoning produces cerebral palsy, epilepsy, permanent mental retardation, and death. Between 1954 and 1964, 128 children died of lead poisoning in New York; in the last 10 years 138 have died in Chicago. In May a 2-year-old girl died in Newark.

Because available funds are so scarce in our cities, it is difficult for them to cope with this problem. For this reason, Federal assistance is necessary if the causes and effects of lead-based paint poisoning are to be eliminated. Congress must take the lead in arresting this disease and ending these unnecessary deaths.

I introduced three bills—H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699—in March, and then again in July with 18 of my colleagues, which would deal with this problem. These three bills attempt to alleviate, and hopefully terminate this lead poisoning epidemic in our cities' children.

I have already explained H.R. 9191—H.R. 13256 with cosponsors—which is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9192—H.R. 13254 with cosponsors—is aimed at the problem of slum housing itself, and the necessity to end the cause of lead poisoning. It authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local governments which would allow them to generate programs designed to detect the presence of lead-based paints. It would require that owners and landlords remove the paint and refinish the walls and ceilings with non-lead-based paint.

H.R. 11699—H.R. 13255 with cosponsors—attempts to combat the growth of this disease. It would require that local governments submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint before they could receive any Federal funds for housing code enforcement or rehabilitation.

This poisoning of our children must not be allowed to continue. Lead poisoning is not a disease with questionable cause and a nonexistent cure. We know how a child gets lead poisoning, and we know how to cure an afflicted child.

I urge the Congress to take action necessary to combat and eliminate lead poisoning.

Mr. STAGGERS. This subject is covered at least in part under other legislation. But I want to say this to the gentleman that I think he certainly has shown great foresight and vision in mentioning it.

I am not able to say to the gentleman when we are going to have hearings on this subject. We recognize the importance

of a continuing interest in this, and further legislation may be desirable.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the answer would be that the gentleman is talking about a substance already covered under the Hazardous Substances Act. The committee is now awaiting a report from the special Commission on Consumers' Products Safety, where many recommendations will be made and I think it would be wiser to await that report and then act upon the recommendations contained in it, at a time when we can do a more adequate job rather than doing it on a piecemeal basis in dealing with it at this point.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say both to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished chairman of the full committee that I appreciate their interest.

I certainly hope attention will be given by the committee to my bill which would set up a program for testing and then for treatment of lead poisoning among children and make it possible for Federal assistance to be made available to the local communities in order to carry out such a program. That is the intent of this legislation, and I hope action can be taken on it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STAGGERS. In response to the gentleman, I would just like to say to the gentleman from New York that in the present law, and this is in the second section, subsection (g), it reads as follows:

The term "toxic" shall apply to any substance (other than a radioactive substance) which has the capacity to produce personal injury or illness to man through ingestion, inhalation, or absorption through any body surface.

So this is covered but in the light of the gentleman's presentation here today, the committee would be glad to take a further look at the bill now pending before the committee.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the Chairman. Although lead-based paint may be labeled as toxic, there is no Federal program to detect and treat lead poisoning, which is the purpose of my bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7621, the Child Protection Act of 1969. At this time I would also like to commend the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, and the members of the committee for their outstanding work on this legislation, which would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to bring within the purview of the act several new categories of dangerous toys.

The present law defines a hazardous

substance and to this definition the bill adds and defines electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards as they exist in children's toys now on the market.

I am particularly interested in this legislation in as much as it will attempt to correct a serious problem that exists in our Nation—the problem of hazards caused by lead poisoning. Deaths of youngsters, severe brain damage and mental retardation have resulted from lead poisoning. These tragic effects of lead poisoning for so many children demand immediate attention. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that continuing investigation will be pointed toward these areas for the detection and elimination of hazardous substances in children's toys and articles.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Under earlier legislation we set up a National Commission on Product Safety. The Commission has been holding hearings, and they will come up with further recommendations. Recently the Commission's time was extended. They are looking into many safety questions. The bill today is in part a result of the Commission's work. I am sure they will be in operation for some time yet, and certainly they will be listening to any suggestions of any of the Members.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I wish to thank the chairman.

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

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 7621, the Child Protection Act of 1969, to protect children from toys and other articles which structurally present electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

As toys become more sophisticated to meet the needs and interests of the modern child, their construction is of a more technical nature. Hazards such as sharp or protruding edges, excessive heat and accessibility of electrical connections are hidden within the toy's framework and obviously not evident to the purchaser. In many instances, toy manufacturers have not exercised care by incorporating devices which would insure protection of the young consumer against these dangers. Their concern has been with innovation, paying little attention to safety in the introduction of new products. The result has been a devastatingly high rate of toy-related injuries in the under 15 age group. Clearly, some positive steps must be taken to reverse this trend.

Under the enforcement of the 1966 amendments to the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, the Child Protection Act of 1966, toys which are or contain hazardous substances, defined as toxic, corrosive, an irritant, a strong sensitizer, flammable, or radioactive, have been banned. Only recently, however, through work of the National Commission on Product Safety and the Food and Drug Administration, the dangers presented by electrical, thermal, and mechanical hazards have been discovered. Such seemingly innocent playthings as a Little Lady oven, Tyke bike, Roly Poly doll, stuffed toy rabbit, and Kiddie Koop

among many others present lethal dangers if not properly handled. While an aware adult would undoubtedly discern the inherent hazards, one cannot expect a preschool child for whom these toys are designed to exercise care when playing with them. In the same vein, it has been demonstrated that warning labels are not sufficient guards against potential dangers.

Strong preventive measures must be taken to end these needless accidents. I urge my colleagues to support the Child Protection Act.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) such time as he may consume.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I introduced a companion bill or an identical bill to Chairman STAGGERS' bill which is now before us. I have long been interested in safety, having served professionally in that field for 6 years some time ago, and having six children of my own, I know the importance of protecting children from the harm and death that has come from unsafe toys and other items. So I feel confident that this bill will have overwhelming support from the House, and I am hopeful that it will soon be enacted into law.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) such time as he may consume.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, about a part of the committee amendment which might be construed to seriously hinder the enforcement of the provisions of this bill.

I would like to call the attention of the chairman to the language on page 5, starting on line 19, dealing with toys presenting an "imminent hazard." Apparently a hearing will be necessary to remove a "hazardous substance" from the marketplace but, according to the bill, as I understand it, a toy can be removed from the marketplace without a prior hearing if it presents an "imminent hazard." Is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me answer it this way, if I may. If the gentleman will go back to the report, he will see where this fits into the original act, and I might just quote from the law, where it says:

(B) . . . In the case of any toy or other article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance described in clause (B) of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph, if the Secretary finds that its distribution presents an imminent hazard to the public health, he may by order published in the Federal Register give notice of such finding, and thereupon it shall be deemed to be a 'banned hazardous substance' pending the completion of proceedings relating to the issuance of regulations pursuant to such clause.

If the Secretary finds the substance presents an imminent hazard to the public health, he may by order published in

the Federal Register give notice of such finding, and the substance shall be deemed to be banned as a hazardous substance, and then there will be hearings; but it is banned from the market. It says right there the substance shall be deemed to be a banned, hazardous substance, and it is banned right then. There may be hearings afterward to see whether the substance shall be put back on the market or banned forever, but those hearings will be held after it is banned. This language is already in the law, and we have included it in this bill to cover electrical, thermal, and mechanical hazards.

I know it has been misrepresented to this House that we have weakened this bill, but the Department need not and should not go through any formal proceeding under this bill whenever an imminent hazard exists. The Secretary should ban it right then. He has the authority. Hearings can follow.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I would like to inquire further. It has been suggested by some who oppose this change the committee made—and I am not one of them—that in order to establish an "imminent hazard," the administration would have to demonstrate that the substance had killed or maimed people, or something of that nature. Could the chairman give us a clearer idea of what findings would be necessary to establish an imminent hazard permitting removal of a toy from the marketplace before hearings had been held?

Mr. STAGGERS. All the Secretary has to do is be sure in his own mind, that it presents an imminent hazard; he has the power given to him in the law, and he can ban it right then.

Mr. O'HARA. In other words, if it seems clear to the Secretary that this toy is a hazard, that is enough?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee. I think the change made by the committee is constructive and ought to help rather than hinder proper enforcement of this act.

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not know where the suggestion ever came from that it would hinder the enforcement. I certainly back the subcommittee in what they have done.

There are so many things I could give examples of. One was the Zulu dart in Philadelphia, in which 11 children using the dart sucked parts into their lungs. The damage by those darts could have been prevented. As I said a moment ago, there are 15,000 deaths which occur needlessly in the United States each year. We have all kinds of examples.

Mr. O'HARA. The term "imminent hazard" would clearly include an item such as the Zulu dart, would it not?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes. All the Secretary has to have is an indication that it might be hazardous and he has the power then to enforce it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I see no reason why the administrators of this act, if it is amended as the committee has suggested and I hope it will be—cannot give prompt and effective and strong enforcement under

the committee's language. I fully support the committee's amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. That is the intent of the committee action, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, recently, a nationally syndicated column charged that the House bill would impose "impossible bureaucratic procedures" requiring the Government "to go through a prolonged process of notice, hearings, and bureaucratic maneuvering before a dangerous toy could be banned from the market." The article implies that these procedures could delay for years action against toy manufacturers who, in the meantime, could continue to market hazardous toys. It also accuses a committee staff member and a Washington attorney of conspiracy to bring about these provisions, and I quote from the article:

The Senate bill to protect children from dangerous toys—games that blind, toy ovens that produce 660-degree temperatures, rattles that come apart exposing sharp daggers—has run into a road block in the House.

The toy manufacturers, careless about hazardous toy designs if they cut costs and who have been getting away with it, abandoned their New York lawyer and looked around for a Washington attorney with influence in Congress. Like many big-money clients before them, they sought out the prestigious, politically potent law firm of Clark Clifford.

Clifford's law partner, Thomas D. Finney, Jr., who managed Sen. Eugene McCarthy's presidential campaign last year, accepted the case. He slipped around to see members of the House Commerce Committee about pulling the stinger out of the Senate bill.

Finney succeeded, with the help of committee aide Bill Dixon, in encumbering the bill with impossible bureaucratic procedures. The language Finney has tacked onto the bill would require the government to go through a prolonged process of notice hearings and bureaucratic maneuvering before a dangerous toy could be banned from the market.

Finney could use these procedures to delay for years action against toy companies that manufacture hazardous playthings. In the meantime, children could continue to be injured.

The no-nonsense Senate bill was the work of Sen. Frank Moss (D-Utah) who acted upon evidence produced by the National Commission on Product Safety.

Toys that should be a source of fun, he found, often cause injury and death. Every year 500,000 children are injured from swings; 200,000 from slides, 50,000 from seesaws. Toxic, corrosive, flammable goods abound on the toy counters.

A blowgun caused serious injuries when the darts were inadvertently inhaled and embedded in the lungs. One "sonic blaster" emitted such a blast that it endangered children's eardrums. Manufacturers are making more hazardous bicycles with highrise handlebars. There are S-hooked swings, skateboards and lead-painted toys.

Some baby teethingers contain water contaminated with coliform bacteria. Chemistry sets were found with inadequate or non-existing caution labels. Highly flammable cloth was wrapped around the metal hoops of a toy tunnel. In a plastic doll manufactured for toddlers, a hair ribbon can be easily pulled out exposing a dangerous pin-like protrusion.

With the aid of the influential Finney,

however, the toy industry appears to have sabotaged the needed reforms.

I would like to state for the RECORD that these charges are totally untrue. This bill applies existing provisions of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to toys which present an electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard. A toy or other article intended for use by children which presents hazards defined in the bill is automatically subject to the act and cannot be marketed unless labeled in conformity with its requirements. If the Secretary finds that, notwithstanding such labeling, the hazard to the public health remains, the toy is then banned from the marketplace. In making that determination, the Secretary is required to afford interested parties an opportunity for a hearing and to make his determination based on the evidence at such hearing. But as a safeguard, the bill authorizes the Secretary to remove any toy or article from the market immediately pending his final determination as to whether it will be banned permanently from the market.

Thus, there are no bureaucratic procedures which could tie the administrator's hands or prevent his removing a hazardous toy from the market immediately. Moreover, since a hearing cannot be used for delay, there is no incentive for the manufacturer to request such hearing unless there are honest questions of fact to be resolved.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of H.R. 7621—the Child Protection Act of 1969—presents us with an ideal opportunity to exercise our functions as legislators. We have on the one hand an intolerable and perilous situation that needs urgently to be remedied; we have on the other hand precisely the remedy needed.

According to the figures of the National Commission on Product Safety, each year more than 15,000 American children under 15 die from accidents caused by dangerous or lethal toys or other products intended for children. This shocking mortality rate—which is 28 per 100,000 population—exceeds the rate of death in this age group from cancer, contagious disease, heart disease, and gastroenteritis combined.

Most of the injuries caused by toys and other children's products seem to involve electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards; such products as toy ovens, grills, or irons, certain types of archery or dart sets, bikes or rocket ships, are examples of products that can cause injury or death to young children. Even some dolls and stuffed toy rabbits have been found to have sharp pins or points concealed about them.

Shockingly, none of these toys are covered under the Federal Substances Act and are thus still allowed to be marketed in this unsafe condition. Passage of the Child Protection Act would materially change the unfortunate situation which I have described. The bill would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other children's articles which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards upon a specific

regulatory determination by the Secretary that an article is hazardous. It would thus follow the lead of the Child Protection Act of 1966 which amended the Hazardous Substances Act to ban toys made of or containing irritants, strong sensitizers, toxic, corrosive, flammable, or radioactive substances.

We—and the people we represent—have recently become aware that a gap exists in the Hazardous Substances Act, in the protection of our children from dangerous products—and we have learned to our sorrow how serious a gap it is. Let us close this gap, let us in future years be able to erase the cruel statistic of 15,000 children's deaths, let us pass the Child Protection Act of 1969.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, in 1966 the Congress went a long way in gaining the confidence and approval of American parents concerned about the safety of their children when we passed the Child Protection Act of that year. That measure amended the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children by banning toys or other articles that are made of—or that contain—hazardous substances. This year, we in the Congress can once again do a service to American parents, their children, and to the Nation as a whole: We can pass the Child Protection Act of 1969.

This bill—H.R. 7621, recommended by the National Commission on Product Safety—would amend the Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other children's products which are dangerous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards. It would thus expand the definition of a hazardous substance, which now means any irritant, strong sensitizer or toxic, corrosive, flammable, or radioactive substance.

In 1968, the Product Safety Commission held extensive hearings and discovered that a number of articles presently on the market constitute serious hazards to children. Such things as sharp or protruding edges, excessive heat, and accessibility of electrical connections were found on numerous toys and articles designed for use by children. Various toy ovens, corn poppers, grills, and irons were examined and were found either to present the possibility of electrical shock or to heat up to temperatures of as high as 800 degrees. Certain toy rockets were determined by the Commission to have dangerous protruding points and fins, while a type of bike revealed potentially perilous surfaces once the handlebar grips were easily removed. Some dolls, it was found, have sharp pins connecting their hair ribbons to their heads; certain archery and dart sets have sharp metal points under the easily removed rubber tips; even the ears of a stuffed toy rabbit were easily taken off to show razor-sharp metal tips, while straight pins only loosely connected its eyes to its head. In sum, the examination conducted by the Product Safety Commission convinced its members—and the public—that a large number of truly dangerous articles for children are still on the market and not covered by any Federal law.

Toys such as the ones that I have here

described can expose children to cuts or burns, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, or electric shock. Every year in the United States 15,000 children under the age of 15 die from accidents. This rate of death—28 per 100,000 population—exceeds the rate for deaths in this age group from cancer, contagious diseases, heart disease, and gastroenteritis combined. And, according to the Product Safety Commission, most of the injuries caused by toys and other such articles result from electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards. This scandalous situation must be allowed to continue no longer; such intolerably dangerous products must no longer be allowed to be available to unsuspecting parents and innocent children.

Passage of the Child Protection Act of 1969 would have a number of highly beneficial results: First, it would surely lower the shocking rates of death and injury among children from toy-related accidents. Second, enactment of this piece of legislation would serve notice on product manufacturers in all areas that the Congress is determined that all American citizens will be protected in the marketplace from potentially damaging articles. Finally, the passing of this measure would almost certainly contribute to a resurgence of confidence in the Government's intentions in the field of consumer legislation. Only good can come from the passing of H.R. 7621; not to do so would be to compound a scandal already too long in existence.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7621, the Child Protection Act of 1969.

The evidence is overwhelming that sophistication has touched upon all aspects of our daily lives. In the home, modern appliances and gadgets of every conceivable type and for almost every known purpose are available to us today. Even our very young and our not-so-very young have come within the ambit of this sophistication. In this age of Apollo, toy manufacturers have assumed that unless their products are copies of grownup versions in every important detail, their toys would not find a ready market. The result has been that toys and other children's articles are made with little regard for, and too often purchased in ignorance of, safety factors.

It is clear, therefore, that something has to be done, and soon in view of the approaching year-end holiday season, to protect the Nation's children from toys and other articles which are dangerous because of the presence of electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards.

The legislation we are now considering is designed to meet this need. H.R. 7621 would enlarge the definition of a hazard in the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to include electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards as to children's toys and articles.

If enacted, this legislation would ban from the marketplace toys and other children's articles which have sharp or protruding edges, accessible electrical connections, or produce excessive heat. The National Commission on Product Safety has found that the toys possessing

these characteristics exposed children to burns, cuts, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, and electric shock. Of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in this country, more than 15,000 of them die each year from accidents. And it has been found that electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards predominate in the records of toy-related injuries.

While it is true that the National Commission on Product Safety recommended this legislation, it is nevertheless to the great credit of the distinguished chairman of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the able members of his committee that this legislation was acted upon favorably and with such obvious dispatch.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation deserves our support. I urge a unanimous vote in favor of passage.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of similar legislation, H.R. 8277, I most earnestly hope and urge that the House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 7621, which expands existing legislation in order to further protect children from toys and other articles that are dangerous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

As most Members are aware, the provisions of this measure have been recommended by the National Commission on Product Safety; they are also recommended by the administration, and they have significant congressional support as indicated by the great number of bills that have been submitted on this subject by Members of both the House and the Senate.

In substance, the effect of this bill is to require manufacturers to take into account, when designing and producing toys and articles for child use, the safety of the article in normal use and when it is subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse. This requirement recognizes and accepts the idea and recommendation of the representatives of the Committee on Accident Prevention of the American Academy of Pediatrics that the greatest need, for protection against child injury from using toys and other articles, is the projection, in original manufacture, of engineering standards for safety, built-in safety, fail-safe products, and fail-safe design.

Unquestionably, authoritative experience and testimony tends to clearly and impressively show that this is the best practical and comprehensive way to insure, as much as we reasonably can, that children are protected from substantial injury or illness from the use of toys and other articles commonly associated with their daily life activity.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt, from the expert testimony presented here, that there is urgent need for this child protection legislation; the requirements being placed upon manufacturers and the investigating and regulating duties and costs imposed upon the Federal agencies involved are entirely reasonable and unquestionably the legislation is in the national interest. Let us, therefore, recog-

nize the urgency and reasonableness of this legislative proposal on behalf of the Nation's children and adopt it without extended delay.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more tragic than the needless injury to a child caused from hazardous elements in his own personal toys. Yet manufacturers continue to mass produce toys that are potential killers and innocent parents eagerly purchase them for the ones they love most.

Dangers in children's toys have sparked a wave of concern throughout our Nation. Letters pour into the Department of Consumer Affairs, the U.S. Public Health Service, toy manufacturers, and into each of our offices stating incidents of injury and begging for help in controlling this monstrous situation.

We only have to list some of the harsh facts to realize the graveness that prevails. Seventeen million children a year are reported injured in some way by using unsafe toys. Fifteen thousand children have already been killed and of these more than 50 percent had not yet reached their fifth birthday.

It is very possible that right at this very moment a toy which is making a little girl laugh will be that which takes her life. A lovable doll easily has a flammable face, sharp pins holding on its hair and some spiked mechanism turning its head. A young boy's delight, a self-propelled space rocket, is often made with protruding fins and jagged points which readily pierce the skin. A collapsible tunnel, a toy tent, a playhouse can easily turn into an inferno caused by the combustibility of the unheated fabric.

I am sure that no manufacturer deliberately makes a product to intentionally hurt or kill the person we want to use it. But children and parents are often unaware of a toy's intended use and its potential dangers. Indeed, in our advanced technological society we should feel free to purchase the many appealing toys without being compelled to dissect and test their safeness. America's products on the open market must have the confidence of the consumer.

Manufacturers can easily eliminate hazards in toys by redesigning them. The toys will still be just as creative, just as sophisticated, just as alluring and just as cherished by children using them. It is quite apparent that simple precautions can save a life or stop a physical impairment without costing this imaginative industry any dollars.

Safety is not solely the responsibility of the manufacturer, it is the responsibility of every citizen.

Protection for consumers was first sought in 1960 with passage of the Federal Hazardous Labeling Act making it mandatory to fully label products. Amendments in 1966 strengthened this act by providing the authority to ban certain toys and products from the market.

Despite the steps already taken current laws do not adequately protect children. Many injuries are caused by electric shock, sharp edges, asphyxiation, overheating, and suffocation. The bill presently before the House, the Child Protection Act of 1969 will complete the gap

left unfinished by the 1966 law. When passed, toys and other articles intended for use by children will be banned if they have electrical and mechanical devices and flammable elements that in any way cause injury to a child. The Child Protection Act of 1969 offers our Nation the necessary legislative protection. Harmful toys will be kept out of the arms of small children.

We in the U.S. Congress must act now in providing better protection. Time is not on our side, for every moment we wait the bell tolls for the lives of innocent children. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to pass this bill.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to indicate my support for the bill now under consideration despite the fact that I am not in agreement with some of the changes which the committee made in the bill which I introduced and the bill which already has passed the other body.

By far the most significant difference in the bill which the Senate passed and the one which we are now considering relates to the procedure to be utilized by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in banning a hazardous toy or other article intended for use by children. The major purpose of the Child Protection Act of 1969 as sponsored by myself and others, was to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act relating to banned hazardous substances to permit the Secretary by regulation to eliminate from interstate commerce any toys of products to be used by children which have electrical, thermal, or mechanical hazards. In my view, the bill which we now are considering is superior to the one passed by the Senate earlier this year and the one which I cosponsored in one respect only: its definitions of thermal, electrical, and mechanical hazards are preferable because of their relative simplicity.

The Child Protection Act of 1969, as passed by the Senate, provides for an informal rulemaking determination by the Secretary pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 554, while the bill we are now considering requires a formal proceeding pursuant to section 701 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. I firmly believe that the version passed by the Senate and the language which I included in the bill which I sponsored is vastly preferable to this procedure. The procedure which is contained in H.R. 7621 might in fact severely impair the effectiveness of the statute. I base this conclusion on the fact that the procedure contained in the House bill for getting a hazardous toy off the shelves would require a lengthy trial-type proceeding with respect to the banning of every toy which the Secretary decided was hazardous. In view of the acknowledged lack of personnel and funds available to the Food and Drug Administration, which under both bills would enforce the statute, the administrative burden of such elongated proceedings would be substantial. Under a similar procedure now found in the Federal Hazardous Substances Act—but not now applicable to toys—only one hazardous household product, a floor wax has been

banned from the marketplace since 1966. A second product—carbon tetrachloride—has been involved in a morass of administrative proceedings for over a year.

I believe the procedures set forth in my bill, and incidentally in H.R. 7621 as originally sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the committee, are much more desirable in view of the structure of the toy industry. We all can appreciate the fact that a substantial portion of all toys sold are sold during a short 2- or 3-month period immediately prior to the Christmas holidays. The lengthy administrative procedure which is required by H.R. 7621 as reported by the committee would make it impossible, in many situations, to remove toys from the marketplace before they had passed into the hands of consumers.

I recognize full well that H.R. 7621 as it is now written does provide that the Secretary may ban a toy pending completion of administrative hearings if he finds an "imminent hazard," the use of this provision may well be limited by administrative fear of court reversal in all but the most severely hazardous situations. I believe that in the case of children, the burden of proof should not be so heavy on administrative officials charged with their protection. For these reasons, I urge the committee to reconsider its position as to the procedures it has outlined for banning hazardous toys from the marketplace.

I will not go into an exhaustive list of the toys which just cursory examination by the Commission on Product Safety found to be hazardous to the lives and limbs of our children. They are all there in the record of the hearings and the committee report. Also, I will not go into the ineffective manner in which the toy industry has regulated itself. This too is contained in the hearings record. One thing which is not contained in the hearings record in either body is testimony by anyone supporting the change which the committee has made in the procedure which the Secretary can employ in taking these hazardous toys off the shelves. I find this implausible at best. Where did this bill come from with its new procedure? There is no record of it ever having been discussed.

Our children will not be protected from hazardous toys by the old way of taking these toys out of the marketplace just as they will not be protected by the old doctrines and comforting presumptions. Caveat emptor will not protect the children of this Nation from injurious toys. Neither will these children be protected by the Underwriter's Laboratory seal, the Good Housekeeping Seal or the approval of the Parent's magazine. I am not under the illusion that we can protect the consumer public through legislation alone. We must do two things additionally. We must pass laws which prod the enforcement agencies who are charged with the implementation of the legislation into realizing that they must enforce the law. In this respect, I believe we should avoid wherever possible the long drawn out rulemaking procedures which are included in H.R. 7621. Second, we must create an atmosphere where

these enforcement agencies are not timid about asking for additional power. This also would not be enhanced by the bill we are now considering. However, because I believe so strongly that something has to be done to take hazardous toys off the market, I will support this bill in the hope that the conference committee will act to make this Child Protection Act of 1969 more protective of the lives and limbs of our children.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation becomes readily apparent when one considers the fact that of the nearly 56 million U.S. children under 15 years of age, more than 15,000 die each year from accidents, a rate of 28 per 100,000 population. This figure is higher than the combined number of deaths from cancer, contagious diseases, and heart disease for this age group. More than half of the number of children who died as a result of accidents in 1967 were preschool children.

Of the 20 million nonfatal accidents that occur in and around the home, 10 million affect children under the age of 16. Stationary outdoor recreational equipment used by younger children is estimated to cause an exceedingly high injury toll: 500,000 from swings; 200,000 from slides; 50,000 from seesaws.

Injuries involving children's mobile equipment are estimated to total 1,300,000 each year, with 1 million of these attributable to bicycles and resulting in 120,000 fractures and 60,000 concussions and another 100,000 related to tricycles.

There is a definite need for additional legislation to protect our children against hazards found in various toys and other articles intended for use by youngsters. Too many unreasonably hazardous articles for children are for sale in the marketplace today. Hardly any industry standards exist to deal with their design and manufacture. Passage of H.R. 7621 would go a long way toward providing a safer environment for our children.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the Child Protection Act of 1969.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, all time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7621

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

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Child Protection Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(f)1 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f) (1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) Any toy or other article intended for use by children which presents an electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard."

(b) Section 2(q) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(q)) is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (A) of subparagraph (1) is amended by inserting "as defined in clause

(A), (B), or (C) of subparagraph 1 of paragraph (f) or in subparagraph 2 of such paragraph" immediately after "which is a hazardous substance"; and by inserting "such" after "bears or contains".

(2) Subparagraph (1) is amended by striking out "or (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) any toy or other article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance as defined in clause (D) of subparagraph 1 of paragraph (f) of this section, and which the Secretary by regulation classifies as a 'banned hazardous substance' on the basis of a finding that, notwithstanding such cautionary labeling as is or may be required under this Act for that toy or article, the degree or nature of the hazard involved is such that the objective of the protection of the public health and safety can be adequately served only by keeping such toy or article out of the channels of interstate commerce; or (C)".

(3) Subparagraph (2) is amended—
(A) by inserting "or (C)" immediately after "clause (B)";

(B) by striking out "Provided, That" and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "In the case of any toy or other article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance described in clause (B) of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph if the Secretary finds that its distribution presents an imminent hazard to the public health, he may by order published in the Federal Register give notice of such finding, and thereupon it shall be deemed to be a 'banned hazardous substance' pending the completion of proceedings relating to the issuance of regulations pursuant to such clause. In the case of any hazardous substance described in clause (C) of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph,"; and

(C) by striking out "issuance of such regulations" and inserting in lieu thereof "issuance of regulations pursuant to such clause".

(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) An article may be determined to present an electrical hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture may cause personal injury or illness by electric shock.

"(s) An article may be determined to present a mechanical hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture presents an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness (1) from fracture, fragmentation, or disassembly of the article, (2) from populsion of the article (or any part or accessory thereof), (3) from points or other protrusions, surfaces, edges, openings, or closures, (4) from moving parts, (5) from lack or insufficiency of controls to reduce or step motion, (6) as a result of self-adhering characteristics of the article, (7) because the article (or any part or accessory thereof) may be aspirated or ingested, (8) because of instability, or (9) because of any other aspect of the article's design or manufacture.

"(t) An article may be determined to present a thermal hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture presents an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness because of heat as from heated parts, substances, or surfaces."

Sec. 3. (a) Subparagraph 1(A) of section 2(f) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "or combustible" after "flammable".

(b) Section 2(l) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and the term" and inserting in lieu thereof "the term";

(2) by inserting before the semicolon the

following: ", and the term 'combustible' shall apply to any substance which has a flash point above eighty degrees Fahrenheit to and including one hundred and fifty degrees, as determined by the Tagliabue Open Cup Tester";

(3) by inserting "or combustibility" after "flammability"; and

(4) by inserting ", 'combustible,'" after "the terms 'flammable'".

(c) Section 2(p)(1)(E) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(p)(1)(E)) is amended by inserting "'Combustible,'" after "'Flammable,'".

Sec. 4. (a) The Federal Hazardous Substances Act is amended by redesignating sections 15, 16, 17, and 18 as sections 16, 17, 18, and 19, respectively, and by inserting after section 14 the following new section:

"REPURCHASE OF BANNED HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES"

"Sec. 15. (a) In the case of any article or substance sold by its manufacturer, distributor, or dealer which is a banned hazardous substance (whether or not it was such at the time of its sale), such article or substance shall, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be repurchased as follows:

"(1) The manufacturer of any such article or substance shall repurchase it from the person to whom he sold it, and shall—

"(A) refund that person the purchase price paid for such article or substance,

"(B) if that person has repurchased such article or substance pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3), reimburse him for any amounts paid in accordance with that paragraph for the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase,

"(C) if the manufacturer requires the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase of it in accordance with this paragraph, reimburse that person for any reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in returning it to the manufacturer.

"(2) The distributor of any such article or substance shall repurchase it from the person to whom he sold it, and shall—

"(A) refund that person the purchase price paid for such article or substance,

"(B) if that person has repurchased such article or substance pursuant to paragraph (3), reimburse him for any amounts paid in accordance with that paragraph for the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase,

"(C) if the distributor requires the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase of it in accordance with this paragraph, reimburse that person for any reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in returning it to the distributor.

"(3) In the case of any such article or substance sold at retail by a dealer, if the person who purchased it from the dealer returns it to him, the dealer shall refund the purchaser the purchase price paid for it and reimburse him for any reasonable and necessary transportation charges incurred in its return.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, (1) the term 'manufacturer' includes an importer for resale, and (2) a dealer who sells at wholesale an article or substance shall with respect to that sale be considered the distributor of that article or substance."

(b)(1) Subsection (a) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 18 is amended by striking out "section 18" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 19".

(2) The section of such Act redesignated as section 19 is amended by striking out "section 16(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 17(b)".

Sec. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading).
Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent

that the committee amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7621) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 516, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. 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 327, nays 0, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]
YEAS—327

Abbott	Bow	Carter
Abernethy	Brasco	Casey
Adams	Bray	Cederberg
Addabbo	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Albert	Brooks	Chappell
Anderson,	Broomfield	Clancy
Calif.	Brozman	Clark
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Calif.	Clay
Annuzio	Brown, Mich.	Cobelan
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Collier
Ashbrook	Broyhill, Va.	Collins
Ashley	Buchanan	Colmer
Aspinall	Burke, Fla.	Conable
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Conte
Beall, Md.	Burleson, Tex.	Conyers
Belcher	Burlison, Mo.	Coughlin
Bell, Calif.	Burton, Calif.	Cowger
Bennett	Burton, Utah	Cramer
Betts	Bush	Cunningham
Bevill	Button	Daddario
Blester	Byrne, Pa.	Daniel, Va.
Bingham	Byrnes, Wis.	Daniels, N.J.
Blackburn	Cabell	Davis, Wis.
Boland	Caffery	de la Garza
Bolling	Camp	Delaney

Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fasell
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallifanakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Horton
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen

Kee
Keith
King
Klepe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Molloy
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Plrnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rallsback
Randall

Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shiplev
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Tait
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—104

Adair
Alexander
Anderson,
Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ayres
Baring
Berry
Biaggi
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Brademas
Brock

Broyhill, N.C.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chisholm
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Corman
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell

Dulski
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Flynt
Foley
Garmatz
Gilbert
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.

Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hollfield
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Kirwan
Kyl
Landgrebe
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens

McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Melcher
Michel
Mills
Morton
Myers
Obey
O'Konski
Olsen
Passman
Patman
Pollock
Powell
Quillen
Rees
Reifel
Rivers
Rooney, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.
Saylor
Scherle
Snyder
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
White
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wold
Wolff
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Johnson of Penn-
sylvania.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Wolf with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Hollfield with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Don H.
Clausen.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr.
Pollock.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Young with Mr. Broyhill of North
Carolina.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Andrews of North
Dakota.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. Heckler
of Massachusetts.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Steiger of Wiscon-
sin.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Flynt with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Hanley.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. White with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Passman of Louisiana with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 516, the Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1689.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1689

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 "Toy Safety Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(f)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(D) Any toy or other article intended for use by children which the Secretary finds pursuant to the provisions of section 2(q)(1) of this Act meets the requirements of clause (A)(iii) of such section."

(b) The matter preceding the semicolon in clause (A) of section 2(q)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(q)(1)) is amended to read as follows: "(A) any toy, or other article intended for use by children, which, pursuant to a determination made by the Secretary in accordance with section 553, title 5, United States Code, (i) is a hazardous substance, or (ii) bears or contains a hazardous substance in such manner as to be susceptible of access by a child to whom such toy or other article is entrusted, or (iii) is otherwise hazardous because it presents electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards".

(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) The term 'electrical' means of or pertaining to the flow of an electrical charge or to electrons in motion; an article may be determined to present an 'electrical hazard' if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture may cause personal injury or illness by electric shock resulting from current leakage, inadequate insulation, accessibility of live parts, or other conditions.

"(s) The term 'mechanical' means of or pertaining to the design, construction or structure of a substance; an article may be determined to present a 'mechanical hazard' if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture presents an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness by strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, fragmentation, explosion, puncture, or other mechanical means.

"(t) The term 'thermal' means of or pertaining to the transfer or manifestation of heat energy; an article may be determined to present a 'thermal hazard' if it has surfaces or parts normally touched, hand held, or grasped which exceed a temperature of 113° Fahrenheit (or 140° Fahrenheit in the case of surfaces other than metal), or if it has surfaces or parts exceeding 140° Fahrenheit (in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse) which may be touched accidentally, causing personal injury or illness. However, articles which have parts or surfaces exceeding a temperature of 140° Fahrenheit which may be touched accidentally and are not normally touched, hand held, or grasped shall not be found to present a 'thermal hazard' if the following three conditions are met: (1) the article requires such surfaces or parts in order to perform the normal function or purpose of the article; and (2) the article bears labeling giving directions and warnings for safe use, and (3) because of such labeling and warnings or other factors the article is likely to be used only by children who will comprehend the warning and use the toy safely. Temperature tests shall be made

at an ambient (room) temperature of 77° Fahrenheit (25° C.)."

Sec. 3. (a) Subparagraph 1(A) of section 2(f) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "or combustible" after "flammable".

(b) Section 2(f) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)) is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "the term 'flammable'"; (2) by inserting the following before the semicolon: ", and the term 'combustible' shall apply to any substance which has a flash point above eighty degrees Fahrenheit to and including one hundred fifty degrees as determined by the Tagliabue Open Cup Tester"; (3) by inserting "or combustibility" after "flammability"; and (4) by inserting "combustible," after "flammable".

(c) Section 2(p)(1)(E) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(p)(1)(E)) is amended by inserting "Combustible," after "Flammable".

Sec. 4. Section 2(q) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(q)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) If any substance or article is determined to be a banned hazardous substance after the sale of such substance or article by a manufacturer or a distributor to a distributor or a dealer and prior to the sale of such substance or article by such dealer or distributor, the distributor shall immediately repurchase such substance or article at the price paid by such dealer, plus the transportation charges involved, and the manufacturer shall immediately repurchase from the distributor (or from the dealer if there is no distributor) such substance or article unsold or repurchased at the price paid, plus all transportation charges involved."

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 5. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1689 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 7621, as passed, as follows:

"Section 1. This act may be cited as the 'Child Protection Act of 1969'.

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 2(f)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) Any toy or other article intended for use by children which presents an electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard."

"(b) Section 2(q) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(q)) is amended as follows:

"(1) Clause (A) of subparagraph (1) is amended by inserting 'as defined in clause (A), (B), or (C) of subparagraph 1 of paragraph (f) or in subparagraph 2 of such paragraph' immediately after 'which is a hazardous substance'; and by inserting 'such' after 'bears or contains'.

"(2) Subparagraph (1) is amended by striking out 'or (B)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(B) any toy or other article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance as defined in clause (D) of subparagraph 1 of paragraph (f) of this section, and which the Secretary by regulation classifies as a 'banned hazardous substance' on the basis of a finding that, notwithstanding such cautionary labeling as is or may be required under this Act for that toy or article, the degree or nature of the hazard involved is such that the objective of the protection of the public health and safety can be adequately served only by keeping such toy or article out of the channels of interstate commerce; or (C)'.

"(3) Subparagraph (2) is amended—

"(A) by inserting 'or (C)' immediately after 'clause (B)';

"(B) by striking out: 'Provided, That' and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: 'In the case of any toy or other

article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance described in clause (B) of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph, if the Secretary finds that its distribution presents an imminent hazard to the public health, he may by order published in the Federal Register give notice of such finding, and thereupon it shall be deemed to be a 'banned hazardous substance' pending the completion of proceedings relating to the issuance of regulations pursuant to such clause. In the case of any hazardous substance described in clause (C) of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph; and

"(C) by striking out 'issuance of such regulations' and inserting in lieu thereof 'issuance of regulations pursuant to such clause'.

"(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) An article may be determined to present an electrical hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture may cause personal injury or illness by electric shock.

"(s) An article may be determined to present a mechanical hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture presents an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness (1) from fracture, fragmentation, or disassembly of the article, (2) from propulsion of the article (or any part or accessory thereof), (3) from points or other protrusions, surfaces, edges, openings, or closures, (4) from moving parts, (5) from lack or insufficiency of controls to reduce or stop motion, (6) as a result of self-adhering characteristics of the article, (7) because the article (or any part or accessory thereof) may be aspirated or ingested, (8) because of instability, or (9) because of any other aspect of the article's design or manufacture.

"(t) An article may be determined to present a thermal hazard if, in normal use or when subjected to reasonably foreseeable damage or abuse, its design or manufacture presents an unreasonable risk of personal injury or illness because of heat as from heated parts, substances, or surfaces."

"Sec. 3. (a) Subparagraph 1(A) of section 2(f) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting 'or combustible' after 'flammable'.

"(b) Section 2(l) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(l)) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and the term' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the term';

"(2) by inserting before the semicolon the following: ', and the term "combustible" shall apply to any substance which has a flash point above eighty degrees Fahrenheit to and including one hundred and fifty degrees, as determined by the Tagliabue Open Cup Tester';

"(3) by inserting 'or combustibility' after 'flammability'; and

"(4) by inserting ', "combustible";' after 'the terms "flammable"'.

"(c) Section 2(p)(1)(E) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(p)(E)) is amended by inserting "Combustible," after "Flammable".

"Sec. 4. (a) The Federal Hazardous Substances Act is amended by redesignating sections 15, 16, 17, and 18 as sections 16, 17, 18, and 19, respectively, and by inserting after section 14 the following new section:

"REPURCHASE OF BANNED HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

"Sec. 15. (a) In the case of any article or substance sold by its manufacturer, distributor, or dealer which is a banned hazardous substance (whether or not it was such at the time of its sale), such article or substance shall, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be repurchased as follows:

"(1) The manufacturer of any such article or substance shall repurchase it from the person to whom he sold it, and shall—

"(A) refund that person the purchase price paid for such article or substance,

"(B) if that person has repurchased such article or substance pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3), reimburse him for any amounts paid in accordance with that paragraph for the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase.

"(C) if the manufacturer requires the return of such article or substance in connection with his repurchase of it in accordance with this paragraph, reimburse that person for any reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in returning it to the manufacturer.

"(2) The distributor of any such article or substance shall repurchase it from the person to whom he sold it, and shall—

"(A) refund that person the purchase price paid for such article or substance,

"(B) if that person has repurchased such article or substance pursuant to paragraph (3), reimburse him for any amounts paid in accordance with that paragraph for the return of such article or substance in connection with its repurchase.

"(C) if the distributor requires the return of such article or substance in connection with his repurchase of it in accordance with this paragraph, reimburse that person for any reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in returning it to the distributor.

"(3) In the case of any such article or substance sold at retail by a dealer, if the person who purchased it from the dealer returns it to him, the dealer shall refund the purchaser the purchase price paid for it and reimburse him for any reasonable and necessary transportation charges incurred in its return.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, (1) the term "manufacturer" includes an importer for resale, and (2) a dealer who sells at wholesale an article or substance shall with respect to that sale be considered the distributor of that article or substance."

"(b) (1) Subsection (a) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 18 is amended by striking out 'section 18' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 19'.

"(2) The section of such Act redesignated as section 19 is amended by striking out 'section 16(b)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 17(b)'.

"Sec. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 7621) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING SECTION 104 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12085) to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The

question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12085, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the committee and we recommend its passage by the House. The bill would extend for 1 year, with limitations, the authority for appropriations contained in section 104 of the Clean Air Act. The other body has already passed a bill on this subject. We believe this bill should be passed before the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is finally passed by the Congress so that the programs authorized under this bill can be contained in that appropriation act.

Section 104 of the Clean Air Act, which expired June 30, 1969, authorized appropriations specifically earmarked for research into air pollution problems involving fuels and motor vehicles.

As amended by the committee, the bill extends this authority for 1 year, so that the authorization will expire at the same time as the authorization for all other programs under that act—June 30, 1970. The bill authorizes \$18.7 million in appropriations for section 104 programs for fiscal 1970. This is the same amount the agency had for this purpose in 1969.

We do not expect that passage of the bills will involve any increase in appropriations since there is already authority under other provisions of law for appropriations in excess of those contained in the HEW appropriations bill as passed by the House. Passage of this bill will permit earmarking of funds in the regular HEW appropriation bill for this program, which will not be possible unless this bill is passed.

There is no question but that this bill increases the authorization for total appropriation for fiscal year 1970. The current total appropriation authorization is \$134,300,000. This bill will add an additional \$18.7 million to that authorization, for a total of \$153 million; however, we do not anticipate any increase in the appropriation requests as heretofore submitted by the administration nor do we expect a supplemental appropriation for any of these sums to be requested. As I mentioned earlier, we anticipate that some of the funds contained in the regular appropriation bill will be specifically earmarked for the section 104 programs authorized by this bill, authorizing appropriations for programs under section 104 of the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Chairman, the principal reason for this bill is twofold—first, section 104

represents a clear commitment on the part of the Federal Government to conduct research in joint Government-industry programs into air pollution problems involving the combustion of fuels and the operation of motor vehicles. Second, section 104 contains two authorities with respect to research which are not contained in other provisions of the Clean Air Act: First, authority for funds to remain available until expended which aids orderly planning for research programs; and, second, clear authority for Federal payment of construction costs of industrial-type facilities on private property, which can then be disposed of to the owner of the property. This authority is quite similar to authority of the Department of Defense in this research area.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, hearings were held on this bill, and all witnesses were in favor of the bill. I know of no opposition to the legislation, and the committee was unanimous in recommending its passage to the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the 90th Congress passed the most comprehensive air pollution control act thus far. We called it the Air Quality Act, and it was a sweeping amendment to the Clean Air Act. Included therein was a provision for extensive research on fuels and motor vehicles.

It was the feeling at that time that the ultimate answer to our largest contributor to air pollution—the automobile—lay in extensive research. Since that time the committee has discovered that priority has been given to research on sulfur oxides in order to complete and issue the criteria necessary for suppression of most of the industrial pollution. The committee in the hearings and in the report expresses its opinion that more should be done to find the answers to automotive pollution since it probably accounts for 60 percent of the entire problem.

It is the expressed contention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to expend \$18.7 million for this purpose during fiscal year 1970. Since the authorization for this particular activity extended only through 1969, it is now necessary that it be extended if the authorities therein are to be used. The other programs included in the Air Quality Act will run out at the end of fiscal year 1970, and for that reason a 1-year extension only is included in this bill. In this way all of the programs will expire at the same time, and it will give the committee and the Congress an opportunity to again evaluate the research effort which is being made. We are hopeful that a more encouraging report can be made when this legislation again comes before us.

I recommend this bill to my colleagues in the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to speak in favor of passage of H.R. 12085, the purpose of which is to extend for 1 year—fiscal 1970—the authority contained in section 104 of the Clean Air Act, as amended. This section authorizes research and development by

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels and the operation of motor vehicles.

In adopting the Air Quality Act of 1967, the Congress set up an intergovernmental system for dealing with the problems of air pollution on a regional basis. State and local governments were given a major share of responsibility in making this system work, by dealing with air pollution arising from industrial, commercial, and other stationary sources located in virtually every urban community in this Nation, as well as in many small towns and rural areas.

The activities of State and local agencies in preventing and controlling these stationary sources of air pollution depend in large part on the availability of practical and economic techniques. Similarly, the national program of regulatory action to control motor vehicle pollution depends on progress in developing appropriate control techniques.

It is essential that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continue the research and development activities authorized by the Air Quality Act, especially those activities under section 104 relating to air pollution problems caused by the combustion of fossil fuels to produce electric heat and power and from the operation of motor vehicles. These sources account for more than two-thirds of the Nation's yearly air pollution.

Section 104 also reflects the need for extensive involvement of the private sector in the search for solutions to these problems. For example, the effort to develop and demonstrate techniques for sulfur oxides pollution control under section 104 is a coordinated Government-industry program which involves the National Air Pollution Control Administration, several other Federal agencies, and more than 40 organizations in the private sector. Also, under section 104, the National Air Pollution Control Administration is conducting research and development on motor vehicle pollution control. This effort includes continued attempts to develop improved emissions control from the internal combustion engine as well as initial work on the development of alternative propulsion systems for motor vehicles.

Section 104 provides two unique authorities not explicitly provided in the rest of the Air Quality Act. The first such feature is that funds made available under this section can remain available until expended. This flexibility is very useful in planning and scheduling large-scale research and development projects.

The second unique feature of section 104 is that it clarifies the legal implications of supporting projects which involve construction and testing of air pollution control equipment on private property. In many instances, industrial or utility power plants are the best possible sites for making realistic evaluations of economic and technological feasibility of new processes in air pollution control.

Favorable action on H.R. 12085 would reaffirm the Federal Government's commitment to providing leadership in the Nation's efforts to develop ways to overcome the growing threat of air pollution.

The Federal Government cannot and should not be expected to take all the responsibility, but it must continue to lead the attack. Enactment of H.R. 12085 will show that the Federal commitment to clean air remains as strong as ever.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with this legislation. However, I would like to direct the attention of the Committee to what I believe is a necessary approach to the critical air pollution problem confronting urban areas in which heavy, basic industries are located. In these communities, air pollution imposes incredible damage on human life and property.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that the industrial air pollution problem is something that could be best solved on an industry-by-industry basis rather than by leaving the entire complex burden of regulation on local communities. A steel mill or petro-chemical industry operates in almost the same manner wherever it is located. The pollution problems are the same in the same industrial operation. The methods of control or nuisance abatement are the same. Industry-wide standards of abatement or control could be uniformly adopted on Federal recommendations for a specific industry. Polluting industries would not be able to compete on inferior, low-cost abatement procedures tolerated by some communities indifferent to the problem. Such competition is unfair and detrimental to the public interest.

I feel that insofar as industrial pollution is concerned the time has come for this Congress to set on a course of an industry-by-industry approach so that industries and communities are not competing with each other on the basis of what they fail to do with respect to controlling the air pollution problem.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the present program will be amplified and extended so that we may approach this problem on an industry-by-industry basis and so that we can clean up the air, especially in our urban areas where so much industrial air pollution occurs to the detriment of the public health.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, residents of California's 28th District, which I represent, know well the problems created by unclean air, and they understand the immediate urgency for finding new methods to curb the growing threat of air pollution.

I believe that leadership in providing such research must come from the Federal Government.

The Los Angeles air quality control region includes seven counties.

Pollutant emissions from Los Angeles County alone, however, account for over 60 percent of the total regional emissions.

The largest single source of air pollution in Los Angeles is from transportation.

In fact, more than 80 percent of pollution in Los Angeles results from the use of motor vehicles.

Nationally, motor vehicle exhausts ac-

count for 60 percent of the air pollution problem.

Yet, as the committee has pointed out in its report, little over 3 percent of the national air pollution control administration's budget has been spent on research in this area.

I believe the agency must clearly re-evaluate its budgetary priorities.

And I am confident that my constituents would share the committee's observation that the small proportion of the agency's budget devoted to motor vehicle emissions has been less than the urgency of the problem would indicate.

We have the highest population density in the Los Angeles air quality control region.

Approximately one-half of the freeway system and one-half of the total surface transportation facilities of the region will soon be located in Los Angeles County.

These factors clearly indicate that well over half of the total pollution from mobile sources occurs in the Los Angeles Basin.

In recent years there has been some progress in reducing pollution from motor vehicles.

But the industry has not yet developed an emission-free vehicle.

We must not neglect the possibility that some alternate propulsion system to the present internal combustion engine may be necessary to keep the pollution problem under control.

Existing techniques for the control of pollution from automobiles are clearly inadequate for Los Angeles.

I believe that clean air will be restored to our urban centers only through the development of new techniques.

Extension of section 104 affirms our desire to secure better methods of control, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support for H.R. 12085.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that the gentleman will be here when the bill is read for amendment, because I propose offering an amendment to prohibit the manufacturing of internal emission engines after 1978 unless they comply with the California law which says that the State will bar automobiles unless they have standards of emission that equals that adopted by the State for the purchase of automobiles and I hope that the gentleman will be here.

Mr. BELL of California. I will certainly be here, and will be happy to listen to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this legislation to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuels and vehicles for 1 year.

This legislation would enable the National Air Pollution Control Administration to continue for another fiscal year, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, its research and development ac-

tivity in the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels.

Section 104 differs from the other provisions of the Clean Air Act in that funds made available under this section can remain available until expended, thereby providing flexibility which is extremely useful in the planning and scheduling of large scale research and development and demonstration projects. Too, this section clarifies the legal implication of supporting projects involving construction and testing of pollution control equipment on private property such as the use of industrial or utility powerplants.

Enactment of H.R. 12085 will not result in any increase in the National Air Pollution Control Administration's proposed budget for the present fiscal year. Funds have already been requested in the budget under section 309 of the Air Quality Act, but separate appropriation under section 104 is desirable for the aforementioned reasons and H.R. 12085 would make this possible.

We are far from victory in our efforts to clean up the air around us, but we must not relent and this legislation will permit us to continue in our quest for cleaner air for all.

I believe it is essential for us to pass the legislation, because we want to have the kind of research work done that is required.

Mr. Chairman, along the line of the use of funds, I believe it may be interesting to the Members to know that the committee did go into specifics on that, and expressed great concern, which I share, as to the allocation of the research funds in relation to the problem of air pollution. For instance, it is estimated that 60 percent of the air pollution problems of the country come from automobile emissions—60 percent—and yet do you know the amount of the research funds which are being allocated to solve the 60 percent? About 3.4 percent of the \$88,733,000 appropriated to the agency for air pollution.

We have taken this up in the committee hearings with the agency and expressed the concern of the committee on the disproportionate allotment of the research funds in relation to the actual problem which exists.

I am sure that the committee will follow this up so that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will begin to allocate its funds more in proportion with the problem that actually exists. If not, I believe we are going to have to take some steps to change it ourselves. But I do think this will come about, and I would certainly hope so, because our major problem is this vehicle emission. We hope they are getting into effective research now in trying to bring about an emission-free propulsion system for vehicles.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to add one thought to the gentleman's concept, and that is that there is a great deal of urgency in the Los Angeles

County area, very, very strong urgency. So I would urge that the committee move with all haste in this direction.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would concur with the statement of the gentleman from California. I think the committee has made it clear that we expect action from the Department on this, and as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BELL of California. The gentleman may or may not know that the State legislature in California almost passed legislation that would accomplish that which the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) suggested during his presentation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I understand that, and I presume that the California Legislature in its judgment did not take that action because they thought it was better to try to meet the problem through research, and to encourage achieving a solution to the problem rather than to see everybody start walking.

I am not sure that the public would want to make that choice.

Mr. BELL of California. Does the gentleman believe that the automobile industry is doing all it can to develop new forms of emission prevention and abatement?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I will not say that I know personally they are doing everything they can, but from the information the committee has, I do think emphasis is being placed on this problem by the automobile companies and by the Government as well. I think this will accelerate the finding of some new type of such engines.

Mr. BELL of California. I certainly hope the gentleman is correct because it is going to be a real problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we have to have action and I agree with the gentleman.

Let me say also that we expressed concern in the committee on the problems of exhaust—of diesel exhaust from buses and large trucks. Now we have been told that we can expect the 1970 models of these diesel vehicles to have emission control devices on them. The committee intends to follow that up because I think this is a very severe problem that has not been dealt with—many people have been talking about automobiles or motors for private passenger travel rather than talking of buses and big trucks which I think is just as much a problem and contributes to the overall problem.

So we are trying to emphasize these things.

Mr. BELL of California. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I wonder if the gentleman's subcommittee in its wisdom has prompted the administrative agencies and those expending the research and development funds, towards the problem of noxious gases in closed spaces emitted by inconsiderate fellow human beings?

Have you done anything with reference to human emission by some in closed spaces? To me this is a more serious problem than others, to have a hu-

man venting cigarette and cigar and pipe smoke in a confined or closed space, where those who may be allergic or supersensitive to smoke so far as his eyelids or mucous membranes are concerned.

I dare say, as a man who has been skilled in the past in lung surgery or black lung disease and white lung disease and problems of silicosis and pneumoconiosis and anthracosis—and all of these other examples of air vented contamination in closed spaces by unthinking people, many of whom all light up at the same time their wish-fulfillment of expectant death, immediately when the smoking light goes on in an airplane, whereas they are perhaps unthinking—but their nonparticipating fellow passengers cannot escape—not even by going into the often scrubbed and many times air-cleansed bathrooms aboard such conveyances—and this applies even in private cars, buses, and other closed spaces.

I wonder if the committee has done anything to see if we can increase the scrub rate or decrease that kind of contamination emitted by human ventration in closed spaces—and if not, I strongly recommend it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and concur in saying that something needs to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my strong support of H.R. 12085, the bill we are considering today.

This bill specifically deals with section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1967, a section directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research and development programs to improve methods and techniques currently in use for the abatement and control of air pollution generated by the combustion of fossil fuels. It directs the Secretary to conduct a similar program relating to automotive emission control.

A special feature of this bill is that allocated funds can remain available until used, without being tied to the specific fiscal year in which they were appropriated. This means that research and development programs can be executed properly without undue haste or errors, that they can be initiated at the most advantageous time. Therefore, the National Air Pollution Control Administration, the responsible HEW agency, can select the best possible contractors or grantees for a given undertaking.

Under the Air Quality Act of 1967, funds authorized for fiscal year 1968 totalled \$35 million, and for 1969, \$90 million, with the funds authorized for section 104 projects to remain available until expended. However, these appropriations will expire at the end of fiscal year 1969 unless an amendment to the act is passed to preserve them.

Following the enactment of the Air Quality Act in November of 1967, the National Air Pollution Control Administration developed techniques to prevent and control sulfur oxides pollution, a major pollutant resulting largely from the combustion of fossil fuels.

In the area of automotive air pollution control, the agency conducts a program to improve control devices for

abating emissions from the internal combustion engine, and has embarked on a program of developing alternative propulsion systems for automobiles.

To continue these programs and initiate new ones, the agency must be assured of continuing use of its fund beyond the arbitrary deadline of the 1969 fiscal year. An extension of the section 104 provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967 thus is mandatory at this time. I therefore sincerely urge all my colleagues to endorse H.R. 12085 now to provide for this essential continuity.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for this legislation—H.R. 12085—seeking to amend the Air Quality Act of 1967 and to extend the program of research on fuels and vehicles. Progress is being made in this field. Momentum for abatement actions is building up. New technology is becoming available. Therefore, we cannot afford any lapse in technical effort simply because of a quirk in the existing law. The bill which we are considering is necessary to remedy a time deadline arbitrarily imposed on an important research clause in the act.

When we unanimously passed the Air Quality Act in November, 1967, we established a system for dealing with air pollution problems on a regional basis, charging State and local governments with major responsibility for the implementation of the various provisions contained in the act. To do so, however, the States depend on information—information made available by the Federal Government—on up-to-date feasible and economical technology for the prevention and control of air pollution stemming from stationary sources such as factories and powerplants, and from motor vehicle engines. In the long run, we may very well need the development of automotive propulsion systems other than the present internal combustion engine.

Today, more than two-thirds of all pollution emitted into the Nation's air is generated by combustion of fossil fuels and by the operation of ever-increasing numbers of motor vehicles. It is critical that Federal research, development, and demonstration activities in this field be allowed to continue without lapse. Under section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the National Air Pollution Control Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is carrying out numerous projects to develop efficient techniques for combatting sulfur oxide pollution, a major pollution problem arising from the combustion of fossil fuels. It also continues to improve methods for controlling emissions from the present automobile engines and has begun work on the development of alternate means of propulsion for motor vehicles.

The provisions of section 104 make research and development funds available until used for these purposes beyond the fiscal year in which they were appropriated. This allows for much needed flexibility in planning and execution of projects which frequently must exceed the artificial limits of a fiscal year. However, this special feature expires at the end of fiscal 1969 unless extended by the Con-

gress. The amendment before us today would accomplish extension to the end of fiscal year 1970, corresponding to the date when the entire act will be considered for continuation.

Another feature of section 104 clarifies the legality of supporting the construction and installation of control technology on private property for testing purposes. Quite logically, an industrial plant using fossil fuels is the best site for an evaluation of new pollution control equipment designed to combat fumes from stationary sources of pollution.

I am convinced that passage of H.R. 12085 is needed now to assure the continuation of NAPCA research and development projects now underway, and to provide for the inception of additional, equally important efforts that will stimulate industry to install air pollution control equipment in their plants and to accelerate the development of low-pollution engines for automobiles. I urge the bill's passage.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us, H.R. 12085, is designed to amend the existing Clean Air Act, in order to extend the program of research control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels and motor vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, it has been authoritatively established that the motor vehicle represents the major single source of air pollution in this country, that this air pollution is a significant contributor to dangerous disease and costs the American economy at least \$12 billion a year. The Federal Government, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has the primary responsibility for regulatory action to deal with the national problem of motor vehicle air pollution. It is certainly obvious that this Nation has an urgent need to find new and improved methods and means of dealing with this particular fuel combustion and motor vehicle air pollution problem. The basic purpose of this measure before us is to approve the continuing availability, until expended, of authorized funds to project prudent planning and scheduling of long and large-scale research and development and demonstration projects that will enable the Federal Government to take the lead in effectively controlling and preventing the continuing and ever-increasing, very dangerous pollution of the air from combustion fuels and motor vehicles. Mr. Chairman, by any standards, I think it must be clearly judged that this is a wise and urgent legislative measure in the national interest, and I hope that the House will overwhelmingly accept it without extended delay.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, the Air Quality Act of 1967 includes an unusual section which provides a realistic basis for improved research and development activities in automotive air pollution control. Recognizing that present control technologies are inadequate, section 104 directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research and development activities into new and improved methods and low-cost techniques for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion and evaporation of fuels, and

from the use of the present automobile internal combustion engine. To accomplish these ends, funds under this section can remain available until used. Thus, the provision of the 1969 amendments removes the need for a research development or demonstration project to be completed within any one fiscal year. It also permits the National Air Pollution Control Administration, the Health, Education, and Welfare agency charged with the implementation of the Air Quality Act, to select the best possible contractors and grantees, and to start projects at the most advantageous time. A further advantage provided by these amendments is the ability to place control experiments on private property if necessary for testing.

As a result of the enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the National Air Pollution Control Administration has embarked on an extensive 5-year plan for research and development on automotive pollution control. This plan attempts to define specific goals and ways and means to attain them, and includes the work of NAPCA research and development projects as well as those of other Federal agencies.

Since passage of the act, NAPCA has started numerous research and development activities related to motor vehicle pollution control. Projects include new control systems to curb carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions from internal combustion engines, and for the control of nitrogen oxide emission; techniques to reduce emissions of particulates, especially lead; investigations of alternate fuels for use in internal combustion engines, and of odors emanating from diesel engines used by trucks and buses. The use of unconventional engines such as the turbine and steam and electric-powered engines, for use in private cars also is being scrutinized.

This is a good beginning. But it is only a start. The funds authorized for fiscal year 1968 totaled \$35 million, and for 1969 \$90 million, with those funds appropriated for section 104 remaining available until expended. However, as of now, authorizations for research and development activities under section 104 will expire at the end of fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, in the words of the first progress report by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress pursuant to the Air Quality Act of 1967:

In terms of the total quantity of pollutants, the automobile represents the most important single source of air pollution in the United States today.

The Federal research and development program in automotive air pollution control has, by HEW definition, three primary objectives:

1. To stimulate optimum activity by the private sector in developing control technology; 2. to fill the research gap areas that are not receiving attention elsewhere; and 3. to develop the technical base for establishing future Federal emission standards.

I feel that it is essential that these objectives be met as soon as possible. I feel that it is essential that NAPCA be provided on a continuous basis with adequate tools by the Congress to proceed

with the implementation of its plans; that sufficient funds be made available under section 104 of the act to provide for uninterrupted, accelerated research, development, and demonstration activities that will result in concrete and useful findings of benefit to the whole Nation.

I believe that NAPCA's plans of investigating alternate modes of propulsion for automobiles while devising better control systems for existing internal combustion engines is commendable. A limit will no doubt be reached beyond which further emission reductions will not be feasible technically or economically, and we must be prepared for this eventuality.

Dr. Lee DuBridge, Presidential science adviser, addressed himself to this topic on August 26 when he said that, although the Nation would have to "depend on the gasoline engine and its improvement for the next 10 or 20 years," it "should not be neglecting the possibility that some new unconventional type of automotive propulsion device may be needed to keep the pollution problem within limits in the 1990's and the year 2000."

Congress has approved the Air Quality Act of 1967 unanimously. Let us now make sure that we provide for its proper and timely implementation, by providing the fiscal means to carry out its intent.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps no other area that we deal with here in the Congress that is more vital yet receives less attention than the problem of controlling our environment.

In adopting the Air Quality Act, the Congress set up an intergovernmental system for dealing with air pollution problems on a regional basis. State and local governments have a major share of the responsibility for making this system work. They have a particular responsibility for dealing with air pollution problems arising from the many industrial, commercial and other stationary source located in virtually every urban community in the Nation and in many small towns and rural areas.

It is essential that the research and development activities authorized in section 104 be continued, particularly those activities relating to the air pollution problems arising from the combustion of fossil fuels to produce electric power and heat, from the operation of motor vehicles, and also emissions from aircraft engines. Together, fuel combustion sources and motor vehicles account for more than two-thirds of all discharges of pollutants into the Nation's air resource each year.

The problems of environmental pollution, unless dealt with quickly and effectively, will plague mankind ad infinitum. The steps contained in H.R. 12085 are but the bare minimum. I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12085, which would amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles.

The legislation before the House would extend through June 30, 1970, the authority in section 104 of the Clean Air Act providing for research and develop-

ment in preventing and controlling air pollution from fuel combustion and motor vehicles. The sum of \$18.7 million, all within the National Air Pollution Control Administration's overall budgetary request for fiscal year 1970, would be authorized under this proposal. The legislation is intended to do nothing more than to channel the funds involved into the best of two existing air pollution control and prevention programs.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has discovered the disturbing fact that the amount spent on research into motor vehicle exhausts has been a little over 3 percent of the National Air Pollution Control Administration's budget, to deal with the source of 60 percent of the air pollution problem. Clearly, a reallocation of fiscal emphasis is urgently needed. This bill would put our money into the biggest battle against air pollution, and it is a battle that must be won.

With continued leadership by the Federal Government, proper planning and regulatory action by State and local governments, and support from the private sector, I am convinced that the fight against air pollution will eventually be won. In the meantime, greater effort must be exerted to control or eliminate the emissions from motor vehicles. H.R. 12085 will make this increased effort possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge unanimous passage of the bill we are considering.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 18571) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the first sentence of section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857b-1(c)) is amended by striking out 'and', and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ', and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$18,700,000.'"

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEN

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEN: On page 2, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. Title II of the Clean Air Act is amended by renumbering section 212 as section 213 and by adding immediately after section 211 the following new section:

"INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINE BAN

"SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of this section, it is hereby prohibited to manufacture for

sale, to sell, or to offer for sale, or to introduce or deliver for introduction into commerce or to import into the United States for sale or resale, any new motor vehicle powered by one or more internal combustion engines and any new internal combustion engine manufactured for use in a motor vehicle if such vehicle or engine is manufactured after January 1, 1978.

"(b) Violations of this section shall be subject to injunction and the penalties provided in sections 204 and 205 of this Act in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided therein for violations of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 203(a) of this Act.

"(c) This section shall not apply to any new motor vehicle powered by one or more internal combustion engines or to any new internal combustion engine manufactured for use in a new motor vehicle which vehicle or engine produces a level of exhaust emissions of not more than .5 gram per mile of reactive hydrocarbons, 11 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, and .75 gram per mile of oxides of nitrogen."

Mr. FARBSTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to H.R. 12085 to prohibit the manufacture and sale of cars powered by internal combustion engines after January 1, 1978. This ban would not apply to engines which meet the equivalent of the pollution emission standard for automobiles purchased by the State of California which are 0.5 gram per mile of reactive hydrocarbons, 11 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, and 0.75 gram per mile of oxides of nitrogen. The Federal standards for the 1970 models, which are the most stringent to date, are 23 grams per mile of carbon monoxide and 2.2 grams per mile of hydrocarbons.

I offer this amendment because I represent the city which the Public Health Service has ranked as the most polluted in the country. I represent a city which has suffered from inversions in the air, periods when the winds failed to blow away the carbon monoxide, the lead particles, the hydrocarbons, and the other deadly pollutants which were produced by the internal combustion engine automobile with the result that many died.

I come from a city where 2 million autos daily crowd into the city spouting forth dirt and heavy smoke which corrodes every material with which it comes into touch.

I offer this amendment because I want to do something about this situation.

Until now, most of the effort to combat auto-caused air pollution has come through utilization of emission control devices attached to the crankcase or tailpipe. The use of such devices has brought a noticeable reduction in emission levels of certain auto pollutants. However, these devices can only partially reduce the level of pollution emission. As the Air Pollution Control Administration projection of the level of auto pollution suggests, the increasing number of cars will begin to offset the decrease in pollution brought about by exhaust emissions control devices after 1980.

POLLUTION LEVEL FROM AUTOMOBILES BASED ON 1970-71 AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

HYDROCARBONS [In millions of tons per year]					
	1968	1972	1975	1980	1990
Urban.....	7.0	6.0	5.0	4.5	7.0
Total emissions, nationwide.....	12.0	10.0	8.5	7.0	10.0
CARBON MONOXIDE					
Urban.....	47.5	40.0	32.5	27.5	43.0
Total emissions, nationwide.....	68.0	55.0	45.0	37.5	58.0
OXIDES OF NITROGEN ¹					
Urban.....	3.0	4.0	4.5	6.0	10.5
Total emissions, nationwide.....	6.5	8.5	9.5	12.0	19.5

¹ There are no current emissions standards.

The primary source of pollution is the internal combustion engine. Since it cannot uniformly burn all of the gasoline it consumes, it inherently must produce a certain level of pollutant emission. Control devices can modify its output, but they cannot prevent it. Other types of propulsion systems are capable of being emission free. They can operate with little or no release of deadly pollutants into the atmosphere.

The need to seek alternatives to the internal combustion engines, which do not have to pollute, was recognized by the President and his Environmental Quality Council last week when they viewed alternatives to the internal combustion engine and heard a warning from Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the Presidential science adviser, that if we do not ban the internal combustion engine sometime in the future, we would no longer be able to breathe anything but noxious air.

In spite of this, the auto industry has resisted all efforts to reduce air pollution by developing an alternative to the internal combustion engine—just as it resisted efforts to place safety belts and other safety equipment in the American car and just as it resisted efforts to install pollutant reduction equipment.

This is dramatically demonstrated by the recent Justice Department suit against the big three auto companies, charging them with combination and conspiracy to develop and manufacture motor vehicle air pollutant equipment. Two years of Los Angeles Federal grand jury hearings has brought out auto company activity going back to 1953, one year after the link between the auto and air pollution was first established. The auto companies agreed at that time to install pollution abatement equipment only if all companies agreed to install such equipment at the same time. And on at least three subsequent occasions, the companies met and agreed to attempt to delay installation of pollution abatement equipment. In 1961, they agreed to delay the installation of the positive crankcase until the 1963 model. In late 1962 and early 1963, they agreed to delay the adoption of an improvement to the crankcase ventilating device, and in early 1964, the introduction of a new

exhaust emission control measure until the 1967 model year. In 1964 the auto companies agreed to tell the State of California the technology would not exist to install tail emission devices until the 1967 model year although they had the technological know-how and devices to do so.

What we are hearing today is the same thing. Dr. Fred Bowditch, director of GM's emission control engineering, told a panel of the California State Assembly, which was then considering the Senate-passed bill to ban the internal combustion engine by 1976, that—

The know-how isn't there to do the job by 1976. (Los Angeles Times, August 1, 1969.)

I do not believe Dr. Bowditch was under oath for at a press conference given by GM at its research laboratory, after the California bill had been safely killed, he answered a reporter's query of "What would you have done if the panel had passed the bill?" with the statement:

We would have complied, and of course, General Motors would have remained in the business of producing automobiles. (San Fernando Valley News, August 7, 1969.)

Apparently the big three just do not want to tell the American public the truth. Hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee have revealed that low-cost, low-emission vehicles can be produced today but that none of the big three is actively moving toward this goal because they are satisfied with the market status quo. Only American Motors, which is not satisfied with its share of the current market, is moving to explore alternative methods of propulsion. I am inserting at this point the summary of the report by the Senate Commerce Committee which evaluated one alternative engine—the Rankine propulsion system.

[From "The Search for a Low-Emission Vehicle," Report prepared for the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, 1969]

THE RANKINE PROPULSION SYSTEM

Introduction

In the Rankine or vapor cycle propulsion system,⁵¹ the ignition of the fuel takes place without explosion outside the engine in the burner.⁵² The heat produced by the burning of the fuel in the burner is used to heat up a working fluid—water or some other neutral fluid. When the fluid is heated, it converts to vapor. This conversion takes place in a monotube steam generator. The vaporized fluid becomes the power source for the engine. It is conducted to the engine, where it is used to drive the pistons or turbines which turn the shaft and drive the wheels. Valves control the entry and exit of the vaporized fluid. Instead of an explosion within the piston chamber, as occurs in the internal combustion engine, there is simply the entry and exit of a vaporized fluid. In a closed Rankine cycle system, the exhausted vapor is captured, run through a condenser resembling a radiator, cooled, and returned to its liquid state where it is ready to be heated again in the generator.

A Rankine propulsion system does not utilize a transmission. The car can accelerate from a dead stop without a transmission because the engine delivers high torque at low speeds. Its high-torque qualities may, however, require a simple system to gear down the drive train in order to prevent wheel spin.⁵³

When the vehicle is at a standstill, the vapor source to the engine is cut off, and the engine does not run. The vehicle is put in motion by simply opening a valve. Acceleration is very good. An engine with an engine rating of 168 horsepower will accelerate from 0 to 60 miles per hour in 9.5 seconds. An ICE with a rating of 250 horsepower propelling the same load takes 10 seconds to accelerate from 0 to 60 miles per hour.⁵⁴ Smaller horsepower Rankine engines accelerate at rates equivalent to larger horsepower ICE's because the Rankine engine loses less power between the engine and the wheels since there is no complicated transmission.

Braking for a Rankine-powered vehicle can be accomplished by conventional means, or else the engine, by means of reverse torque, can brake the car. Reverse torque can be employed in emergency situations only or in each braking maneuver.⁵⁵

The Rankine propulsion system is adaptable to present automobiles. The burner, generator, and condenser can fit within the existing space under the front hood.⁵⁶ The engine can be placed in the present transmission casing or further back under the car near the differential. Existing auxiliaries can be run off power provided by a small Rankine turbine engine which operates even when the main engine does not; thus heat or air conditioning can be provided at all times.⁵⁷

Emission characteristics

Unlike an ICE, combustion of fuel in the burner of a Rankine cycle system is almost complete. This means that under normal operating conditions, without attempts at emission control, a steamcar produces almost no pollution. In emissions tests conducted on the 8-year-old Williams Steamcar the following results were obtained:⁵⁸

Hydrocarbons	20 p.p.m.
Carbon monoxide	0.05 percent
Nitrogen oxides (no lead)	40 p.p.m.
Lead	None.

Compare these results with the uncontrolled ICE:⁵⁹

Hydrocarbons	900 p.p.m.
Carbon monoxides	3.5 percent
Nitrogen oxides	1,500 p.p.m.
Lead	(?)

The low-emission characteristics of the external combustion engine (ECE) are built in. This is an important feature. There are no emission controls to maintain or repair. Deterioration is virtually nonexistent. As long as the engine functions, it will function with low-emission characteristics. Compared to the controlled ICE, then, the Rankine systems emission characteristics are far superior.⁶⁰

Noise characteristics

The Rankine system not only helps eliminate air pollution, it also greatly alleviates noise pollution. A Rankine vehicle cuts perceived vehicular noise by a factor of 4 at peakloads which is equivalent to multiplying the distance between sound and person by 10.⁶¹ Trucks and buses gearing up and gearing down are the greatest generators of surface vehicle noise. By operating under steam power, the need for a transmission in trucks and buses is eliminated; and their roar can be reduced to a tolerable whirring sound. Again, noise pollution control like air pollution control is a built-in quality of the steam engine. No practical amount of muffling of the ICE can replicate the inherent, relative silence of the ECE.

Fuel requirements

The Rankine vehicle operates on a variety of fuels.⁶² It can burn gasoline from the pump of any service station, or it can operate equally as well, perhaps, better, on low-grade white kerosene. The steamcar does not require leaded gasoline with high octane rat-

ings. Rankine fuel, then, is less refined, less costly, and less polluting than ICE fuel.

Fuel consumption tests on existing steam vehicles and consumption projections for future Rankine vehicles indicate that such vehicles get, or will get, better fuel mileage than their ICE counterparts.⁶³ The Williams steamcar averaged 20 miles per gallon on kerosene in a conventional gasoline mileage test.⁶⁴ Comparable ICE vehicles get only 15 miles per gallon. Representatives of General Motors testified that the steam engine consumed 0.70 pounds of fuel per horsepower hour compared to the ICE's consumption rate of 0.50.⁶⁵ Further examination of those figures revealed, however, that the loss of horsepower in the drive train was not represented in the ICE figures.⁶⁶ It is fair to conclude that steam engine mileage will be as good as the ICE mileage—probably better—and that it will consume less expensive fuels which do not have lead and other additives that add to air pollution.⁶⁷

Cost

Vintage steamcars were quite expensive compared to their ICE competitor, but this was primarily due to low-volume, nonassembly line, production.⁶⁸ Dr. Robert Ayres maintains that a steam-powered vehicle would cost less to produce on the same scale, and the same amount to produce on a smaller scale, than a comparable present ICE vehicle.⁶⁹ Dr. Morse estimates that the steam engine will cost 1.5 times as much as the present ICE; and General Motors Co. boosts that to three times as much.⁷⁰ It is possible that the GM figures take into account only the comparative engine costs, not total drive train costs.⁷¹ The Battelle research report properly concluded:⁷²

"It is impossible to fix a specific cost figure based on current data because no figures are available which reflect volume-production quantity. The best available evidence indicates that the specific cost will be less than that of a comparable diesel engine and about equal to that of an equivalent V-8 engine with automatic transmission. The additional cost of a transmission will be eliminated with steam power."

Maintenance and reliability

Testimony relating to the maintenance and reliability characteristics of the Rankine propulsion system was conflicting. Ford Motor Co. in the hearings considered the Rankine engine to be more complex than the present ICE.⁷³ On the other hand, Professor Gouse thought that the Rankine engine was simpler, particularly when compared with an ICE with emission control:

"If you look under the hood of a new car, the number of valves and devices added for exhaust emission control are not negligible, and the next year or two may bring more."⁷⁴

A recent study has compared the reliability and maintenance characteristics of the ICE and Rankine systems. The following tables illustrate the better maintenance and reliability of the Rankine system:⁷⁵

Other characteristics

1. Safety

In his testimony, Mr. Hafstad of General Motors stated that the high-pressure steam used to propel steam engines created a considerable safety hazard.⁷⁶ In older steamcars the danger of boiler explosions may have been real.⁷⁷ Today, however, steam power is certainly safe.⁷⁸ Mr. Williams discussed this point as follows:⁷⁹

"Let me state exactly what is likely to happen and what might happen if a steamcar is involved in a collision. The modern monotube boiler is totally different from the kind alluded to by Detroit. It is composed of a long length of high-strength steel tubing—of 3/8- to 1/2-inch diameter—coiled tightly in a spiral and helical shape. It is nothing like a storage boiler used in factories and homes. The monotube steam generator has only a

Footnotes at end of article.

very small amount of steam in it at one time. In a collision, the strong coil would be deformed or distorted—nothing more.

"Suppose it ruptures—what happens? First, a small piece of tubing, three-eighths of an inch in diameter, breaks. The result is that the very small amount of steam contained within the coil is dissipated in a matter of seconds, doing virtually no damage.

"There is no large vessel to disintegrate like a huge grenade. In short, the danger of scalding is very slight, and the likelihood of serious danger is not remotely comparable to what happens when 20 or so gallons of high-octane fuel are ignited in a pileup. Here you have an explosion."

There is no danger of boiler explosion in modern monotube steam boilers that would be used in today's steamcar.⁸⁰

2. Possibility of Freezeup

The problem of freezeup does not present serious obstacles.⁸¹ Traditional antifreezes may not work in systems which operate at 1,000° F.—but other antifreezes probably can be developed. Ford Motor Co. assumes that such freezing is a solvable engineering problem.⁸²

Mr. Pritchard, in his testimony, suggested alternative solutions to the freezing problem.⁸³ First, the water tank could be constructed with sloping sides so that freezeups would do no damage and the burner could thaw out the frozen water supply rather quickly. Second, a small pilot light within the burner could keep the water source from freezing—a solution employed in several contemporary steamcars.

Another solution to the freezing problem is to use a working fluid with a low freezing point. Freon, for example, is being tested by some steamcar builders.⁸⁴ When freon is used in the closed-cycle Rankine system, the problem of freezeup is virtually eliminated.⁸⁵

3. Water Consumption

In older steamcars, water consumption was a problem. The steam cycle was not completely closed; therefore, steam escaped from the vehicle and caused appreciable water loss. Today a hermetically sealed closed-cycle Rankine engine consumes at most 1 gallon of working fluid per 1,000 miles.⁸⁶ Water consumption is no longer a problem.

4. Lubrication and Its Effects on Boiler and Condenser Life

Lubrication of the steam engine can be accomplished in a variety of ways. In some systems the lubricant is placed directly in the working fluid. Some testimony in the hearings suggested that impurities in the water and the presence of lubricants would have a detrimental effect on boiler and condenser life.⁸⁷ On the basis of experiences with the Williams steamcar there does not seem to be a problem; high-velocity flow through the boiler tube prevents scale from accumulating.⁸⁸

Thermo Electron uses solid fluorocarbon lubricants in the working fluid system. By placing this type of lubricant in the system, the seals between the cylinder and the crankcase can be eliminated. This allows a simpler piston setup. There is no need for a cross-head piston and a unit similar to the single-power piston in the ICE is possible.⁸⁹

5. Startup Time

Older steam automobiles with large water supply in their boilers took as long as 30 minutes to start. Slow startup, then, is associated with steamcars. Today, with the modern steam engine and its monotube boiler, initial startup time should take less than 20 seconds.⁹⁰ After the initial startup and for about a 3-hour period after shutdown, the startup would be instantaneous. Today, startup time is not appreciably longer than for an ICE.

Recent developments

Appendix A contains correspondence from individuals or business enterprises working on the development of low-emission vehicles. Appendix B contains information from secondary sources on low-emission vehicle development. This section will not attempt to discuss all recent developments in this area but will merely highlight some of the major activities. For complete details on important new developments in the low-emission field the reader should consult the appendices.

California has recently given impetus to the development of Rankine cycle propulsion systems.⁹¹ By resolution the California Legislature has asked the California Highway Patrol to test Rankine cycle patrol vehicles in six different geographical regions of the State.⁹²

The California Highway Patrol demonstration project initially was to be funded by General Motors Corp., which had agreed to pay a selected vendor \$20,000 toward the cost of developing an engine, and up to \$100,000 for outfitting six operational patrol vehicles.⁹³ Because of problems of proprietary disclosure of information and hardware,⁹⁴ the Rankine engine manufacturers rejected the General Motors offer. After several false starts,⁹⁵ the California Highway Patrol has accepted letters of understanding from two firms which will each furnish a highway patrol vehicle to the patrol for testing within the next 6 months.⁹⁶ Thermodynamics Systems, Inc., has been given a late model Oldsmobile by the California Highway Patrol; it will convert the vehicle to steam and return it to the patrol for testing.⁹⁷ No specific details about Thermodynamics' powerplant are presently available.

Lear Motors Corp. of Reno, Nev., will provide the California Highway Patrol with a test vehicle by August 1, 1969. William Lear has purchased a 1969 Dodge Polara, the vehicle presently used by the patrol, and is converting that vehicle to steam.⁹⁸ Lear reports that the Rankine system he is installing will fit within the present space under the front hood. The engine will have a horsepower rating of at least 300 and will meet all necessary acceleration and speed requirements of the patrol. Lear reports significant advances related to the auxiliary system:⁹⁹

"I have enclosed for your interest a diagrammatic representation of our basic power system. You will see that an auxiliary package is in operation whenever the system is used. This auxiliary unit provides support for the system proper and, in addition, powers the various services required by the vehicle, such as the air conditioner, power steering pump, alternator, et cetera. Under this arrangement, even though the vehicle were parked with the motor not running, full accessory usage is guaranteed. This has direct application to our highway patrol vehicle where there is a heavy demand for auxiliary power (rotating lights, power supplies, transceivers, etc.) under static conditions. In a passenger automobile, the car could be heated or cooled under 'parked' conditions."

California is also undertaking a Rankine engine demonstration project financed by the Department of Transportation.¹⁰⁰ This project involves the installation and testing of Rankine systems in buses in the San Francisco area. The objective of the project is "to demonstrate the complete operational feasibility and superiority and public understanding and acceptance of an external combustion engine-based propulsion system for urban mass transit bus use."¹⁰¹ Lear Motor Corp. has announced it plans to bid on the engine contract for this project.

The Department of Transportation has recently announced the award of a second steam bus demonstration contract.¹⁰² The city of Dallas will soon have buses powered by Rankine engines using freon as the working fluid. The Department of Transportation

selected the freon engine for testing in the Dallas project because it appears to reduce difficulties with freezing, lubricating, and starting.¹⁰³ The engine will be furnished by Kinetics Corp. of Sarasota, Fla.; engineering work on the project will be done by Vought Aeronautics Division of Ling-Temco-Vought aerospace industry.

The most publicized activity in recent months in the field of Rankine propulsion system development is Lear Motor Corp.'s announced plans to enter a steam-powered racer in the 1969 Indianapolis 500. There are several interesting accounts of Mr. Lear's plans. (See app. B.) Assuming that race officials allow the steam racer to compete,¹⁰⁴ it will be interesting to watch its performance when competing with traditional power plants. Mr. Lear is not alone in his steam racer plans; Mr. W. D. Thompson of San Diego, Calif., also has announced plans to enter a steam racer in a future Indianapolis 500.¹⁰⁵

In summary, there has been considerable activity in the Rankine cycle field in recent months. This activity has already produced results which reinforce the optimism of Rankine cycle proponents. On the basis of current developments and existing technological capability,¹⁰⁶ there is but one inescapable conclusion.

CONCLUSION

The Rankine Cycle Propulsion System Is a Satisfactory Alternative to the Present Internal Combustion Engine in Terms of Performance and a Far Superior Engine in Terms of Emissions.

This conclusion is based upon the above discussion. The Rankine vehicle is more economical to operate because it gets better gasoline mileage using less expensive fuels,¹⁰⁷ and because it has better maintenance and reliability potential.¹⁰⁸ Its acceleration, auxiliary operation, and braking characteristics are superior to those of the ICE. Alleged "problems" in applying Rankine cycle systems to automotive use have been or are being solved. The Rankine cycle engine is as safe as the ICE;¹⁰⁹ it consumes no more water;¹¹⁰ freezeup can be avoided;¹¹¹ and startup time is satisfactory.¹¹² In terms of the all-important exhaust emission characteristics, the Rankine cycle system is far superior to the ICE,¹¹³ and if the ICE becomes more competitive in this area, it will become less competitive in terms of gas mileage, maintenance, and reliability.¹¹⁴ These assertions have been confirmed in a recent report, entitled "Critical Comparison of Low-Emission Otto and Rankine Engine for Automotive Use," delivered at the International Automotive Engineering Congress in Detroit, Mich., on January 13, 1969.¹¹⁵ The authors of this report conclude:¹¹⁶

"The Rankine engine has the potential of being better than the Otto cycle engine in maintainability and reliability, fuel economy, and exhaust emissions. Also, the Rankine engine should be at least comparable in initial cost and safety in case of accident * * * .

"It is, therefore, recommended that the automotive industry seriously consider the Rankine engine as the future powerplant and that the chemical and petrochemical companies concentrate on the development of the 'ideal' fluid."

Opponents of change may dispute the conclusion reached in this report. But their previous attacks on the feasibility of the Rankine cycle engines are no longer viable; they will have to find new criticisms. For example, Chrysler Corp. can no longer say that the problem of cold weather operation is "a real impediment to the successful application of steampower to automotive vehicles." (See Chrysler letter, Feb. 18, 1969, app. A.) It presents no such impediment.¹¹⁷ Ford Motor Co., in face of the evidence, can no longer argue that complexity is a disadvantage for the Rankine vehicle.¹¹⁸ Finally, Gen-

eral Motors should reevaluate its emission-reduction economics charts.¹¹⁹ In terms of cost, General Motors lumps Stirling, gas turbine, and steam engines in the same category and concludes they are twice as expensive as controlled ICE's. This is simply not the case: All other cost estimates place controlled ICE's and Rankine systems in comparable categories. General Motors probably neglected to include in its comparisons the substantial cost of the ICE transmission—a transmission not required in the Rankine cycle system.¹²⁰

Opponents of the Rankine system will be hard put to find new criticisms. Although Lear Motor Corp. has been in operation only 6 months, it has put together a research, development, and production program that will place a racing vehicle in the Indianapolis 500 and will deliver an operational highway patrol vehicle to the State of California.¹²¹ Progress in other areas has been as rapid.¹²² This progress has taken place without a massive infusion of research and development money; existing technology has been applied. Any critic of the Rankine system will have to confront the fact that Rankine system development is in an embryonic state; the potential for improvement far outstrips any potential for improvement of the ICE upon which immense amounts of capital have already been expended without producing startling improvements in emission or other characteristics.¹²³

Finally, it should be pointed out that the Rankine propulsion system that is being developed today is not new in the sense that it has just come within our technological reach. Without the myopic persistence of the automobile industry in devoting most of its research funds to the ICE, a reliable, low-polluting Rankine cycle engine could probably have been developed 20 years ago.

OBSTACLES TO RANKINE CYCLE DEVELOPMENT

(1) *Inertia of automobile industry*

The auto industry is committed to emission control of the ICE rather than development of a low-emission external combustion system.¹²⁴ At the hearings General Motors stated that "we continue to believe that clean air quality objectives can be achieved most quickly and at a lower price through further development of the internal combustion engine."¹²⁵ In a recent letter to the Senate Commerce Committee General Motors stated:¹²⁶

"To summarize, we are actively investigating a number of energy conversion methods, including steam engines, which offer potential for satisfying automotive power requirements. However, present technology indicates that the gasoline engine still offers the best compromise as to cost, durability, reliability, economy, performance, efficiency, and the control of pollutants."

To substantiate the above claims General Motors has prepared several charts showing pollution-reduction economics.¹²⁷ In every case their charts purport to show that in the 1970's the internal combustion engine will match the pollution performances of the alternative powerplants at an expenditure of at least a third less.¹²⁸

Ford Motor Co. stresses that it is "aggressively pursuing all avenues leading to the ultimate goal of clean air."¹²⁹ The main thrust of the Ford emission control program has been the development of control systems for the internal combustion engine. Ford has been a leader in a reported \$7 million automobile and petroleum interindustry emission control program (IIEC) based on a systems approach concept for solving the common problem of emissions.¹³⁰ Ford announced:

"We have not met all our emission objectives as yet, but we are quite gratified with

the results achieved to date. The second vital phase of the engineering problem—proving the durability of these hardware systems—is also underway but the major efforts in this area lies ahead."¹³¹

Ford also reports engineering and research work with alternate power sources, particularly the gas turbine, which is powering Ford trucks carrying cargo from Michigan to plants in Ohio.¹³²

Without disparaging their efforts at ICE emission control, it would seem that neither Ford nor General Motors plans to work toward the development of what appears to be a more promising Rankine cycle propulsion system. A response from Chrysler Corp. indicates they are of like mind.¹³³

None of the "Big Three" automobile manufacturers are working toward developing a Rankine cycle vehicle. Only American Motors Corp. reports an interest in Rankine propulsion development.¹³⁴

"We are pursuing a program to develop the application of steam as a result of a suggestion by a highly regarded potential supplier of this type of equipment. We have only begun to consider this latter alternative but are presently optimistic about its mechanical possibilities."

"As you might imagine, American Motors is highly interested in developing a low-emission, mass-produced automobile. Not only would this have advantages from a social point of view, but we look upon it as a rare opportunity for our company."

The present juxtaposition of the approach to Rankine cycle development by the "Big Three" and American Motors is interesting. In the hearings, Ford Motor Co. said that " * * * it is often assumed that our industry would resist any radical change in automotive power systems because of our tremendous investment in existing production facilities. On the contrary, one of the reasons we are continually examining new power sources is that we must periodically update our designs, plants, and equipment to meet the ever-changing demands of our customers."¹³⁵ The Big Three must not see a customer demand for a low-emission, reliable Rankine cycle vehicle; American Motors, without a large stake in the existing market, at this time does see such a demand.

Senator Muskie's concern that "the momentum of the status quo may run counter to the public interest" is well founded.¹³⁶ There is no assurance that the present course set by the major automobile manufacturers will lead to the development of a low-emission, reliable internal combustion engine.¹³⁷ Their present course does seem to assure, however, that low-emission Rankine cycle propulsion units will not be developed by one of the major automobile manufacturers.

Ironically, Government, as the protector of the public interest, also may very well be pursuing a course contrary to the public's long-range interest. For example, in fiscal year 1967 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spent \$3.2 million on automobile emission research.¹³⁸ Only \$115,000 was spent for researching ICE alternatives; the rest went to refining the ICE.¹³⁹

The inertia of the automobile industry toward the development of the Rankine cycle propulsion system is perfectly understandable. The auto industry has large sums committed to the present internal combustion engine in terms of development man-hours and production capabilities.

There are several other reasons why the auto industry is dragging its feet in the development of a Rankine propulsion system. As Ford Motor Co. has stated, the automobile industry changes its designs, plants, and equipment "to meet the ever-changing demand of our customers."¹⁴⁰ There is as yet no customer demand for a Rankine propulsion system the public is simply not aware of the advantages of the Rankine system as

a power source for general-use vehicles. Not until a vehicle powered by a Rankine system is developed and widely publicized will there be even a limited customer demand for the Rankine-powered vehicle.

Not only is there no customer demand for a Rankine cycle vehicle, there is not even a general customer demand for a low-emission vehicle. When purchasing an automobile the individual consumer does not use emission control as one of his influencing criteria.¹⁴¹ Although he may be opposed to air pollution in general, he does not normally shop for a low-polluting vehicle himself. In fact, he may shop for the highest allowable polluting vehicle because present pollution control devices interfere with the efficient operation of the engine and require constant adjustment. Because there is no consumer demand, the automobile industry's present posture toward Rankine systems specifically, and pollution control in general (especially before Federal emission standards), is understandable even though it may not be commendable.

Of course, there is presently customer demand for some of the benefits that the Rankine vehicle would offer. For example, the customer presently looks for good gas mileage and low-noise qualities. In addition the Rankine system has better maintenance and reliability characteristics than its elaborately controlled ICE counterpart. Finally, automobile manufacturers do not have to wait for customer demand before they act. How often have they created new customer demands through saturation advertising? As auto critic Ralph Nader once said: "Who wanted fins?"

(2) *The petroleum industry*

The petroleum industry is engaged in a joint auto-gas industry study of ICE emission control and will spend an estimated \$19 to \$25 million for research between 1967 and 1969.¹⁴² It is probable that the petroleum industry and automobile industry are firmly wedded to each other in their approach to the problems of vehicular air pollution.

However, on January 30, 1968, the Wall Street Journal reported that "the automobile industry, in an apparent effort to simplify its own efforts to reduce auto-caused air pollution is now trying to shift part of the blame for dirty air to gasoline * * *. The oil industry, needless to say, is not pleased by the indictment of its products. They're just looking for someone to join them on the hot seat," complains a research executive for one major oil company." The present rift between the automobile industry and petroleum industry may cause the petroleum industry to review its assumed present negative posture toward Rankine cycle systems.

In such a review the oil industry would have to balance the costs of producing "clean" gas against the costs of converting to lower grade fuels. It has been reported that the cost of "clean" gasoline would result in extra costs of 1 cent to 2.3 cents per gallon and an added investment of \$1 to \$3 billion.¹⁴³ There are no available cost estimates on the conversion of refineries from high-octane petroleum to kerosene, but such conversion would necessitate phaseout of existing refinery facilities and cause disruptions which no established industry favors. In addition to refining changes there would be per mile consumption changes downward and some changes associated with auto servicing and supply operations. Certainly the Rankine vehicle is preferable from the oil industry's standpoint to electric vehicles, but on balance the recent rift between the auto and petroleum industry is not likely to cause the petroleum industry to divorce itself from the automobile industry and come out in favor of a Rankine cycle system. Profitwise there is probably "nothing in it for them."

(3) Costs of introducing Rankine propulsion system in face of industry inertia

Because the major automobile manufacturers apparently are not going to develop and market the Rankine propulsion system, such development and marketing will have to be undertaken independently. The obstacles to such an independent undertaking are enormous.

The price of direct entry into the passenger vehicle market has been estimated to be \$300 to \$400 million.¹⁴⁴ This price includes the money necessary to set up nationwide dealerships and nationwide service facilities as well as a cost increment because of anticipated subcontracting problems. In addition, it includes money necessary to sustain a fairly high rate of production in order to produce the vehicle at minimum cost so that it is economically competitive with its ICE counterpart. The extremely high price of entry will undoubtedly prevent any independent steam automobile manufacturer from directly entering the automotive market.

Such large capital expenditure is all the more unlikely, given the risks of such an undertaking. Assuming the innovator meets with initial success, such success is likely to be short lived. The automobile industry is capable of responding to any innovative competitive threat by producing a Rankine vehicle of their own.

"The steam innovator is faced with some very difficult problems. His vehicle is general purpose and will probably require a fairly substantial dealer organization for initial success. A fairly high rate of production will probably be required for minimum cost. The possibilities of subcontracting for large quantities of components he will need are limited. Thus his capital and organizational requirements are heavier than for the electric car innovator. If he overcomes these difficulties and markets an attractive product, success is likely to be short lived. The automobile industry could readily adapt its production and service complex to steam-power if forced by serious competitive threat. Unless the steam innovator is much better, or luckier than most, he will be eliminated. What innovator will challenge the automobile industry in an area where the advantages accruing to him are small and the disadvantages overwhelming?"¹⁴⁵

Any development and marketing of a Rankine propulsion system will take place only when an entrepreneur overcomes the anticipated costs of direct entry. He must figure a way to reduce the cost of establishing nationwide dealerships and service centers and to reduce the cost of manufacturing his own nonpropulsion system automotive component parts. Ideally, he must also figure a way to market a price competitive product at a low initial production rate.

One way to accomplish these goals is to contract with an existing automobile manufacturer to provide Rankine propulsion units for some of its vehicles. By marketing Rankine propulsion system units through an organization with existing dealer and service networks, initial capitalization costs in those areas would be considerably reduced. A new propulsion system would require some service investments, but these could be developed in conjunction with existing facilities. The cost of nonpropulsion unit parts would be eliminated because the automobile manufacturer would supply those parts. The remaining problem of manufacturing a price-competitive product during initial production could be overcome if the Rankine system manufacturer and auto company were willing to accept temporarily an after-tax profit margin lower than the existing one. Any such effort could be countered, however, by a corresponding profit reduction by industry members not producing Rankine-powered vehicles.

Another way to reduce entry costs is to sell Rankine vehicles in specialized markets until

production is raised to a level where a company can offer vehicles generally at competitive prices. Such markets exist where vehicles such as buses, taxis, or trucks are used in fleet operations within a limited geographic area. Such fleet sales would not require extensive dealer networks. The servicing costs would be minimal because fleet operations usually have their own central servicing facilities. Unless the Rankine vehicle producer worked in concert with an existing automobile company, the costs associated with nonpropulsion automotive part procurement and low-volume production would still have to be sustained. Too, such an approach would not lead immediately to widespread development and marketing, but as an initial approach to Rankine development it may be the only practicable method available.

A final speculative approach, used alone or in conjunction with one of the others, might be to try to create a consumer demand for Rankine cycle vehicles by building prototype cars and publicizing their advantages. Once a customer demand has been created, then the automobile industry might respond by developing an innovative propulsion system. Ford Motor Co. suggests that customer demand guides innovative development. A successful race car, for example, built at a cost far below the \$300 million direct-entry cost, might generate consumer demand for Rankine-powered cars, and Detroit might respond to this demand.

FOOTNOTES

¹⁴¹ This report does not attempt to discuss in specific detail the various kinds of external combustion engines. The main focus

in the hearings was upon the Rankine cycle engine. The report will primarily discuss that propulsion system.

There are two systems, however, which should briefly be discussed. General Motors testified that the Stirling engine was perhaps the best external combustion alternative to the internal combustion engine. Hearings at p. 44. The Stirling engine uses hydrogen or helium as the working fluid, and because of very high temperatures and pressures requires rather exotic and expensive alloys. It has excellent emission qualities, is more efficient than the steam engine (about 35 percent thermal efficiency), but is not economically competitive except in large vehicles such as trucks or buses. Hearings at p. 13.

A Stirling engine has been used in an external engine-battery hybrid propulsion system. Id. at pp. 44-45. The low-emission engine is used to charge the electric batteries which serve as the power source for the drive train. Such hybrid systems could employ controlled internal combustion engines and might lead to reduction of air pollution. See hearings at pp. 242-244 for a discussion of these hybrid systems and their potential pollution advantages. See also, app. B for a recent article on GM's hybrid car ("GM Builds No-Smog Car").

¹⁴² For a glossary of terms relating to external combustion engines see hearings at pp. 12-13.

¹⁴³ Professor Gouse testified that such gearing could serve to control acceleration, but such control might not meet with consumer acceptance. Hearings at p. 74.

¹⁴⁴ App. B (Critical Comparison Report):

TABLE 1.—PERFORMANCE OF AUTOMOBILES WITH VARIOUS 150-HP. POWER SYSTEMS

(Weight of auto plus load, 3,500 lbs.; tire pressure=28 p.s.i.; tire diameter=2 ft.; standard air conditions; frontal area=22.4 ft.; CD=0.4; coefficient of friction between tires and road=0.6)

	Otto * cycle (engine rating=250 hp.) ^b	Vapor * reciprocator (engine rating=168 hp.) ^d	Vapor * turbine (engine rating=150 hp.) ^f
Top speed.....	117 m.p.h.	121 m.p.h.	117 m.p.h.
0 to 60 m.p.h. acceleration.....	10 seconds.	9.5 seconds.	10 seconds.
30 to 60 m.p.h. acceleration.....	5½	5 seconds.	6½
Grade at 60 m.p.h.....	20 percent.	22½ percent.	20 percent.

* Transmission efficiency taken as 90 percent.

^b 150 hp. corresponds to maximum torque condition, assumed to occur at 60 percent of maximum power. Engine assumed to operate at constant 3000 r.p.m. during all calculated maneuvers.

^c Transmission efficiency taken as 98 percent.

^d 150 hp. corresponds to normal maximum power at maximum engine r.p.m. (6,000 r.p.m.) Engine operates with fixed gear ratio; rotates at 3,000 r.p.m. at 60 m.p.h. Cutoff held wide open during acceleration to 60 m.p.h.; at 60 m.p.h. the engine develops 168 hp., and reaches 150 hp. at 7.5 seconds (50 m.p.h.). Engine could be designed never to exceed 150 hp. at slight penalty to acceleration time.

^e Transmission efficiency taken as 98 percent for acceleration; 90 percent for other conditions.

^f 150 hp. corresponds to normal peak power at 30,000 r.p.m. turbine speed. Fixed gear ratio assumed during acceleration from 0 to 60 m.p.h. (30,000 r.p.m.); turbine operates at 30,000 r.p.m. at all power levels once having reached 30,000 r.p.m.

* Traction limited. Turbine supplies more torque at start than traction can transfer.

¹⁴⁵ The ability of the Rankine engine to perform the braking maneuver may have some important pollution control effects. Investigations are currently underway to determine the amount of asbestos pollution caused by vehicles whose brake linings are composed of asbestos. (See supra note 10.) If asbestos from automobile brakes is found to be a serious health hazard, the Rankine vehicle could significantly reduce this danger by utilizing the engine in each braking maneuver, thus reducing wear on brakes—wear which throws small asbestos particles into the air.

¹⁴⁶ See app. A (Lear letter).

Testimony in the hearings as to the size and weight of a steam engine was somewhat conflicting. Dr. Robert Ayres stated at the hearings that "a closed-cycle steam engine weighs approximately 4 pounds per horsepower compared to the ICE's 3 pounds" (hearings at p. 4). "General Motors Co. suggested that the steam engine would weigh three times as much as the ICE" (Id. at p. 48). "Ford Motor Co., in a chart comparing engine installations, indicated that the ECE and ICE would be of comparable size and pictured the engines occupying the same space within the vehicle" (Id. at p. 30).

¹⁴⁷ See app. A (Lear letter). See also discussion in text accompanying note 99 infra.

¹⁴⁸ Hearings at 113. These results are well below the projected 1975 emission goals. The suggested national goals for 1975 are: Hydrocarbons, 50 p.p.m.; carbon monoxide, 0.5%; nitrogen oxide, 250 p.p.m.

¹⁴⁹ "Automobile and Air Pollution Report (II)," supra note 3 at p. 23.

¹⁵⁰ See App. A (Smith and Peterson letter) where current Rankine engine emission statistics are presented:

Total grams per mile of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen	Grams
California standards, 1970.....	27.2
California standards, 1972.....	25.9
California low emission vehicle, AB 356.....	12.25
1967 Smith and Peterson test.....	4.8
1968 Smith and Peterson capability.....	2.8

¹⁵¹ Hearings at pp. 8 and 99.

¹⁵² Hearings at p. 99. Of course, an engine will probably be designed to run on one par-

ticular type of fuel and be most efficient with that fuel.

⁶³ See app. B, "Critical Comparison of Otto and Rankine Cycle Engines," at p. 14.

⁶⁴ Hearings at p. 115. The test was the seven-mode California cycle test.

⁶⁵ Id. at p. 48.

⁶⁶ Id. at p. 55.

⁶⁷ See app. B ("Leaded Gasoline Presents Hazards to Health").

⁶⁸ Id. at p. 8.

⁶⁹ Id.

⁷⁰ Id. at p. 48.

⁷¹ See the graphs submitted by General Motors (app. A) which still show a differential in price of about 2 to 1 even when exhaust reactors are added to the ICE. Again, it is possible that the figures do not include transmission cost comparisons.

⁷² See research report for HEW (National Center for Air Pollution Control), "Study of Low-Pollution Potential Power Sources for Urban Vehicles," Battelle Memorial Institute (March 15, 1968) at 61-62.

See also app. B, "Critical Comparison Report."

TABLE 3.—RELATIVE COST COMPARISON OF OTTO AND RANKINE SYSTEM

	Otto cycle	Steam reciprocator	Steam turbine	Organic reciprocator	Organic turbine
Engine ¹	\$0.42	\$0.40	\$0.20	\$0.40	\$0.16
Heat addition.....		.20	.18	.18	.18
Heat rejection.....	.04	.10	.10	.10	.10
Transmission.....	.35	.15	.40	.15	.38
Accessories ²13	.13	.11	.10	.10
Emission control.....	.06				
Total.....	1.00	.98	.99	.93	.93

¹ Engine cost includes fuel-injection system and ignition system.

² Accessories exclude air conditioning, power steering, power brakes, power seats, power windows.

⁷³ Hearings at p. 29. But see id., at p. 165, where the Ford data is challenged. Ford has been severely taken to task for its complexity ratings which testimony disclosed were based on guesses. See also id., at p. 163. A survey conducted in July by Industrial Research found that of the more than 400 scientists and engineers, 87 percent disagreed with Ford's claim that steam engines are more complex. See Ideas, "Information on De-

velopments in Electricity and Steam." November 1968, at p. 15.

⁷⁴ Hearings at p. 82.

⁷⁵ See app. B, "Critical Comparison," at pp. 12 and 15.

"The Rankine engine has the potential of having these major advantages over the Otto cycle engine for automobile use: *maintenance and reliability*, fuel, economy, low emissions." [Emphasis added.]

TABLE 4.—RELIABILITY COMPARISON OF OTTO AND RANKINE ENGINES

	(V-8) Otto cycle	Steam reciprocator (4 cycle)	Organic reciprocator (4 cycle)	Steam turbine	Organic turbine
Main bearings.....	5.....	5.....	5.....	2.....	2.....
Connecting rod and wristpin bearings.....	16.....	8.....	8.....	0.....	0.....
Camshaft and rocker arm and pump bearings.....	22.....	13.....	13.....	2.....	2.....
Set of rings or equivalent.....	8.....	4.....	4.....	0.....	0.....
Valves.....	2 per cycle, cam operated.	1 per cycle mechanically operated, 1 sleeve seal.	Same as steam reciprocator.	Variable nozzle reciprocator.	Variable nozzle.
Controls.....	Throttle control on carburetor (plus automatic control on carburetor, coolant temperature).	Valve cutoff, fuel flow pump speed (plus automatic temperature and pressure control).	do.....	do.....	Do.
Seals.....	2 major oil seals.....	1 major fluid seal.....	do.....	Same as steam reciprocator.	Same as steam reciprocator.
Transmissions.....	Multigear, hydraulically controlled system.	Simple gears.....	Simple gears.....	Multigear, hydraulically controlled system.	Do.
Peak metal temperature.....	1,200° F. plus.....	1,000° F.....	700° F.....	1,000° F.....	700° F.
Minimum internal steady-state temperature.....	180° F.....	212° F.....	150° F.....	212° F.....	150° F.

TABLE 5.—PARTS NEEDING ADJUSTMENTS OR SERVICING

	Otto cycle	Steam reciprocator	Organic reciprocator	Steam turbine	Organic turbine
Prime mover.....	Valve life..... Valve surfaces..... Bearings.....	Cutoff valve.....	Gate valve.....	Cut off valve.....	Gate valve.....
Heat addition.....	Ignition system..... Carburetor..... Carbon cleanout..... Fuel pump and filter.....	Fuel flow control..... Valves..... Igniter..... Safety valve.....	Same as steam..... Reciprocator..... do..... do.....	Fuel flow control..... Fluid flow valve..... Igniter..... Safety valve.....	Same as steam..... Turbine..... Do..... Do.....
Heat rejection.....	Fan belt..... Clean radiator..... Coolant..... Water pump.....	Fan motor..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser.....	Fan motor..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser.....	Fan motor..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser.....	Fan motor..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser..... Clean condenser.....
Transmission.....	Fluid..... Bands.....			Fluid..... Bands.....	Fluid..... Bands.....
Auxiliaries.....	Voltage..... Lube system..... Filter..... Oil..... Pump..... Belt drive.....	Voltage..... Deaerator..... Lube system..... Oil..... Pump..... Condensate and boiler feed pump.	Voltage..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Condensate and boiler feed pump.	Voltage..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Condensate and boiler feed pump.	Voltage..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Deaerator..... Condensate and boiler feed pump.

⁷⁶ Hearings at p. 46.

⁷⁷ There have been no cases of vintage steamcar explosions reported, however.

⁷⁸ See app. A (Lear letter), where it is reported that the latent energy in the generator at any time is equivalent to a few ounces of gasoline only.

⁷⁹ Hearings at p. 112.

⁸⁰ See app. A (Lear letter).

⁸¹ For a general discussion see Dr. Ayres testimony hearings at p. 9. But see app. A (Chrysler letter) where this problem is put forth as a main obstacle to Rankine cycle development.

⁸² Hearings at p. 28.

⁸³ Id. at p. 153.

⁸⁴ See, e.g., Product Engineering, Nov. 4, 1968, where Wallace L. Minto's freon "steam" engine is discussed (app. B).

⁸⁵ Freon has a freezing point of -68° F., hearings at p. 9. Minto's freon engine will be used in the Dallas steam bus demonstration project funded in part by the DOT. See discussion in text accompanying notes 102 and 103 infra.

⁸⁶ Id. at p. 9.

⁸⁷ Id. at p. 46.

⁸⁸ Id. at p. 79.

⁸⁹ See diagram id. at p. 129.

⁹⁰ Mr. Minto claims a 3-6 second startup time for his Freon "steam" engine. Product Engineering, Nov. 4, 1968, at p. 56 (app. B).

⁹¹ In the first place California has passed emission standards that will severely test the emission control potential of the internal combustion engine. (AB 357 (1968)). Secondly, the California Highway Patrol will undertake a testing program of Rankine cycle patrol vehicles. See text infra. Third, the California Assembly will supervise a steam bus demonstration project financed in part by the U.S. Department of Trans-

portation. See text infra. Finally, California by legislative mandate will purchase low-emission vehicles for State use. (AB 356 (1968)). See text infra under "Recommendations."

⁹² See app. B for copy of California Assembly Resolution No. 111 (1968).

⁹³ See Ideas, October 1968, p. 5.

⁹⁴ See Ideas, February 1969, p. 33 (corroborated by phone conversation with William P. Lear, Feb. 19, 1969).

⁹⁵ Initial bidding did not produce satisfactory results and a new request for proposal was distributed to Rankine cycle propulsion system manufacturers. There were four respondents to the second request: Lear Motor Corp.; Thermodynamics Systems, Inc.; Paxve, Inc.; and Berry W. Foster. (See app. B for complete information on the California Highway Patrol's request for proposal.)

⁹⁶ Phone conversation with Inspector David S. Luethje, California Highway Patrol, Feb. 25, 1969.

⁹⁷ Id.

⁹⁸ Id.

⁹⁹ See app. A (Lear letter).

¹⁰⁰ The demonstration project is supported under the Department of Transportation's program of research, development, and demonstrations of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration which is aimed at improving mass transportation in all cities across the Nation through the application of new technology. The total cost of the program for 3 years is estimated at \$610,000 of which the Federal share will be \$450,000. The initial Federal grant is for \$244,250 to aid in the purchase, installation, and testing of the engine. The State of California, AC Transit, and San Francisco MUNI will contribute the remaining funds. (See app. B (California steam bus proposal).)

¹⁰¹ Id.

¹⁰² The Dallas project will cost \$464,684 of which the Federal grant from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration will be \$309,789. The city of Dallas will pay \$114,895 of the project's cost with the balance to be provided by LTV Aeronautics Division in services.

This project was not formally presented to the Department of Transportation in the way the California project was, but the Department is to be commended for allocating funds to both these necessary demonstration projects.

¹⁰³ See app. B ("Product Engineering—Minto") for a description of Minto's activities in developing engines using Freon.

¹⁰⁴ Any attempt to keep the Rankine vehicle out of competition will be viewed by critics as another automotive industry attempt to stifle progress and perpetuate the status quo. Such an exclusion may, in fact, prompt a congressional inquiry.

¹⁰⁵ See app. A (W. D. Thompson letter).

¹⁰⁶ See app. B, "Critical Comparison Report."

¹⁰⁷ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 62-67 supra.

¹⁰⁸ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 73-75 supra.

¹⁰⁹ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 76-80 supra.

¹¹⁰ See discussion in text accompanying footnote 86 supra.

¹¹¹ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 81-85 supra.

¹¹² See discussion in text accompanying footnote 90 supra.

¹¹³ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 58-60 supra.

¹¹⁴ See supra, footnote 38.

¹¹⁵ See app. B ("Critical Comparison Report").

¹¹⁶ Id.

¹¹⁷ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 81-85 supra.

¹¹⁸ See footnote 73 supra.

¹¹⁹ See app. A (General Motors letter).

¹²⁰ See footnote 71 supra.

¹²¹ See footnote 98 supra.

¹²² Thermodynamics Systems, Inc., and Kinetics Corp. are among those about to provide operational equipment within a very short time.

¹²³ Ford Motor Co. will spend a reported \$7 million for one emission control research program designed to improve the ICE. A comparable expenditure in the Rankine field would have far greater pollution control impact. (See footnote 130 infra.)

¹²⁴ Hearings at pp. 24, 33, and 48.

¹²⁵ Hearings at p. 53.

¹²⁶ App. A (General Motors letter).

¹²⁷ App. A (General Motors letter).

¹²⁸ See discussion accompanying footnotes 70 and 71 supra.

¹²⁹ App. A (Ford letter).

¹³⁰ See hearings at p. 27; see also App. A (Ford letter).

¹³¹ See app. A (Ford letter).

¹³² See app. A (Ford letter) and app. B ("Turbine Era Dawns," *Automotive News*, Feb. 10, 1969, p. 8).

¹³³ See app. A (Chrysler letter).

¹³⁴ See app. A (American Motors letter).

¹³⁵ Hearings at p. 25.

¹³⁶ Hearings at p. 33.

"Senator MUSKIE. You [Mr. Misch, Ford Motor Co.] make the point, which is very legitimate, that the internal combustion engine has benefited from the contributions of thousands of engineers, scientists, and manufacturing experts over many years. In addition, there is a commitment to the internal combustion engine in terms of investment, and consumer acceptance, and consumer familiarity.

"Doesn't all this, however, add to the momentum of the status quo in a way that may run counter to the public interest?"

"Mr. MISCH. Well, it would only run counter to the public interest if we pursued the internal combustion engine and failed to arrive at the satisfactory final position with regard to pollutants."

¹³⁷ See discussion in text accompanying footnotes 33-35 supra.

¹³⁸ "The Automobile and Air Pollution: A Program for Progress (Part II)," U.S. Department of Commerce (December 1967) at p. 25.

¹³⁹ Id.

¹⁴⁰ Hearings at p. 25.

¹⁴¹ Very few individuals are aware enough or public spirited enough to choose an automobile merely on its pollution qualities. The steam vehicle will have to be competitive in every other way if it is ever to gain wide public acceptance. But competition does not require limitation. The steam vehicle may offer an unusual opportunity to adopt innovative and safer, but still competitive, design characteristics that complement the novel propulsion system. (See e.g., app. A (Lear letter).)

¹⁴² "Automobile and Air Pollution Report (II)," footnote 138 supra at p. 28.

¹⁴³ Ideas, February 1969, p. 35. The figures were based on an American Petroleum Institute report.

¹⁴⁴ Hearings at p. 10.

¹⁴⁵ Hearings at pp. 65-66.

It took congressional action to make the auto safer. It took congressional action to get antipollution devices installed in the auto. It will take congressional action to make the air breathable again by doing something about the major source of air pollution—the internal combustion engine.

It is generally recognized that the automobile represents the most important single source of air pollution in the United States. It currently is responsible for 60 percent of all air pollution in the country and in many urban areas for well over 90 percent. This air pollution is a cause of pulmonary emphysema, chronic bronchitis, lung cancer, genetic mutation, degeneration of pulmonary functions, increased sensitivity of various allergic conditions, accelerations of pre-existing heart disease, numerous other kinds of respiratory and circulatory diseases, cancer, and even the common cold.

Even aside from the lethal and safety hazards, the dollar loss resulting from air pollution is staggering. It is estimated at \$11 billion a year or \$600 per family.

The amendment would not take effect for 9 years. I feel certain that within that period, the industry can come up with a motor which will greatly reduce, if not totally eliminate, pollution emission.

I believe that passage or even a respectable number of votes for it will demonstrate to the automobile producers that the Congress is serious in its desire to do something about automobile-caused air pollution.

The amendment I am today offering, I originally introduced as H.R. 13225. It would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transporting into commerce of any new motor vehicle powered by an internal combustion engine manufactured after January 1, 1978 unless the vehicular engine produces a level of exhaust emission of not more than 0.5 gram per mile of reactive hydrocarbons, 11 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, and 0.75 gram per mile of oxides of nitrogen.

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

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

Mr. BELL of California. I wish to commend the gentleman for offering his amendment. As the gentleman has stated, and I certainly agree, sometimes we need some kind of hard action in a matter of this kind to move the automobile industry.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I agree fully with the gentleman from California. That is basically the purpose of my introducing this amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that a period of only 8 years elapsed between 1961 when President Kennedy announced the goal of landing on the moon and the time when we achieved it in 1969? The gentleman from New York is giving 1 additional year beyond the 8, he is giving 9 years for the industry to meet this goal. I wonder if the gentleman feels, if we set a goal like this, it might possibly be the kind of challenge American industry could meet?

Mr. FARBSTEN. Very frankly I think American industry can meet this prior to that date, but my purpose in using that date was to remove from the industry any suggestion that we are pressing industry to the wall and not giving industry an opportunity to do something about air pollution.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman from West Virginia and say that the Federal Government is not spending \$50 billion, or anything near that, to correct this very large danger we have here today, but the Federal Government did spend \$50 billion to put a man on the moon, and it took 9 years. If we were to spend that kind of money, we could buy every car in the United States and clean it up and run it on some superfuel. We do not have that much money to spend.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the chairman of the committee, apropos of what the chairman just said, it seems to me those who are earning not millions but billions of dollars on the production and sale of automobiles are the ones who should assume the responsibility for clearing up the pollution by manufacturing engines that will not produce the pollution or the smog that is harmful to people.

I do not believe the onus should be on the Federal Government to spend \$50 billion, although, of course, I favor the legislation before us today. I do believe the automobile companies should do this, and very frankly, I believe they can do it. They have the technology today. As a matter of fact, different types of fuels can be used by existing engines which greatly reduce pollution. I understand in Florida, for example, a large firm uses natural gas to run its trucks. There are electrical cars, steam cars, and other cars using other fuels. They can be produced

without contributing further to the smog problem.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment offered by the gentleman is unnecessary. Existing law says the Department may ban new motor vehicles from sale unless they meet the emissions standards set by the Secretary. This requires that the Secretary take into account several factors which were written into the original law. This can be done at any time.

This amendment would instead have the Congress set emission standards, and we are not equipped to do that. This is the kind of a job we created the air pollution agency to handle, and we expect them to do the job with the authority we have given them, which in our opinion is adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the goal of trying to make this subject to the standards set in California, but there are other cities, such as the home town of the gentleman from New York, which have problems. Many different means are used to meet the problem. There are different problems and different air quality standards set in New York from those set in Los Angeles, and those set in Pittsburgh, and in Chicago. Unfortunately, proportionately little money is being put into the research programs on automotive pollution. I know a great deal more will have to be done, but we are relying on experts. The Congress is not expert. We cannot say these are going to be the standards. We have left this to the Secretary, who with his team of experts sets the standards, and these standards must be met or the cars cannot be sold in interstate commerce. It is just that simple; that is the law today.

Pollution is an immediate problem for the large cities, we recognize this. The gentleman from Florida made the statement that not enough money is being put into this, and we are telling the agency and the Secretary that Congress feels more money should be put into it, that the standards should be made tougher. They have the authority now. But with respect to the gentleman's amendment, it certainly is not necessary at all.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I wish to join in what the distinguished chairman of the committee has already said. Obviously that authority is already vested.

Also I wish to reply to the gentleman from New York, who has said, I believe, and I quote: "They have the technology today" to do this sort of thing. Dr. Lee DuBridge, who is the President's science adviser, spoke on this very problem just a few days ago and he said that the development of a new automobile engine is a big job, and then he went on to say, and I quote:

We must depend upon the gasoline engine and its improvements during the next 10 or 20 years.

He went on after that to discuss the problems of air pollution from the auto-

mobile, and to point out that progress has been made in this regard.

After hearing some of the talk here in the House, one would get the impression that progress is not going forward. But it is.

Let me point out what Dr. DuBridge said, for example, on progress on the control of hydrocarbons. He said that the control thus far achieved—and I quote again—"has gone from 900 parts per million of hydrocarbons before 1965 to less than 275 parts per million of hydrocarbons today," and that with the introduction of the 1970 models in the auto industry that figure will be reduced to less than 120 parts per million of hydrocarbons.

This, Mr. Chairman, represents a reduction of more than 80 percent being achieved by the industry today. I would say to the House that in my judgment this represents real and substantial progress in attempting to comply with the requirement to meet a very serious and recognized health condition.

In the field of carbon monoxide he went on to point out that more than a 65-percent reduction had already been made in that field. This again I say is substantial evidence of progress in this particular field.

We do not say that more progress cannot be made, but we say they are going ahead just as fast as they possibly can in recognition of a very serious problem.

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

Mr. HARVEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. As the gentleman stated they are making great progress, and have plans for research in the future.

The great and overwhelming amount of this material which is being put in the air now is put there by used cars which are not equipped with the equipment to prevent this from going into the atmosphere. Those are the older cars. The newer ones are meeting the standards as set by the Secretary.

I am sure the cars in California are meeting the standards set by that State. In fact, California is the only State in the Union, out of the 50, that we exempted from the motor vehicles law. We said that the problem is so serious in California they should be permitted to do their own job out there. It is up to the States to do it, because we exempted the State of California, as to going ahead and making higher standards.

The fact is that it is the older cars which are now on the roads which are doing most of the polluting of the air.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York that in my judgment to blindly set a date such as 1978 when cars with internal combustion engines can no longer be produced except under these conditions is ridiculous.

The gentleman from West Virginia pointed out that we could go to the moon in less time than that. That may be true, but as Dr. DuBridge pointed out the problem has not yet been solved, the technology does not yet exist to do these things. Nor are we spending the sums of

money, as the chairman pointed out, to do these things.

But we are making substantial progress.

I would point out to my colleagues that, yes, I do speak as one who represents a district in which the automobile industry is very important. There are more than 25,000 workers in one city alone in my district who work directly for one company in the auto industry. I would point out to the Members that in this Nation of ours one out of every seven workers' jobs is traceable to the auto industry in some way or another; one out of every seven workers.

I would point out to you that there are more than a million directly employed by the industry itself, not to mention the dealers, the suppliers, and all of their employees. I point out to you that the net sales of autos last year came to over \$19 billion and that out of our balance of payments more than \$1 billion came from the sale of autos alone. So I say to you that the industry has significance. You can knock it all you want to and say that it is not doing a good enough job in getting rid of air pollution. But this industry means an awful lot to an awful lot of people in America, and I would consider that very carefully before we tamper with writing standards that would affect it on the floor of this House.

Thus far we in our committee, although we have held lengthy hearings on the entire matter, have never seen fit to write in standards neither in auto safety, toy safety, or air pollution devices. We do not claim to have that sort of expertise and, as a result, we have instead given the authority in all cases to the Secretary, or someone in the administration. Never have we written such standards. This is precisely what this amendment would do, and that is why I ask it be defeated.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the gentleman from Michigan spoke very ably on this subject, but I wish to point out that sometimes necessity is the mother of invention.

The gentleman spoke to some extent about the Space Committee and our space efforts. I might point out that we discovered in that committee at various times, as the gentleman from California knows, that by setting a time and a place where we could obtain certain results in the way of space efforts we could accomplish a great deal. When we did set these times and places the people involved said that they could not meet the goals, but when all was said and done they made an all-out effort and did meet our time limitation.

The point of the gentleman's amendment is to establish a time limit and therefore mandate this all-out effort. I believe that we in the House would be surprised at the amount of achievement that the auto industry could obtain in this field.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), very much for those comments, because I know he is both intimately acquainted with the space industry as well as the petroleum industry, which is, of course, an important part of the automobile industry, and his remarks have particular significance because of that.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all impressed with the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken with regard to the fact that the present laws are adequate and that progress has been good in this field and that it is only the old cars that are polluting the atmosphere and so forth. In my opinion, with all due respect to the good judgment and intent of the speakers, they are in every case completely wrong.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. In California do you not have the authority to set up standards of your own?

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes, we do.

Mr. STAGGERS. Then, is your automotive pollution problem the fault of the California legislature or this Congress?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am not sure I understand your question.

Mr. STAGGERS. If you have the problem, then if you have the authority to do something about it would it be the fault of the California Legislature or this Congress?

Mr. BROWN of California. Insofar as the State of California has the right to set a standard, it is certainly no fault of this Congress that they have not set more stringent standards.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY. Has the State of California done anything with regard to setting standards for used cars? It is my understanding they have not.

Mr. BROWN of California. Only in a very limited way, with regard to certain blow-by devices, but they have not applied the same stringent standards there as they have to new cars.

Mr. HARVEY. They have not. If I understood the gentleman from California who spoke earlier, he pointed out that 18 percent of the pollution today is coming from used cars and that the State has done nothing about it.

Mr. BROWN of California. With regard to this term of 18 percent of pollution coming from used cars, this whole concept has to be modified in the light of the definition of pollution.

Essentially, what we are talking about in terms of present standards with reference to pollution apply to hydrocarbons

and no standards have been set to the best of my knowledge—and I stand corrected if that statement is not true—with respect to the more serious problem of nitrogen oxides and lead, for example, both of which are critical ingredients in the poisonous smog which exists in Los Angeles and in other parts of California as well as other parts of the United States.

We have not actually begun to grapple with the most serious aspects of the pollution problem. We are talking about it only from the standpoint of the emission of hydrocarbons. We have made some progress in that field but we have made little or no progress in controlling these other more serious elements of pollution. This is what I refer to with regard to the remarks that it is only the old cars that are polluting the air. It is the old cars as well as the new cars which are contributing to this pollution situation.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY. I did not say it was only the old cars that were doing the polluting. I pointed out the fact that they had reduced hydrocarbon pollution by 80 percent and carbon monoxide by 65 percent. But, certainly, there is still pollution coming from new cars. However, there is more pollution coming from old cars.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman from Michigan is correct insofar as he has gone here. What I am trying to do here is to point out the fact that hydrocarbon pollution is probably the least serious element of the total pollution problem. Insofar as the emissions from internal combustion engines is concerned I think we are speaking basically of only hydrocarbons and not the pollution from other elements, when we say progress is being made.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply concerned about this problem for, roughly, 15 years. It was at least 15 years ago that I became involved in efforts to control pollution in Los Angeles. As a local government official at that time I was told then that it could be done with the effort we were then devoting to research, and that progress was good. However, what has happened? Essentially nothing. Smog today in Los Angeles is worse than it was 15 years ago. There is no question about that. Yet, all the time we have been told that the automobile industry is doing everything possible to correct the situation.

Then, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the State legislature I conducted hearings 10 years ago—hearings on the problem of smog and more particularly lead and its contamination of the atmosphere. We had before that committee the best possible witnesses that the petroleum industry could produce at that time. The reaction I had after the hearing was that not only was my concern with re-

gard to lead in the atmosphere unnecessary, but actually the more lead put into the atmosphere the healthier it was for the people of the area. The experts have the statistics to prove it. Of course, it does not take a very intelligent person to know that lead is a cumulative poison and that the more there is in the atmosphere the worse it is for the people.

I think industries which are concerned with the production of lead—and it is a very big industry, at least one quarter of a billion dollars a year—will state that it is unnecessary to control the emission of lead and, in effect, that the more you ingest the better it is for you. However, I am not sold on the proposition that progress is being made because in my opinion the exact opposite is true.

The gentleman from Michigan has made reference to what we have done with regard to a lunar landing in recent years. I can understand the simple logic of the gentleman from New York in offering this amendment and in placing the time for the correction of this problem into a period roughly equal to what it took us to reach the moon.

The cost of this lunar operation was not \$50 billion, but was essentially \$25 billion from the time that the goal was set until the time it was achieved. It has been pointed out how large and important the automobile industry is, and this is very true. The very size of that industry makes it possible for the industry at the expenditure of perhaps \$10 per unit sold, for example, to have a fund of \$100 million a year for research. Yet they have not begun to do this.

At much less than the cost of the new model changeover each year, which runs to something like \$4 or \$5 billion a year, they could have produced a completely redesigned automobile which would not pollute the atmosphere. At the price of 1 cent per gallon of gasoline sold they could have a fund of a quarter of a billion dollars per year for researching into how to eliminate pollution.

Have we seen the automobile industry or the petroleum industry offer to do these things? Absolutely not.

What we have seen—and I have pointed it out in the letter to the Attorney General, and I made reference to it yesterday in the RECORD—is that the automobile companies and the manufacturers' association are now the subject of an antitrust suit because they have failed to take any action with regard to the question of emission controls and pollution. They have actually conspired over the last 10 years, according to the complaint of the Justice Department, to avoid doing anything about controlling this problem.

Hence I believe that the only practical thing to do is that which was suggested by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York—which I frankly consider to be too moderate—and that we should, if anything, cut off completely the manufacture of automobiles with internal combustion engines, probably within 3 years. Given that stimulus, and given the vast resources which these companies possess, I have no doubt but what that they could find a solution to

this problem. I have no doubt but what they could find a solution. And the argument that we should not tamper with the automobile industry because one person out of every six in this country is engaged in the business just does not appeal to me. What if one person in every six were engaged in the sale of heroin in this country? Would you argue that we should do nothing about heroin either? I doubt that very seriously. And yet, in view of the adverse impact of automobile air pollution upon this country, there is no question whatsoever but what the automobile industry and the petroleum industry and the poisons which they are emitting into the atmosphere are having a far worse effect upon the health of our country than heroin is. And that will continue to be the result of these emissions as they continue to concentrate in the atmosphere, because we refuse to control an \$80 billion-per-year industry in this country.

I say that the time has come for this Congress to do something about this. Again I compliment the gentleman from New York for his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the argument of the gentleman from California, and the other arguments in support of this amendment. During the recess I had occasion to do some flying around Chicago, and one does not really appreciate the immense dimensions of our air pollution until one gets above the ground and until you can take a look at these large industrial centers.

In doing this flying it struck me very forcibly that people are breathing this filth. When we look through these reports and look through the testimony we are overwhelmed at all sorts of statistics about what great progress is being made when the fact of the matter is, as the gentleman just stated a moment ago, that in Los Angeles the pollution and smog are worse today than they were 15 years ago.

Until we can get a total commitment to deal with this problem of air pollution, unless we have a national total commitment that we are going to destroy air pollution, it will destroy us, and you know it and I know it.

We talk about our space program. On the day that these great Americans walked upon the surface of the moon, all of us here in this Chamber talked about it. At that time I said that it demonstrates what a nation can do, and it demonstrates what mankind can do if he has a total commitment.

This amendment gives the auto industry 8 years, but it does give us a total commitment to do something about the largest contributor toward air pollution.

I ask the Members to come to my district and stand near O'Hare Field, and you will see the real ravages of air pollution. Every day you can see 2,500 landings and takeoffs from O'Hare Field—with each one of these jet aircraft emit-

ting a long stream of black kerosene smoke over my whole district.

Gentlemen, we have an opportunity today to make a significant move. I know it is not a popular one necessarily. I know there are those who are going to argue very effectively against it, but this resolution will serve notice that there is a total commitment by this Congress to do something significant about air pollution. I would hope that this amendment would be adopted.

I know it is a severe measure. I know there will be great outcries of anguish against it. But the fact of the matter is that the time has come when this legislative body has to start engaging in total commitments. We are talking here about air pollution. I believe if we will follow that doctrine of total commitment that we can do something about this problem. Otherwise, we will be back here next year or the year after that and we are going to be overwhelmed by more statistics about all the things that need to be done.

The fact of the matter is that you have people in the rural areas and in the urban areas such as mine who are continuing to breathe this filth in ever-increasing numbers. It seems to me this is a logical approach. The Congress always has the opportunity to work its will. If after 3 or 4 or 5 years we do see that there is real significant progress being made, the Congress can always repeal this amendment. What the Congress does—it can undo with the same expedition.

But I say to you, this amendment today would serve notice on the manufacturers that they have 8 years—and that is all—8 years in which to do something about this problem or they will be out of business. It is going to take that kind of severe action by the legislative branch of the Government to get this job done.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of this committee, for whom I have great respect and who I think is doing a magnificent job on this committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his comments.

Does the gentleman agree that the Secretary now has the right to ban any new motor vehicles if they do not meet certain standards?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, but I want to tell you that one thing that has been my greatest single disappointment in my 10 years of service in this legislative body is the extent to which special interests and vested interests affect every move of this Government.

So while the Secretary does have powers, and there is no question about it, the fact of the matter is that these people come in here screaming about an \$80 billion industry and every time that somebody wants to move in a positive way and a forward direction, he gets boxed in and locked in by the special interests.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman from Illinois says then that the Secretary does have the power, but yet you are

still not going to let him set the standards—because the Congress is not expert and cannot set the standards. We in Congress have no agency and no body of experts—no one. So they have to set the standards and they do have that right at the present time.

I say, for that reason, it is good to bring this to the attention of the Congress and to an agency, but you are duplicating the Secretary's powers that he does have today and he would only have to carry them out.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In reply to the very eloquent statement made by the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), of course, this Congress is not equipped to cross every "t" and dot every "i" and we have to delegate to the administrators of these bills the promulgation of rules and regulations and standards.

But I must tell you in all honesty and sincerity that I have lost faith and I have lost confidence in some of these administrators. This is a Government of three coequal branches and I consider this legislative body a coequal branch of our Government. So I stand here on my own two feet today and I feel capable and I hope that every other Member of this Chamber can stand here and feel capable of making a decision as a legislator to say that after 8 years there shall be no more manufacturing of engines that lead to the sort of filth that is killing our cities. I think I am capable of making that decision. I do not ask the Congress to cross every "t" or dot every "i," but basically on a fundamental policy decision, I do not intend to abdicate my responsibility to some bureaucrat down range who makes these decisions that are totally unresponsive to the needs of the people in our districts. I will make that decision and that is why I support this amendment.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the author of the amendment.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. I just want to state that we are not setting the standards. The standards that I put in my amendment are the standards set by the State of California in the purchase of their vehicles. That is all that I do.

We would not be putting them out of business—all we would say to the producers of automobiles is, "You manufacture engines that will not emit any more hydrocarbons or whatever it is that causes air pollution greater than the standards set by the State of California in their purchase of automobiles."

That is all I seek to do by my amendment.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman talks eloquently about total commitment and the problem of getting rid of pollution. Is the gentleman ready to say that we will not allow the cities to utilize coal or fuel oil for heating pur-

poses because there is pollution that comes from their use?

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

(On request of Mr. WAGGONER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAGGONER. If the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman willing to take that position?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. In fact, in Chicago the Commonwealth Edison Co. right now is undertaking a multimillion-dollar conversion from coal to other means of providing fuel to generate electricity for that very reason. I support every one of those moves. I support every single move. In fact, I am perfectly willing to make sure our own garbage disposal plants are forced to use whatever methods are possible to eliminate pollution.

Mr. WAGGONER. Has the gentleman checked with Consolidated Edison to see how long it would take for them to convert the total heating requirements in the city of Chicago, where he lives, so that no longer will fuel oil or any other fuel which causes pollution be used? Would it not be wise to know before we start drawing deadlines?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact is that the Edison Co. is now—not 1 year from now, not 2 years from now, not 5 years from now—now—in the process of conversion, because they realize the problem of pollution. So all the gentleman here says is that we are serving notice. Now, in 5 years, 3 years, or 2 years, if we can find that these statistics are meaningful, if indeed there is an appreciable decrease in pollutants, I will be the first one to stand here and argue for the repeal of this amendment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Before the gentleman argues this, rather than using the word "if," would it not be better to know?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact is my friend knows that we have talked about pollution, and we passed the original act that held out hope for mankind. Look at the progress that has been made.

Mr. WAGGONER. This is a statement that the Congress always makes. We hold up some new token legislation as a program that will produce an ideal situation. The gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) who preceded the gentleman from Illinois, talked as you do about getting rid of pollution. Upon finishing his eloquent remarks, he walked over to the rail where he lit up a cigar that has now polluted this Chamber, and there is more smoke in here than there was to begin with. In the interest of getting rid of pollution, I would suggest that the gentleman pay attention and look at the smoke that his cigar is giving off now. Yes, the situation can be improved but total accomplishment is a dream. We must as we move forward be practical. This amendment is not practical.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I would like to address my remarks to the very able gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI). The greatest source of pollutants, as I understand, in your congressional district, is the airplane. The largest airport in the world is located either in your

district or at the edge of it. Is that correct?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the greatest source of pollutants that you have.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. All you have to do is to have a resolution in legal form passed by the Cook County Board of Commissioners saying that no airplane can land in Cook County until the engines of those airplanes reach a certain rate of emission. That will solve your problem entirely. So it is within the ability of the board of commissioners of Cook County to resolve the question entirely, may I say, to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure the gentleman realizes that this is an unacceptable alternative. No one has seriously suggested we close down O'Hare. But I will tell you what one alternative is, and I am trying to pursue it. I am suggesting to the city of Chicago that it file an injunction suit against the airlines to bar them from polluting the air with their engine emissions. I want to get this matter into court. The court will then set a cutoff period, after which these airplanes will have to comply with our air pollution standards or be barred from further operation. I do not know how many years it would be, but the court would set a reasonable date when they have to retrofit their aircraft with nonpolluting engines. Pratt Whitney has developed an engine that does not pollute the air. The only thing is that the airlines have been dragging their feet on retrofitting their aircraft with these new engines.

The tax reform bill that we passed before the recess—and which is now before the Senate Finance Committee, would give the airlines an incentive to make the change because it provides a faster writeoff through depreciation of antipollution engines. Perhaps that will do the trick. I do not know. But I am trying to get this whole matter into the courts, where the courts will set the date for an end to air pollution by aircraft, as this Congress is now being asked to set a date for an end to pollution by automobiles. I am sure the court will set a reasonable date when it realizes the extent of pollution presently caused by the airlines.

There is no reason why the airlines should not be compelled to observe the same antipollution regulations that we impose on all other industry. I believe we should seek the same kind of injunctive relief as the city of Newark is seeking through an injunction against the airlines.

I want to make it clear I am not trying to prohibit aircraft operation. I merely want to seek a court order which would set a reasonable date to compel the airlines to install pollution-free engines in their planes. The tax reform bill permits them to recapture their investment through an accelerated depreciation in 5 years instead of the usual 15 years. With this kind of an incentive, there is no reason why the airlines should

not be compelled to retrofit in a reasonable time.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am suggesting that the gentleman has an easy alternative that can be done in 30 days.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN). I concur with the statements made by the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) and others who have spoken in favor of this amendment.

I want to point out some additional facts to the Member. It is not possible to close down the Chicago airport because there have already been cases on that, and it has been decided that is a Federal responsibility and no locality can impose its will with respect to aviation standards. That is why we cannot do that in New York and that is why it cannot be done any place else. We have tried it in New York. So it is the obligation of this Congress if we are to get air pollution standards affecting the aviation industry.

What distresses me most is to have a scientist like Dr. DuBridge saying it will be 21 years before we can have a non-polluting automobile engine. That simply is not acceptable.

I know industry will never do anything in the area of public safety unless it has the carrot and the stick—the carrot, which is the money to do the research and the stick, which is the law, the law to compel them to do it.

The automobile industry did not move in the area of safety until Ralph Nader spoke up and this Congress ultimately passed laws on the subject. The industry did not do it because of the goodness of its heart; indeed industry fought the safety standards every step of the way.

Similarly, the tobacco industry, when the bill regulating its commercials was before this House not very long ago, fought every step of the way, and we unfortunately yielded to them. It is only because of the action of the other body that the cigarette industry has given up the fight with respect to radio and television advertising. Remember how they said it would be terrible? Now they have done it voluntarily—again under pressure.

Similarly, the automobile industry yielded and has met the deadline on safety, and again they did it under pressure.

This country loses hundreds of millions of dollars every year because of air pollution. It costs more and more money. More important it also costs in human health. There are people whose lives are shorter today, not just because of pollution caused by the automobile industry, but by pollution generally, by the electric companies, and by cigarette smoking, and by all the other things we hear about, and the industries fight every attempt to safeguard the health of the public.

Do we just say to our citizens they are unimportant? Professor DuBridge says, not that they are unimportant, but he says we should wait 21 years before we abolish the condition. The President of the United States, in one of his most uninspired speeches, concurred.

I think if we had the commitment and

provided the resources, and if we set a date of 3 years or 8 years or whatever the number of years, the automobile industry, if it were under the gun of law, would find the way to do it.

I say if we are going to have a better America and have cleaner cities, we will have to make them more habitable. Some of the scientists have said that some of our cities will be uninhabitable by 1990. We cannot wait until 1990 to remove the causes of air pollution. We can do something meaningful now with the passage of this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New York is concerned. I presume he is also concerned, as are others who have talked about this, with the automobile deaths at the rate of 50,000 to 55,000 per year, plus all the injuries, and so on, but I have not seen any amendments to say we are going to ban the automobile. This is the approach the gentleman is using. Rather than ban the auto, the Congress has been trying to do something about safety.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to that, those people who cause deaths by automobiles are punished for negligence civilly or with criminal action. There is a law against drunken driving. There does not happen to be a law against pollution which is severe enough to do the job.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If there is a drunken driver, of course, he is punished, but we do not simply go about it by abolishing the vehicle, because it contributes too much to our society.

Mr. KOCH. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and we are not suggesting we get rid of the automobile but we are suggesting the automobile should be measurably improved.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, the gentleman is saying there should be no automobiles by a certain date. The gentleman is saying they are banned. I do not think the gentleman really wants to take that approach.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I accept what the gentleman is saying in the spirit in which he says it, but the gentleman is in error in interpreting what I am saying. I am not saying that there should not be any automobile, but I am saying there should not be any internal- or external-combustion engines which do not meet non-air-pollution standards. I am saying if the art is not presently available to make the engine nonpolluting that we give the industry a time limit in which to do this. Frankly, I believe the technology is presently available. We have gone to the moon in less than 10 years, and many people thought we could not do it. We did it because we had the commitment and provided the funds. I guarantee if we say Detroit must do this in this time schedule, the manufacturers will find the way and do it.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Watson was allowed to speak out of order.)

RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS REMARKS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time and I have made this request to speak out of order immediately after the gentleman who just spoke in the well because earlier, I understand, he was the one who took a moment under the 1-minute rule to praise Ho Chi Minh or to compare him with Washington and Lincoln and other great leaders of the past in this Nation.

Now, let me say this, my friends: I would fight for any man's right to take any position that he wishes and to say or speak in behalf of anyone he wishes. That is his right.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point, please?

Mr. WATSON. I will be happy to yield later on, if I have the time, or the gentleman can get additional time.

But I believe it would be unpardonable for the day to pass without someone saying a word in response to that Member who saw fit to praise Ho Chi Minh, the one who has been largely responsible for killing more than 40,000 young Americans. Regardless of what one may think or our involvement there, those young men did not ask to go to Vietnam. They are over there because their Government asked them to go. They lost their lives for the same reason.

Mr. KOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I believe it would be a crying shame for someone not to speak up in behalf of their memory.

Mr. KOCH. On a point of personal privilege. You are misstating my position.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has been recognized.

Mr. WATSON. I said that anyone could take any position he or she wishes in this body, speaking in behalf of a Communist or against a Communist, for one who kills Americans or against one who kills Americans.

In my honest judgment, Mr. Chairman—and I have been here some 7 years now—I have never heard of any Member who would not stand up for our fighting men. Why does that Member only call for America to stop fighting and withdraw from South Vietnam? Why does not he likewise ask for the North Vietnamese to withdraw and leave South Vietnam alone?

I would say this: regardless of the politics or the personal feelings involved in this matter, anyone who would even intimate praise of this ruthless dictator does a disservice to America, a dishonor to the memory of the 40,000 young Americans who gave their lives in behalf of this country, and in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine any congressional district in the whole of the United States where a majority of the constituents of that district would take the position of that Representative or believe that he would be fit to be a Member of this body.

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to address the Committee for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first state that I am personally honored to share membership in this distinguished body with

a man of the caliber, integrity, and thoughtful concern for his fellow man as the gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch).

Second, there exists in this House, as I am sure each of us is quite aware, a great diversity of political opinion. It is part of the greatness of this Nation that within that diversity each Member of this House serves the Nation and its people according to his own lights, in his own individual way, and guided by what conscience dictates to be an honorable and proper course. To impugn the character or loyalty of a Member of this House serves neither the need for free and open discussion nor the honor of this House.

As it so happens, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch) and I have quite similar voting records and most often see matters eye to eye.

With reference to his remarks about Ho Chi Minh—I would hope that they would have been heard in full and in context or be read in full and in context. They are, I believe, an honest reflection of the view of the North Vietnamese with which few experts in this field of Southeast Asian affairs would disagree.

This is a nation with which we are in a state of virtual war and our Nation's leaders must be aware of the dangers which exist during this very delicate period of the transition of power in North Vietnam and equally aware of the consequences of a miscalculation of our intentions.

The cause of peace can best be served by caution in this transition. It will best be served by refraining from any action which might threaten North Vietnam into unthoughtful and precipitous course during this most delicate period.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege I would request an opportunity to respond.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

A point of personal privilege cannot be raised in the Committee of the Whole. If the gentleman wishes to respond, he may offer a pro forma amendment, and he can be heard.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman made the statement because he was not here when I made my statement.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Before the gentleman can proceed out of order he must request unanimous consent to proceed out of order, which he has not done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman must request to speak out of order.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I request permission to speak out of order so as to have the opportunity to respond to the personal attack upon me a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection. I simply wanted to follow the rules of the House.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Koch was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the speaker who just spoke—

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (during the counting). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Would it not be necessary under the rules of the House for the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order can be withdrawn without the consent of the Committee of the Whole unanimously.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, once again I believe that the speaker who attacked me in what I thought was an unfair way, did so without malice and without knowledge of the facts, because he was not present, I believe, at the time I made my original statement early this afternoon when the House assembled and I would like to have him hear it and then have him respond if he thinks it fits the category that he alleged when he made his statement attacking me. My statement made earlier today was this:

KOCH URGES THAT THE DEATH OF HO CHI MINH BE MARKED WITH A MUTUAL CEASE-FIRE AND A COMMITMENT BY THE UNITED STATES TO WITHDRAW ALL OF ITS TROOPS NOW

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Ho Chi Minh, the leader of a country with which we are now engaged in war, died. There will be those in our country who will take great satisfaction in his death and will think in terms of expanding the war with the thought that his people will lose heart because of the loss of his leadership. We would be better advised from the point of view of world peace and our own national interest to use this occasion to extend the hand of friendship to the Vietnamese people, North and South, at a time when they will be most introspective in thinking of the extraordinary feats of one of their national leaders. To many of them, Ho Chi Minh is George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and John Kennedy. Whatever we may think of him and knowing that he was a tough and dedicated communist we must recognize that he was above all a patriot in his own country. It is now, when the North Vietnamese are most vulnerable, that we can and should use the opportunity to say to the North Vietnamese, "Let this death of Ho Chi Minh end the war and end it now with an immediate ceasefire." Let us state that we will now undertake through immediate withdrawals the return of the only foreign troops in North and South Vietnam, namely the Allied troops and primarily American soldiers.

Death is a tragedy for the individual family and more than 37,000 families in our own country have suffered that tragedy as a result of the deaths of our fine young men on the battlefield. For the North Vietnamese, Ho Chi Minh's death is a national tragedy.

Let us now undertake to see to it that the greatest tragedy of all, namely the continuing war is brought to an end.

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

Mr. KOCH. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Would the gentleman read to us the first few sections from today's New York Times editorial?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. The editorial which I have here is as follows—

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

Mr. KOCH. I will yield to you in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch) has the floor. The time belongs to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the Chairman. This is an editorial from the New York Times today from which I read:

HO CHI MINH

Ho Chi Minh was a formidable foe who might have been a friend if this country had been more consistently faithful to some of its noblest principles which he admired.

As a young Vietnamese patriot working in Paris at the close of World War I, Ho was fired with enthusiasm by President Wilson's Fourteen Points. But his attempt to petition the Versailles Conference on behalf of Vietnamese independence was spurned. Ho turned to Communism as a means—not an end—to achieve his lifelong goal of freedom and unity for his homeland.

During World War II, Ho was on excellent terms with American O.S.S. agents with whom he collaborated against the Japanese occupation of Vietnam. A resister of many things American, the diminutive guerrilla leader had hoped for American support for Vietnamese independence after the Japanese defeat. He modeled part of his new Constitution on the United States Constitution. But after the war and the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who had favored freedom for the Vietnamese, this country acquiesced in the uncompromising return of French colonial power to Indochina.

After Mao's victory in China, Washington actively supported France's futile war against Ho's Vietnam in the mistaken belief that Communism—not nationalism—was the dominant force in the Vietnamese revolution. Then the United States moved to frustrate the Geneva compromise that terminated the French-Vietnamese conflict, helping to bar the election that even President Eisenhower acknowledged would probably have been won handsily by "Uncle Ho."

There is no question that behind his benign appearance, Ho Chi Minh was a tough and dedicated Communist, trained in Moscow and seasoned by years of conspiratorial service as a Kremlin agent in Asia. The evidence is strong that he did not hesitate to dispose of non-Communist nationalist rivals during his climb to power. He ran a repressive, authoritarian state that was responsible for thousands of executions during a zealous land reform drive in the early fifties.

But like Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, Ho was a patriot first. He skillfully maneuvered between his two giant Communist allies, avoiding dominance by either. There is every reason to believe he would have resisted any attempt at Chinese or Russian intervention in Vietnamese affairs just as vigorously as he resisted the French and Americans. He repeatedly demonstrated an undogmatic capacity for compromise in the interest of Vietnamese independence only to be thwarted by uncomprehending Western intransigence.

The impact of Ho's death on efforts to end the Vietnam war may depend as much on

this country as it does on the temper of his successors. As long as two years ago, an American correspondent who had visited Hanoi reported his conviction that Ho already had transferred effective power to Premier Phom Van Dong, his faithful disciple for more than thirty years. It is unlikely that there will be any immediate dramatic change in Hanoi's basic policies.

But the inevitable struggle for dominance among Ho's loyal but disparate followers poses new challenges to American diplomacy. A divided and uncertain new government will be hesitant about taking fresh initiatives for peace and may be tempted to fall back on a policy of dogmatic intransigence, especially if confronted by an allied attempt to exploit any temporary disarray.

If there is to be further progress toward peace, it is essential that the United States now offer every possible encouragement to those men in Hanoi who may still be disposed to accept the kind of compromise settlement that Ho Chi Minh was so often denied.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Since you have referred to Ho Chi Minh as a patriot, I would like to read you something that we have just taken off the wires by columnist Bernard Levin which he wrote. He said this:

The plain truth is that Ho Chi Minh was a ruthless and bloody tyrant. His first action on completing the conquest of North Vietnam was to slaughter in cold blood some 50,000 men and women who might have opposed his rule.

That is the patriot of which you were speaking a moment ago. You take some satisfaction and others dissatisfaction in this. I only fail to see how you can take any satisfaction from this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his point of order.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman in the well, Mr. Koch of New York, asked unanimous consent of the Chair to insert the editorial in the RECORD. Under the rules of the House while we are in the Committee of the Whole it is not correct procedure that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD but that he read it. However, is it not necessary that that request be made after we are out of the Committee of the Whole and back in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Unanimous consent must be obtained in the House to insert it.

Mr. KOCH. Rather than take the time to read the editorial, I shall ask unanimous consent to insert it when we are back in the House.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the words of the gentleman from South Carolina be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The request comes too late. Further debate has continued beyond that point and the gentleman's demand is not in order.

The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can agree upon a time limit on this amendment. We have gotten far afield. I see that we have

quite a few who do want to speak and I do not want to cut off debate. However, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just came on the floor. I just got out of Walter Reed Hospital. I wish I had stayed there, because the minute I came on the floor I heard somebody praising the bloody murderer, Ho Chi Minh. Somebody said he murdered 50,000 of his own countrymen. They put the figure low. The reason we got in the Vietnamese war is because we brought more than 1 million North Vietnamese out of North Vietnam so they would not be killed. And, if we bugged out in South Vietnam now, they will be slaughtered, principally because of their religious beliefs.

I want to tell you it makes me ill to hear him praised on the floor of the House, and it must make the boys who are fighting out there sicker.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure I understood the motion made by the distinguished chairman. Is this for this amendment and all amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The people of this country, and particularly in the metropolitan areas, run great danger of being strangled today from the air pollution that we are throwing into our atmosphere. It amounts now to some 133 million tons of particulate pollution per year. That is almost double our annual production of iron and steel in this country.

A large majority of that pollution is produced by the internal combustion engine.

Scientists with whom I have consulted concerning the electric car and the steamcar say that these means of propelling vehicles are within just a very few years of becoming both economically and technologically feasible. Last year I was privileged to offer an amendment to the Clean Air Act that would have promoted production of such vehicles.

The automobile companies in this country, on the other hand, have such a tremendous commitment to the existing mode of propulsion that they show no real inclination to do the research and to put forth the effort necessary to effect a transition.

This amendment would put them on

notice that the Congress is really serious about doing something about a condition which is threatening the health of the people of this country.

I praise my colleague from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) for offering this amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I oppose very strongly the amendment, and I think that anyone who takes the time to read the amendment will oppose it. Everybody wants to try to stop pollution, but the committee has gone into this problem very carefully, and has reported a very effective bill to the House.

In effect, what the gentleman would do, although he says he would ban automobiles in 1978, he is simply turning over to the State of California the setting of standards. Right now we have set up in the bill the fact that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must set standards. If we set specific standards in a bill this then becomes the goal. I do not believe we want to do that, because I believe we want to do better, and we ought not to say that the standards proposed in this amendment are all that Congress wants to accomplish. We may want to do better than .75 grams per mile of oxides of nitrogen, which is specifically set forth in the amendment, or .11 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, or .5 grams per mile of reactive hydrocarbon. That is simply setting up California's present standards. We had better be looking toward the future, and not set pollution controls on a standard of the past.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be soundly defeated, as it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I wish to associate myself with the earlier remarks of my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

I understand the concern of those who wish to reduce air pollution, and I share that concern. Certainly it is a pressing national issue.

I hope that we are going to be able to control this problem, and that industry, generally, will beat the suggested timetable proposed in this amendment.

But as the Chairman suggests, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has the power now to establish whatever emission standards he determines to be in the national interest.

This amendment does nothing to add to the body of expert knowledge now available to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Further, beneath the Federal level, State and local authorities have the right to establish emission standards at whatever level they deem appropriate in their particular environments.

It is a well-intentioned amendment, but it is blind in its impact in that it presumes events 8 years into the future. Such a move is really a poor substitute for careful administrative decisions by the experts on this problem.

So I urge the defeat of this amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I am not positive that we know exactly what we are doing. I understand that in the beginning the amendment was not read, so I ask unanimous consent at this time that the amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER)?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state his unanimous-consent request again please?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I understand that the amendment in the beginning was not read. I am not positive that I understand exactly what the amendment consists of from some of the remarks that have been made on the floor and I believe we should have the amendment read.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that if the amendment is read, it will come out of the total time allotted before debate closes, and if the answer is "Yes", then I will have to object and we can have the amendment read after we have consumed the time agreed to for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will not come out of the time limitation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, earlier today the gentleman from Illinois made a comment about the air pollution around O'Hare Field at Chicago. Now I would like to ask the author, will this amendment have anything to do with the control of jet engines?

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. No, it does not concern such vehicles or jet engines in airplanes. The purpose of the amendment is concerning automobiles only.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Strictly automobiles? Are there plans for any limitations of time as to when jet engines would be restricted?

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Let us be successful with this amendment and if we are successful with this amendment, then we can start to operate on the others.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. The subject of jet engines seemed to take up a lot of our time this afternoon and that is why I wanted to make it clear whether we are talking of automobile engines or jet airplane engines.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in my discussion I referred to airplane engine pollution in the context of the total problem of pollution and I was not suggesting in any way that that would be affected by this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, since reason gained dominance over instinct, man has become the most destructive of all living creatures.

This whole problem of pollution is a manmade problem. The problem of fumes being emitted by automobiles, is not a new problem. But there is no question that the automobile today is the most serious of all polluters in this country, simply because there are more of those particular vehicles in the country than any other polluter.

We can always repeal this amendment. I call my colleagues' attention to section C of the amendment that was just read. It does not bar the production or manufacture of engines. It does not mean, as has been suggested here, that in 8 years there will be no more automobiles in the country. Not at all. All this amendment does is to say to the automobile manufacturers and the engine manufacturers that this House has voted a total commitment to deal with this problem, and we are giving them 8 years in which to do it. We are giving them 8 years to bring down the amount of pollution that they emit to meet the acceptable standards.

I honestly do not see how any well-meaning Member can vote against this amendment. It is a necessary amendment. It does not put them out of business tomorrow. This House can always repeal the amendment if indeed they meet this target before the 8 years. So I hope the amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTAIN).

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Chairman, for almost 75 years the automobile producers have been refining the internal combustion engine, and what have we gotten after 75 years? A vast increase in the level of air pollution, particularly in our largest urban areas has been the result; and with it disease and death. As far as I am concerned one life is worth more than the entire automobile industry. Unless we force them to make the necessary changes in their automobiles—for which the technology now exists—nothing is going to be done in the next 75 years.

We hear pious statements to the effect that they are making advances in curing the situation. Seventy-five years is certainly long enough to wait. We see what the result has been. Are we going to wait for the situation to reach the severity of a Tokyo? This may surprise you. They have oxygen tents on street corners in Tokyo. Otherwise automobile operators could not keep on driving.

In Los Angeles they tell teachers not to permit the children to exercise outside on certain days when there is smog, and over 90 percent of that smog is produced by internal combustion engines. We have the technology and the means to manufacture automobiles which do not emit, or at least greatly decrease the level of pollutants in the air.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12085, which is of major significance in our commitment to improve the condition of air in our cities. The bill would extend the provisions of the existing act, paving the way for further research and development in the control of pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels.

Although technical advances have been made in this area, if, as is likely, motor vehicle registrations continue to increase, the blight caused by fuel combustion will become uncontrollable. At this time, driving an automobile 25 miles at a moderate speed uses up more breathable air than 7,000,000 people will use in the same period of time. One meteorologist has gone so far as to predict that by the year 2025, the air will be so polluted that we will all die of asphyxiation. While one may readily look askance at the degree of these kinds of predictions, there is an alarm sounded. We are called to action now to avoid an even more serious problem in the future.

As brought out in the committee hearings, the automobile industry has no economic incentives to conduct the necessary research in the area of emission-free automobiles. Consequently, persons outside the industry must be encouraged through adequate financial support to carry on the sorely needed business of making the air breathable. In the past, there simply have not been sufficient moneys appropriated for research in this specific cause of pollution, even though it is the source of 60 percent of the problem.

All levels of government are involved in the control of air pollution, but the Federal Government must take the lead. Extending the program of research through H.R. 12085 will give State and local governments added tools to aid in following through with their enforcement programs.

The well-being of our Nation depends on our continuing commitment to clean air for our cities. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this most worthy legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I rise again to

oppose this amendment. I say that the amendment is completely unnecessary. It is covered by the law now. I sympathize with these gentlemen who are trying to bring this matter to the forefront, but we have other problems besides the automobile. In Chicago we have talked about the airplane and the pollutants in the air resulting from the airplane, but a major problem in that city is sulfur oxides that come from the steel industry to a great extent.

In New York City their municipal incinerators are the greatest contaminants of the city. In Houston, Tex., the chemicals emitted by industry in that city are the greatest cause of danger. So we have different problems all over the country. We do not have only one thing that we must attack. We must go about it in an overall effort, and that is why we are trying to extend the time for research under this bill.

I say the amendment is completely unnecessary. I know the gentleman from New York is sincere in what he is trying to do. He has always been a great Member of the Congress, and has always tried to be helpful.

I am sure if the gentleman understood and knew the law as it is now written, he would understand the amendment is completely unnecessary to this legislation.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my support for extending section 104 of the Clean Air Act which would provide for 1 additional year of research and development in the prevention and control of air pollution.

As my colleagues are well aware, we, in California, have experienced unique problems with regard to smog and air pollution in general. As a result, our State has taken the initiative to develop and implement what I believe is a very unique and far-reaching clean air program that Governor Reagan and Senator MURPHY, in particular, have worked very hard to advance.

The California plan is basically designed to help alleviate the serious smog problem in the Los Angeles Basin and to prevent future air pollution problems in other areas of the State.

One of my primary concerns with this legislation has been to insure that nothing in it will limit or inhibit California's on-going efforts in this regard and I have been assured by several of my colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that nothing in this bill will adversely affect the California clean air program.

But, as we all recognize, pollution is a very serious and compelling national problem and there is much that remains to be learned about its actual causes, effects, and methods of prevention and control. In the final analysis, this knowledge can only be gained through further extensive research and development.

Certainly, favorable action on this legislation would have the effect of reaffirming and reinforcing the Federal Government's commitment toward a

fully successful effort to restore clean air to the Nations' cities and towns.

The Federal Government, however, cannot and should not be expected to assume total responsibility for combating air pollution. In this regard, it is section 104 of the Clean Air Act which most clearly spells out the need for comprehensive involvement of the private sector in the never-ending search for solutions to these problems.

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. The research and development in the area of improved methods to control the air pollution resulting from combustible fuels is as important as any matter our Government is acting on today.

The amendment which the gentleman from New York has offered to prevent the manufacture of any combustible engines within 10 years time is startling to say the least. I think we all recognize that it is offered more for sensational reasons rather than for serious hopes of passage. At the same time, I do recognize that the intent probably is to bring attention to the very serious problem facing the people of the world with respect to the pollution of air, not only in the automobile industry but in all phases of air pollution.

If the Congress had not taken important first steps in this matter, the amendment offered might have more meaning. The Congress, however, has through the Clean Air Act and the Air Quality Act laid out the guidelines for the initial steps that must be taken. Every Member ought to read title I of the Air Pollution Prevention and Control Act, section 104 (A) and (B). Here is listed the very strong, clear directive to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that positive and immediate steps should be taken to find a better solution to this problem. This is being done and good progress is being made. To pass such an amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York would be to take a drastic and almost unthinkable step.

At the same time, we all should admit that air pollution is as serious as any problem facing us in the world. A ride during the summertime through the streets of any major city in America is an open invitation for discomfort, if not nausea. If we do not do something about this problem, the prospects are horrifying. I personally think that present conditions could be harmful to the health of this Nation. It has far outstripped the point of unpleasantness. It has become a health menace. Although only a few of the very largest cities in our country are threatened at this point, principally Los Angeles, New York, and perhaps Chicago, it is obvious to all what will happen if corrective steps are not taken. In other parts of the world, the problem is even more severe. Recently, it was my privilege to visit the city of Tokyo, Japan, and the smog of air pollution hangs over that city of 11 million people like an ominous blanket, cutting off vision and making breathing difficult. I am advised

that city has not yet really come to grips with the air pollution problem caused primarily by industry, but automobile pollution, of course, is a contributing factor. The cities of this country will face the same fate if we do not go forward in bold and aggressive steps.

I am confident that we have made a proper beginning, and I am confident that Government and industry together can come up with better answers. But the offender is not just the automobile industry; it is a broad-spread matter and our Government should approach it from that standpoint.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest expressed by the President and my colleagues here in the concept of eliminating air pollution created by carbon monoxide fumes due to automobile engines, I want to call the House's attention to an electric car designed by the EMV Corp. of Littlefield, Tex. The principals in the corporation have furnished me with a booklet which fully describes and pictures the electric car which they hope will revolutionize the auto industry.

I only wish my colleagues could see each of the impressive photos of this remarkable automobile, which is now in its final testing stages. A second prototype model will be produced in Amarillo, Tex., during the next several months and subsequent to that several production models will be built.

I include several pages from the corporation's explanatory material in the RECORD at this point for my colleagues' benefit:

A REVOLUTION IN TRANSPORTATION

A dream has become a reality which will give birth to a revolution in the automobile transportation industry. Production is being planned for the first practical electric car ever built. Top cruising speed of the Electricar is 50 m.p.h. for best economy on battery usage. The car can be driven approximately 120 miles before a recharge. At present, it takes eight hours to recharge the system, however, a 15 to 20 minute recharge method is currently in development. The recharger can be plugged into any normal 110-volt electrical outlet. The battery system could go as long as a week without recharging, depending on its use, however, it should be recharged every night to prolong its life. A full-cycle recharge, which requires eight hours, takes approximately 8¢ worth of electricity. The Electricar has a set of eight six-volt industrial batteries, wired in series, placed directly behind the seat. The batteries need a total of one or two gallons of water at intervals in a year's time. The batteries will last 3 to 3½ years. Normally, the wet acid batteries can be bought anywhere for \$18 to \$20 each. The heating system assures quick warmth for the batteries in cold weather, providing maximum efficiency. To get the car to 50 m.p.h., 28 amperes are required.

The car has three forward speeds and a reverse. The electrical control unit is adaptable to any electric motor on which various rates of speed might be desired, and controls both AC and DC current. The electrical controls and batteries can be replaced in a few minutes by a quick snap-out exchange. The overall design of the Electricar is so simple that any garage can repair the mechanical brakes, repack the wheel bearings, or refill the transmission. The average annual cost of operation is approximately \$12 to \$20 for recharging the batteries, a few cents for

grease and transmission oil when needed, and approximately one gallon of water per year to properly service the battery. The cost of the five-horsepower electric motor is approximately \$125. The motor should have a life of 25 to 30 years, and simple rewinding of the motor will be the most expensive upkeep required. Without the batteries, the total weight of the car is 700 pounds.

Air pollution from automobiles would be completely eliminated. The prototype has performed very successfully in various types of driving tests, including climbing 700 feet in a distance of 1.1 miles. The estimated selling price of the Electricar is \$2,000. Other possible uses of the product include sand buggies, golf carts, delivery vans, taxis, lawn mowers, mail trucks, and airport vehicles. The body of the car is made in one piece of fiberglass. An entire new body for the car costs only approximately \$250. The body can be patched like a fiberglass boat or other such structure very inexpensively. The front seat of the car very comfortably seats three people. The average automobile has 15,000 movable parts, the Electricar has less than 500, including the ball bearings and the wheels. The current model weighs 2,000 pounds, however, the production model will be reduced in weight to approximately 1,400 pounds.

THE ELECTRICAR

Width: 64 inches.
Height: 3 feet 10 inches.
Overall length: 14½ feet.
Wheelbase: 96 inches.
Trackage: 53 inches.
Weight: 2,000 pounds.
Electric motor: 5 horsepower.
Equipped with eight six-volt batteries, weighing 70 pounds each.
Solid state control system.

EMV CORP.

The EMV Corp. (Electrically Motivated Vehicle Corp.) is the designer and developer of the Electricar. The Corporation was chartered by the State of Texas in September of 1967. The Corporation has 34 stockholders from Littlefield, Tulia, Dumas, Gainesville and Amarillo, all located in Texas. Five thousand shares of stock have been issued at \$10 per share.

Principal officers of the Corporation are D. L. (Cotton) Whatley, President; Glen Cowsar, Vice President; and Jim Finch, EMV Secretary-Treasurer. These officers all currently live in Amarillo, Texas.

A contract has been signed between the EMV Corporation and the Littlefield Industrial Corporation calling for Littlefield, Texas, to become headquarters for the development of the Electricar.

A second prototype model will be produced in Amarillo during the next four to five months. Subsequent to that, several production models are planned, and will be built in Littlefield.

Further information about the development of the car can be secured from any of the principal officers mentioned above, or from Mr. Jack Wicker, President of the Security State Bank, Littlefield, Texas, and also a member of the Littlefield Industrial Corporation. Also, information may be obtained from Mayor J. E. Chisholm, of Littlefield.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FARBERSTEIN) there were—ayes 22, noes 99.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12085) to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles, pursuant to House Resolution 518, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 0, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]
YEAS—332

Abbitt	Cabell	Edmondson
Addabbo	Caffery	Edwards, Ala.
Albert	Cahill	Edwards, Calif.
Alexander	Camp	Ellberg
Anderson,	Carter	Erlenborn
Calif.	Casey	Esch
Anderson, Ill.	Cederberg	Eshleman
Annunzio	Chamberlain	Evins, Tenn.
Arends	Chappell	Fallon
Ashbrook	Chisholm	Farbstein
Aspinall	Clark	Fascell
Barrett	Clausen,	Feighan
Beall, Md.	Don H.	Fish
Belcher	Clay	Flood
Bell, Calif.	Cohelan	Flowers
Bennett	Collier	Ford, Gerald R.
Betts	Collins	Ford,
Bevill	Colmer	William D.
Blester	Conable	Foreman
Bingham	Conte	Fountain
Blackburn	Conyers	Fraser
Blatnik	Coughlin	Frelinghuysen
Boland	Cowger	Frey
Bolling	Cramer	Friedel
Bow	Cunningham	Fulton, Pa.
Brasco	Daddario	Fulton, Tenn.
Bray	Daniel, Va.	Fuqua
Brinkley	Daniels, N.J.	Galifianakis
Brooks	Davis, Wis.	Gallagher
Broomfield	de la Garza	Gaydos
Brotzman	Deaney	Gettys
Brown, Calif.	Dellenback	Glaimo
Brown, Mich.	Denney	Gibbons
Brown, Ohio	Dennis	Gilbert
Broyhill, Va.	Dent	Goldwater
Buchanan	Derwinski	Gonzalez
Burke, Fla.	Devine	Gray
Burke, Mass.	Dickinson	Griffin
Burleson, Tex.	Donohue	Griffiths
Burleson, Mo.	Dorn	Gross
Burton, Calif.	Dowdy	Grover
Bush	Downing	Gude
Button	Duncan	Hagan
Byrne, Pa.	Dwyer	Haley
Byrnes, Wis.	Eckhardt	Hall

Halpern	Michel	St Germain
Hamilton	Mikva	St. Onge
Hammer-	Miller, Calif.	Sandman
schmidt	Miller, Ohio	Satterfield
Hanley	Minish	Schadeberg
Hanna	Mink	Scheuer
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall	Schneebeli
Harsha	Mize	Schwengel
Harvey	Mizell	Scott
Hastings	Mollohan	Sebellus
Hathaway	Monagan	Shipley
Hawkins	Montgomery	Shriver
Hays	Moorhead	Sikes
Hechler, W. Va.	Morgan	Sisk
Helstoski	Morse	Skubitz
Henderson	Mosher	Slack
Hicks	Moss	Smith, Calif.
Hogan	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Hull	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Hunt	Natcher	Springer
Hutchinson	Nedzi	Stafford
Ichord	Nelsen	Staggers
Jacobs	Nichols	Stanton
Jarman	Nix	Steed
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara	Stephens
Jones, Ala.	O'Neal, Ga.	Stokes
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill, Mass.	Stratton
Jones, Tenn.	Ottinger	Stuckey
Karth	Patman	Sullivan
Kastenmeier	Patten	Symington
Kazen	Pelly	Taft
Kee	Pepper	Talcott
Keith	Perkins	Taylor
Kleppe	Pettis	Teague, Calif.
Koch	Philbin	Thompson, N.J.
Kuykendall	Pickle	Thomson, Wis.
Kyros	Pike	Utt
Landrum	Pirnie	Van Deerlin
Langen	Poage	Vander Jagt
Latta	Podell	Vanik
Leggett	Poff	Vigorito
Lennon	Preyer, N.C.	Waggonner
Lloyd	Price, Ill.	Waldie
Long, Md.	Price, Tex.	Wampler
Lujan	Pryor, Ark.	Watkins
McCarthy	Pucinski	Watson
McClory	Purcell	Watts
McCloskey	Quile	Weicker
McClure	Railsback	Whalen
McDade	Randall	Whalley
McDonald,	Rarick	Whitehurst
Mich.	Reid, Ill.	Whitten
McFall	Reid, N.Y.	Widnall
McKneally	Reuss	Wiggins
McMillan	Rhodes	Williams
Macdonald,	Riegle	Wilson, Bob
Mass.	Roberts	Winn
Madden	Robison	Wright
Mahon	Rodino	Wyatt
Mann	Rogers, Colo.	Wylder
Marsh	Rogers, Fla.	Wyllie
Martin	Rosenthal	Wyman
Mathias	Roth	Yates
Matsunaga	Roudebush	Yatron
May	Roybal	Zablocki
Mayne	Ruppe	Zion
Meeds	Ruth	Zwach
Meskill	Ryan	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—99

Abernethy	Findley	Mills
Adair	Fisher	Morton
Adams	Flynt	Myers
Anderson,	Foley	O'Konski
Tenn.	Garmatz	Olsen
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Passman
Andrews,	Green, Oreg.	Pollock
N. Dak.	Green, Pa.	Powell
Ashley	Gubser	Quillen
Ayres	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Baring	Hébert	Reifel
Berry	Heckler, Mass.	Rivers
Biaggi	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Blanton	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Boggs	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Howard	Saylor
Brock	Hungate	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Joelson	Snyder
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.
Carey	Jonas	Steiger, Wis.
Celler	King	Stubblefield
Clancy	Kirwan	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Kluczynski	Thompson, Ga.
Cleveland	Kyl	Tiernan
Corbett	Landgrebe	Tunney
Corman	Lipscomb	Udall
Culver	Long, La.	Ullman
Davis, Ga.	Lowenstein	White
Dawson	Lukens	Wilson,
Diggs	McCulloch	Charles H.
Dingell	McEwen	Wold
Dulski	MacGregor	Wolff
Edwards, La.	Mailliard	Young
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Young with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Udall with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. Heckler.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. White with Mr. King.
Mr. O'By with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Olsen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 518, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 2276.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2276 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12085 as passed, as follows:

"That the first sentence of section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857b-1(c)) is amended by striking out 'and', and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ', and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$18,700,000.'"

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Maryland what is the nature of this legislation?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed a House bill, and we are seeking to substitute in the Senate bill the language passed by the House. It is a similar bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 12085) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJUSTING SALARIES OF VICE PRESIDENT AND CERTAIN OFFICERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7206) to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$49,500".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PERSONAL ATTACK ON THE HONORABLE EDWARD I. KOCH

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the bill which we have just passed the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. WATSON), entered into a lashing attack upon my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH). In that attack he misrepresented the words of Mr. KOCH. He imputed to Mr. KOCH ideas, sentiments, and words that he did not express and I am sure would not support.

I asked that his words be taken down, and made a point of order to that effect, which unfortunately was not made in time.

This kind of a personal attack with great vindictiveness, falsely representing what a fellow colleague actually did have to say, I feel is quite improper. I feel badly that this body did not have the opportunity to censure the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I remember what the gentleman from New York just said, it was that the gentleman from South Carolina had misrepresented the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. OTTINGER. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And imputed to him—

Mr. OTTINGER. Imputed to him ideas. Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Imputed improper motives or something to that effect.

Mr. OTTINGER. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Now, that is a matter of judgment. The judgment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) is no better than the judgment of anybody else.

Mr. OTTINGER. This is a matter of fact. I decline to yield further.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is a matter of judgment.

Mr. OTTINGER. The gentleman either said what he did or he did not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from New York was not on his feet early enough to have it decided by the House.

Mr. OTTINGER. I quite agree and regret it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. He is now after the fact.

Mr. OTTINGER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is a question of judgment whether the gentleman from South Carolina did or did not. It is the judgment on our side and a good many on your side he did not.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the question of what the gentleman from New York said is a matter of fact.

The gentleman from South Carolina said that the gentleman from New York praised Ho Chi Minh, when in fact he did not; that he equated him with the great leaders of this country, which in fact he did not. It seems to me that is a completely improper act of vindictiveness and one which deserved to receive the censure of this body.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the business for the week and will ask to go over until Monday upon the announcement of the program.

The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are no district bills.

On Monday we will consider H.R. 11039, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Tuesday we have scheduled: House Joint Resolution 247, relating to the administration of the National Park System, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 471, to hold in trust certain Lands for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and

House Resolution 491, providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 681. This is, of course, the rule which will make in order the consideration of a proposed constitutional amendment which will be taken up on Wednesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we have a joint meeting on Wednesday when the Congress will have as its guests the Apollo 11 astronauts. Also on Wednesday, House Joint Resolution 681, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President, under an open rule with 6 hours of debate. I expect consideration of that resolution to continue into Friday and even possibly the following week.

This announcement is made subject to the general and usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask two questions of the distinguished majority leader. Will the joint meeting be at the usual hour of 12 to 12:30 on Wednesday?

Mr. ALBERT. We expect it to be at about 12:30. That cannot be answered definitely to the precise minute, but we do expect it to be at about 12:30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the gentleman's remarks concerning the electoral college reform legislation the gentleman indicated that we would start consideration of it on Wednesday.

Mr. ALBERT. We hope to adopt the rule on Tuesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And start general debate on Wednesday and go through Friday. Then the gentleman said that it may go over into the following week.

Mr. ALBERT. If we do not dispose of it by a certain time on Friday. The rea-

son for that is Friday at sundown is the commencement of a high Jewish holiday, and we will have to put the legislation over if we are not through with it by that time in order to enable Members of that faith to observe this important religious occasion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that clarification.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week, September 10.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WELFARE PROPOSALS

(Mr. NIX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I categorically reject President Nixon's welfare proposals. One of the great illusions of reform is quite often its delusion of progress.

We tend to accept the myth—all of us—that any change or reform in existing laws is, ipso facto, a giant leap forward merely because an efficient public relations machine of the person making the claim says so.

In reality, the so-called giant leap forward is nothing more than a tiny, reluctant step sideways.

America was recently subjected to this legislative terpsichore when our distinguished President on August 8 sent to Congress his proposals for welfare reform. Once again, the Nation was being asked to do the "Nixon foxtrot"—one step forward, two steps backward, then three steps sideways and take a 15-minute break.

The critical problems of our country demand more energy and imagination than a few steps. We must commit ourselves to galloping sprints. In his welfare proposals, President Nixon once again reveals that he not only lacks a sense of urgency but the bold commitment to rid our Nation of poverty and hunger. The same old, tired Nixon formula for change—two parts hesitation, three parts reluctance, and four parts conservatism—dominate the package program he sent to Congress.

Probably the most outstanding feature of the President's welfare proposals is the doubling of families who are eligible to receive welfare assistance. Thus, the total number of people receiving such assistance would double from 10,000,000 to 22,400,000. All families with children whose incomes are under a certain level—\$3,920 for a family of four; \$5,700 for a family of seven—would be covered. These families would include both those headed by a dependent female or an unemployed father and those headed by an employed male whose earnings were below \$3,920.

But, in increasing the number of families to receive welfare assistance, the President's proposals would do two things: First, lower the payments to families below the national average, and second, redistribute inadequate welfare payments to a larger number of people. Let me illustrate that last point.

At the present time, the national average for monthly payments per family is \$171.35 per month or \$2,056.20 per year.

Under Mr. Nixon's proposal, that average would be reduced to \$1,600 per family, the minimum a family could receive in payments.

Second, those States, particularly in the North, which have already made sincere and determined efforts to treat welfare recipients as human beings would be penalized and more than half of the appropriations for Mr. Nixon's welfare proposals would be allocated to the Southern States which have consistently refused to appropriate sufficient funds for welfare families.

Again, an example. New Jersey pays an average family on ALDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children—\$263 per month or \$3,166 a year. That is the highest in the Nation. The lowest average monthly payment to an AFDC is, as you would expect, in Mississippi where a family receives \$38.75 per month or \$465 per year, just about one-third of the President's proposed minimum.

Consequently, under President Nixon's welfare proposals, States such as New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Illinois which have been in the forefront of a national effort to humanize welfare reciprocity would be penalized and States such as Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, and Arkansas which have maintained an outmoded welfare system of payments would actually be rewarded for their horse-and-buggy approach.

I would like to point out at this time that last year, my distinguished colleague from New York City, Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, introduced a guaranteed annual income bill for all Americans, H.R. 17331. Under Congressman RYAN's proposals, a family of four would be guaranteed an annual minimum income of \$2,004 and through a series of incentive payments based upon earned income, the family would be removed from the welfare rolls once their income reached \$4,000. Under Mr. Nixon's proposals, the family would be ineligible for welfare assistance when their total income reached \$2,960. I cite Congressman RYAN's proposals as an ex-

ample of the kind of enlightened approach necessary if we are to break the welfare cycle.

A third shortcoming of the President's proposals is that it actually takes food out of the mouths of families by cutting out food stamps as supplementary income for these families.

According to the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition which analyzed the statistics of food stamps for welfare recipients, the new welfare proposals would reduce the food purchasing income for some 87 percent of the 6,478,000 welfare poor. According to the Council, the current combination of welfare payments and food stamps provide more net income to the majority of relief recipients than they could expect to receive under Mr. Nixon's new proposals. The exceptions, of course, are those six Southern States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands where the relief payments are so low that even Mr. Nixon's proposals would result in greater benefits to the poor.

Why the President would call for what he termed "an orderly substitution of food stamps by the direct monetary payments" is not only unexplainably confusing, it's hypocritically inconsistent.

To begin with, it was only on June 6 that the President sent a message to Congress on food stamps that sought to guarantee participation of all counties in the food-stamp program. Yet, having made that commitment to the food-stamp program, the President would then turn around and start phasing out the food-stamp program for those who need it most, the people on welfare and other poverty-stricken families.

As it stands now, the food-stamp program only reaches 22 percent of the poor who receive food in counties which have either the food-stamp program or direct distribution programs.

So, if the President cannot seem to make up his mind how he feels about the food-stamp program, I would hope that he at least would attempt a semblance of consistency in its operation as a critical adjunct of the welfare program. Mr. Nixon's miserly \$1,600 for a family of four is shamefully inadequate. To omit food stamps in this already shortchanged welfare reorganization plan merely worsens the plight of the poor. As the Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said in his criticism of the Nixon proposals:

The cost of food alone for a family of four, according to a recent government report, is \$1,200 a year—and that's eating pig ears and neck bones.

Finally, one of the most tyrannical and oppressive components of the Nixon welfare reform proposals is the requirement that so-called able-bodied welfare recipients accept what is called "suitable jobs" or take job training in order to remain eligible for welfare payments.

According to New York City's Human Resources Administrator, Mitchell I. Ginsberg, that requirement would be "impossible to administer." More importantly, he continued, "it's unnecessary."

America's economy with its built-in racism and barriers against black people in both jobs and job-training programs has historically denied black mothers and fathers the right to earn a decent living. As a result, many of them have been forced on welfare, not because they were lazy or ill-trained, but simply because they were black. Despite this incontrovertible fact, President Nixon now proposes that these same people who attempted to work and have been prevented from doing so, must now suffer the burden of proof of explaining their unemployment. What a sickening irony.

Furthermore, who determines what a "suitable job" is? To many Southern State employment interviewers or job counselors, a "suitable job" for any black man is shining shoes, no matter what the level of his education is. To many Northern job counselors, a "suitable job" for a black woman is domestic or waitress even if she is a Phi Beta Kappa and holds a master's degree. What good does it do to set up elaborate job-training programs in certain skilled trades and then, because of industry barriers and union regulations, prevent well-trained persons from working?

No, let President Nixon conclusively demonstrate that he is committed to a strong and uncompromising enforcement of existing antidiscrimination laws at all levels and then, and only then will I accept the provision that a person should take job training if he or she is untrained.

Note that I said "should." People should be urged and encouraged to undertake job-training, but they should not be under legal duress to do so. It is ironic that many whites complain about laws that would force them to accept blacks as equals. I ask what is the difference between that position and a law that would force a man to take a job or participate in a training program in order to feed his family?

Some experts and leaders have hailed President Nixon's welfare proposals as a start in the right direction and that they are an improvement. In the sense that emancipation was an improvement over slavery, they are right. But emancipation did not guarantee the black man his educational, political, and economic freedom. And for years, many blacks in both the South and the North lived in wretched conditions, similar to their situations as slaves.

Reform without the built-in guarantees of the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws, equal and objective treatment of jobseekers, whether they are white or black, and a more equitable system of apportioning Federal funds to those States with higher payments is no reform at all. Bolder and more imaginative steps are necessary if the Federal Government is ever going to eventually destroy the debilitating cycle of welfareism.

President Nixon's so-called welfare reform proposals fall far short of that goal. As an expression concerning football would say it, "he hasn't even put the ball into play yet."

RUNAWAY INFLATION

(Mr. ULLMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist when it comes to the strength and stability of the American economy. I have been reluctant in the past to join those who have predicted a dark future for this country because of current national economic policies. But for the first time since I came to Congress in 1957, I am beginning to see real danger. I believe that our present policies have set us on a collision course with serious economic crisis, and that the time is short for setting a new course toward economic stability.

Mr. Speaker, despite assurances from the administration, we are losing the fight against inflation. Prices continue to climb skyward. Interest rates are already out of control.

It is now obvious that the recession-oriented policies of the administration can only lead to economic disaster. The tight monetary approach has so far given us only record-high interest rates. Freezes on Federal office building and highway construction, apparently to be announced shortly by the administration, smack of desperate, rather than coordinated policy.

The administration must conduct an immediate reevaluation of its economic policies if we are to restore stability to an economy that is more and more visibly deteriorating.

I urge that President Nixon declare a new national policy to fight inflation that will incorporate clear spending and investment priorities, and establish guidelines for wage and price increases.

Establishment of national investment priorities would allow us to strip away unnecessary spending and direct our resources where the need is critical. The housing industry, for example, is on the verge of collapse. But it is getting no real help from the administration, only policies that lead to more exorbitant money and mortgage costs.

Priorities are necessary, with or without a Vietnam war. Despite contradictory reports from the administration, it appears that no significant amount of Federal funds will be freed after Vietnam to help pay for needed domestic programs.

We need wage and price guidelines to make clear the limits of acceptability for future increases. The formation of a labor-management advisory committee under President Kennedy is one successful approach to arriving at such guidelines.

A new anti-inflation policy must be backed up by firm leadership from the President. He should call leaders of the business and labor communities to the White House and make clear his intention to stick by this new policy until inflation is controlled and stability achieved.

This administration can no longer afford to remain neutral in the face of spiraling prices and wages. Three

months ago, I strongly urged Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy by letter to implement a system of priorities and guidelines. But the response, despite a growing crisis, has been completely negative.

If the administration does not act quickly to gain control of a runaway economy, the ultimate solution may well have to be formal price and wage controls, perhaps coupled with devaluation. This would be disastrous to the long-term objectives of this country and the free world.

COLLEGE LOAN CRISIS CAN AND MUST BE AVERTED

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in just a few short days millions of American students will be entering or returning to college and university campuses. For many it will be the beginning of their higher education, for others it will be to continue or complete college careers.

But for an estimated 150,000 to 200,000 otherwise eligible and academically qualified students this fall threatens to be a fall of frustration and promise denied because circumstances beyond their control have evaporated college loan funds upon which they had depended to finance their higher education.

The Congress has attempted but has not been permitted to alleviate this crisis in the financing of higher education. There is currently legislation reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor which could open the gates of higher education to these 150,000 to 200,000 students. It is the Insured Student Loan Emergency Amendments of 1969. It has been reported but not permitted to come before the House and its Members.

The cause of the education financing problem is the current high interest rate and shortage of funds. Under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, the Federal Government can guarantee college loans through commercial banks at an interest rate not to exceed 7 percent. The prime rate now stands at 8½ percent. In addition some banks have been reluctant to lend and service loans to students who have not or whose families have not previously been customers. There is very little profit in this type of loan because of its long life and its cost of servicing.

As long ago as June of this year, when the prime rate went to 8½ percent it became apparent that unless the interest rate dropped, a dim prospect, the threat of an emergency in college loan financing later in the fall was threatened.

A few weeks later, Chairman PERKINS' Education and Labor Committee reported the insured student loan emergency amendments to "assure the continued flow of money from banks and other lenders to students under the guaranteed student loan program by providing a limited device for increasing

the rate of return to lenders during times of money stringency."

In the bill is a provision for a "market adjustment allowance" of up to 3 percent annually to be paid each bank or other lending institution on the average unpaid balance of principal—not including interest added to the principal—of all loans in the lender's student loan portfolio.

The bill also provides that a new rate be set each quarter to contend with fluctuations in the interest rate. The program would expire in 1971 with the rest of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, on four occasions prior to the August recess, Chairman PERKINS asked for unanimous consent to bring this bill to the floor to avert partisan debate on ungermane issues and give the House an opportunity to vote it up or down. On each occasion objection was raised.

Then again yesterday, the first legislative day following the recess, Chairman PERKINS again asked unanimous consent to bring up the bill and again there was an objection on the grounds that this would be rushing the bill through the House.

Chairman PERKINS has requested unanimous consent because he does not want the issue of campus disorder and the emotionalism thereto related to enter into this debate. And he is absolutely correct.

There is no doubt a need for debate on the campus disorder issue in the House but it has no place in relationship to this bill. Those who feel to the contrary err, I believe, by confusing the rights of thousands of needy, conscientious and deserving young students who wish to better themselves and their environment with the irresponsible desires of the hippie hooligans and hoodlums, many of whom are not even enrolled as students, who would infect our campuses promoting disorder.

It might be well to remember also that in the other body, legislation very similar to the bill from Chairman PERKINS' committee, passed on August 12 by a rollcall vote of 92 to 1. During debate the issue of campus disorder was recognized as irrelevant. Discussion barely touched on the matter and no amendments relating to it were offered.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess I found this problem of the college loan crisis one of the most frequently mentioned by students and their parents. When I would explain why the bill had been delayed in the House invariably the frustrated reply would be on the order of:

But I'm not interested in rioting on campus, I'm just interested in getting on campus and back to school.

It appears now that the next opportunity to bring this bill to the floor will be under the suspension calendar on September 15, a very late date indeed because even then the variances in the House and Senate bills still must be worked out.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that those who wish to debate the matter of campus unrest will not persist in their desire to talk about an unrelated issue at the expense of 150,000 to 200,000 young

Americans to whom education is dearer than irrelevant rhetoric.

GUARANTEED LOANS FOR STUDENTS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the earliest possible consideration of H.R. 13194 to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965. The bill authorizes Federal incentive payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary, in order to assure that students will have access to such loans for financing their education.

The Act currently guarantees that the Federal Government will pay through graduation the interest rate up to 7 percent on loans to students whose parents earn less than \$15,000. At the inception of the program, the Government guaranteed 6 percent, but the prime rate was then set at 4½. This clearly gave lenders an incentive to participate in the student loan program. As of June 9, 1969, the prime rate has been set at 8½ percent.

Since banks are able to command a higher rate on commercial loans than the present 7-percent maximum insured by the Government, present economic motive clearly discriminates against students. In addition, because of administrative difficulties involved in effecting these loans, lenders have a greater incentive to hold available funds for preferred customers.

Denying these young people the funds they so desperately need for the continuation of their education is indefensible. With costs of higher education rising rapidly throughout the country, families find the financing of schooling for their college-age youngsters a burden increasingly more difficult to bear.

It is gratifying to me to note, however, that some lenders are taking the lead in processing these loans despite the lack of economic incentive. The Second Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland, for example, has allocated all funds invested in insured certificates of deposit to make loans to students at the 7-percent rate. Unfortunately, though, most banks are awaiting action by Congress to raise the rate, leaving the students in financial limbo.

We are already tardy in the passage of this sorely needed legislation. The fall semesters of most institutions being this week or next; tuition bills will arrive only too soon thereafter. If positive action is not taken immediately, nearly 200,000 students who are counting on loans will be forced to terminate their academic careers until funds are available. I urge united support of H.R. 13194 in behalf of the young people of our country.

THE PLIGHT OF THE NATION'S MERCHANT MARINE

(Mr. LENNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, on August

20, the Star-News of Wilmington, N.C., published an editorial, "Time for a Change," which calls for a new policy for the revitalization of our merchant marine—a position with which I am in total agreement.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and as a member of the Sea Power Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I have been alerted to the perils of our merchant marine for some time, and with other House Members, I have been trying to do something about it.

During the campaign, President Nixon made several promises about starting new programs to revive our lagging merchant marine. New ships must be built; for 58 percent of our Navy's ships are over 20 years old, which is about the average age of our merchant marine ships. While we face an immediate problem in connection with the unsatisfactory numbers and conditions of the ships in our merchant marine, we must also look to new ideas in shipping for our long-range answers. While we are concentrating on building new ships in our shipyards now, let us not forget the research and development that we must undertake in order for our merchant marine to be competitive with merchant fleets of the world.

We have many interests at heart when we talk about the merchant marine. Our country is directly interested by import or export in one-fifth of the world's ocean borne commerce. Merchant shipping is the only type of transport that can meet the great demand for vast amounts of petroleum, metal ores, and chemicals, grains, manufactured goods, and other key materials in world trade. We are shipping 2 million tons of military supplies a month. We vitally need shipping for our commercial and our security interests. A rejuvenated maritime fleet would reduce the gold outflow. President Nixon has set a goal of transporting 30 percent of our imports and exports in U.S.-flag ships. This is an excellent goal, but it cannot be accomplished overnight.

We presently carry only 6 percent of our own commerce in U.S. bottoms. A revitalized merchant service is essential to our Nation's growth and development. Sir Walter Raleigh's statement that the country which controls the sea lanes controls the world's trade—hence controls the world is no less true today than it was in his time.

As our reserve fleet of commercial shipping is sold and turned into scrap, it becomes even more important for us to start again on a new shipbuilding program. That is the theme of the editorial, with which I am in full accord—and have been for many years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the editorial, "Time for a Change," from the Star-News of Wilmington, N.C., in full at this point in the Record:

TIME FOR A CHANGE

The two ships in the decommissioned Brunswick River Basin of the Maritime Administration give mute testimony to the plight of the nation's Merchant Marine.

The ships are waiting to tow to a scrapping yard and the U.S. Department of Commerce has closed the MA facilities which were part of the locally called "layup basin."

In a recent address to a national group, A. E. Gibson, U.S. maritime administrator, pointed to the dwindling number of ships in the merchant fleet, intimating that the United States was fast losing its eminence as a world sea power.

"Our merchant fleet is rapidly becoming too old, too small and too unproductive to serve our vital defense and economic needs," he told the group in Kansas City, Mo. "In addition," he continued, "too few merchant ships have been built in the past to reverse this situation."

Gibson blamed the lack of assurance provided shipyards for long-term construction programs on which to base the investment necessary to increase their productivity. He also cited the lack of a secure future for shipyard workers under the present situation.

All this is about to change. President Nixon has directed the Maritime Administration to form a program designed to aid all segments of the maritime industry, Gibson said.

"We believe the loss of approximately two-thirds of our entire merchant marine fleet in the next four years—a loss of 500 to 600 ships—calls for drastic action, and we intend to take it," he declared.

A key to the program will be to stimulate the modernization of American shipyards. Others will be simplification and standardization of ship design and parts. Mass production techniques—ordering successful designs in quantity—will also be employed to provide the most in the way of ships for the least in the way of cash.

The end result—a modern, efficient fleet of merchant vessels—may be well worth the added efforts. Assuredly, it is a program sorely needed if the United States wants to keep up with the rest of the world in the field of commerce.

PRESIDENT NIXON HAS PRECEDENT FOR REFUSAL TO SPEND APPROPRIATED FUNDS

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Mr. MICHEL, who spoke earlier, pointed out that President Nixon is in good company if he decides not to spend all the funds this Congress may appropriate.

Harry Truman once said, speaking of the Presidency, "The buck stops here." The ultimate responsibility for administration of the Government and the final forum for safeguarding the people's interests is the Presidency. Even as a Senator, Mr. Truman recognized that it was not only the right, but also the duty, of the President to refuse to spend appropriated funds just because they are there. In June 1944, Mr. Truman told his colleagues that—

When the Congress appropriates funds it gives the executive branch an authority to incur obligations. Certainly none of us hold that we give a mandate to expend the funds appropriated. We expect the funds to be used only where needed and not in excess of the amount appropriated, to carry out some phase of law.

Mr. Truman carried out this philosophy as President. For instance, when Congress appropriated funds for a 58-group Air Force, Mr. Truman went right ahead and limited that Air Force to 48 groups.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has well established precedent for his decision not to spend an extra billion

dollars some would have him spend. Most of us here will acknowledge that one of the administration's toughest battles must be the control of inflation. That is why we are determined to have a balanced budget. That is why we voted to extend the unpopular surtax. Our friends who now would undo this by voting to spend money we do not have say that the President is turning his back on the children of America. This is pure politics—we all support a quality education for our children. It is true that the children of America are America's future, and they deserve a better inheritance than a bankrupt currency and a load of accumulated debt which will reduce their capacity to move against the problems of the future, including the advancement of education. It may be politically expedient to talk about spending money we do not have for aid to education. Perhaps it would be wiser to divert some of this nonexistent money into the education of some adults in the basic principles of economics and the dangers of continuing to spend beyond our income. We see all around us the harmful results of ignoring these basic principles of economics over the past several years.

THE BUDGET, INFLATION, AND CONGRESS

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the President recently informed some of the spenders in this Congress that they cannot have their cake and eat it, too; that they cannot put a ceiling on the budget and at the same time increase appropriations for their pet projects.

He told them that he will not spend money, even if it is appropriated, that unbalances the budget.

In this particular case he was, of course, referring to an action by this body that would increase Federal aid to education funds by nearly \$1 billion.

The President's words brought cries of anguish from some of my distinguished colleagues. They charged the President was flouting the will of Congress and turning his back on the little children.

And they implied that he could not do this to them.

Perhaps he cannot, Mr. Speaker, but in my judgment he is going to. And if he does he will be in good Democratic company.

Mr. Speaker, I have not looked into every case of Presidents not spending appropriated funds, but I do have some information about one President who refused to.

His name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And he did it in more than one instance. For instance, he refused to spend appropriated funds for the National Youth Administration. Was he turning his back on the youth of America?

He refused to spend appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps. Was he turning his back on the young men of America?

He refused to spend funds allocated for the Surplus Marketing Agency which

at that time involved the school lunch program. Was he turning his back on the children of America?

Of course not.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the President to act under the Constitution for the good of the Nation. Sometimes, in his judgment it may be more important to take action to end inflation than it is to unbalance the budget by spending funds that have been appropriated for political purposes.

I thank God, we have a President in the White House who is willing to make the hard decisions and the sound decisions, even at the risk of being criticized by those who should know better.

LET THE STUDENTS KNOW

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, at the start of a new school year on college campuses this fall, I feel that it is important for the administration of each institution to have a firm understanding with each student about his on-campus conduct while he is a member of the student body. In this regard, I was pleased to see the policy statement issued by the dean of students of Mount St. Scholastica College of Atchison, Kans., an institution for which I am privileged to be the chairman of the board of trustees.

Each student at Mount St. Scholastica will be given a copy of this statement and will have it explained to him before classes start. Hopefully this will ward off any disruptive action there, but in the event there are any transgressions, the offenders will know exactly what to expect. I understand this same policy statement is being issued to the students at St. Benedict's College, also in Atchison.

I would recommend it to other colleges and universities. A certain amount of unrest and agitation can be expected as long as present day tensions are what they are, but every college administration owes it to the majority of students who enroll for the purpose of furthering their education, to see that they have the opportunity to attend classes and study with as little interference as possible.

The Mount St. Scholastica policy statement follows:

MOUNT ST. SCHOLASTICA COLLEGE,
Atchison, Kans.

All students of MSSC are hereby informed that any and all students actively involved in student demonstrations that result in destruction of property; forcible entry or occupation of campus offices or facilities, aiding or abetting such entry; physical or verbal abuse to any member of the college community; refusal to respond to instructions to restore order; or any other action that results in the violation of the rights of others and disruption of normal college operation will be subject to immediate suspension. Such students will be required to leave the Mount campus within a time period indicated by the Dean of Students or her representative under threat of civil arrest for trespassing.

Should students suspended under this procedure choose to request a hearing from the Student Review Board, they may do so after

making petition in writing to the Dean of Students and subsequently being informed in writing of the place and time of such a hearing.

Sister RITA MCPHEE,
Dean of Students.

THE NEW FEDERALISM

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on August 8 of this year, President Nixon unveiled his "New Federalism" approach to domestic problems. Since that time, much has been said and written about the administration's proposals to reform welfare, manpower training, and poverty programs, and to institute a system of Federal revenue sharing with State and local governments.

Most commentators agree that the "New Federalism" represents a bold new departure in domestic policy. People of all political persuasions are in general agreement that our existing welfare system has been a colossal failure, that manpower training services are in drastic need of overhaul, and that State and local governments are in dire need of revitalization. The "New Federalism" addresses itself to these problems by first recognizing, in President Nixon's words, that—

A third of a century of centralizing power and responsibility in Washington has produced a bureaucratic monstrosity, cumbersome, unresponsive and ineffective. A third of a century of social experiment has left us a legacy of entrenched programs that have outlived their time or outgrown their purposes. A third of a century of unprecedented growth and change has strained our institutions and raised serious questions about whether they are still adequate to the times.

The new left and old right are in agreement that the time has come to return government to the people and that this will mean a shifting of resources and powers back to the governments closest to the people. Noting that too many powers and revenues have been concentrated in Washington over the years, President Nixon has promised that—

We intend to reverse this tide, and to turn back to the states a greater measure of responsibility—not as a way of avoiding problems, but as a better way of solving problems. Along with this should go a share of federal revenues.

Mr. Speaker, this past month has given us all a chance to digest the President's proposals and to take the pulse of our constituents. I have been greatly encouraged by the overwhelming public response in favor of the President's "New Federalism." Congressional mail and personal chats reflect a high public enthusiasm for the new approach. A nationwide Gallup poll taken a week after the President's speech indicates that the proposals have the strong and bipartisan support of 65 percent of the American people with only 20 percent voicing disapproval.

Yesterday at Colorado Springs the

State Governors gave their endorsement to the President's revenue sharing proposals, and a UPI survey of the Governors reveals that all but one of the assembled Governors give high marks to the President's welfare reforms.

A cross section of national newspapers shows editorial opinion running strongly in favor of the proposed changes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that President Nixon has the Nation behind him and his plans to set a new course for America. The "New Federalism" heralds a new day for America and I am hopeful that we in the Congress can lend our full support for its implementation.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to include excerpts from the President's address to the Governors' Conference, and certain articles and editorials pertaining to the "New Federalism":

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH

COLORADO SPRINGS, Sept. 1.—Following are excerpts from the address by President Nixon tonight at the National Governors' Conference:

The central race in the world today is neither an arms race nor a space race. It is the race between man and change. The central question is whether we are to be the masters of events or the pawn of events.

If we are to win this race, then our first need is to make government itself governable.

When the new Administration took office last January, we confronted a set of hard and unpleasant facts.

I cite these not in a partisan way; they are not the fault of any one Administration or any one party. Rather, they are part of our common experience as a people, the result of an accumulating failure of government over the years to come to grips with a future that soon overtook it.

We confronted a legacy of Federal deficits that has added \$58-billion to the burden of public debt in the past 10 years.

We confronted an inflationary spiral that had gone out of control, that has raised consumer prices 18 percent in the last five years, 26 percent in the last 10 years, and that threatened to destroy the dollar unless we acted promptly and forcibly to curb it.

A FISCAL VICE

We confronted the fact that state and local governments were being crushed in a fiscal vise, squeezed by rising costs, rising demands for services and exhaustion of revenue sources.

We confronted the fact that in the past five years the Federal Government alone spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on social programs—more than \$250 billion. Yet far from solving our problems, these expenditures had reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division.

Never in human history has so much been spent by so many for such a negative result. The cost of the lesson has been high, but we have learned that it is not only what we spend that matters; it is the way we spend it.

Beyond this, we confronted a collapse of confidence in government itself, a mounting distrust of all authority that stemmed in large measure from the increasing inability of government to deliver its services or to keep its promises.

As Prof. Peter Drucker has written, "There is mounting evidence that government is big rather than strong; that it is fat and flabby rather than powerful; that it costs a great deal but does not achieve much."

"There is mounting evidence also that the citizen less and less believes in government and is increasingly disenchanting with it. Indeed, government is sick—and just at the time when we need a strong, healthy and vigorous government."

The problem has not been a lack of good intentions and not merely a lack of money. Methods inherited from the thirties proved out of date in the sixties; structures put together in the thirties broke down under the load of the sixties.

GOVERNMENT UNRESPONSIVE

Overly centralized, over-bureaucratized, the Federal Government became unresponsive as well as inefficient.

In the space of only 10 years, state and local expenditures rose by two and a half times—from \$44-billion in 1958 to \$108-billion in 1968.

States alone have had to seek more than 200 tax rate increases in the past eight years.

We have to devise a new way to make our revenue system meet the needs of the seventies—to put the money where the problems are and to get a dollar's worth of return for a dollar spent.

Our new strategy for the seventies begins with the reform of the Government:

¶Overhauling its structure.

¶Pruning out those programs that have failed or that have outlived their time.

¶Ensuring that its delivery systems actually deliver the intended service to the intended beneficiaries.

¶Gearing its programs to the concept of social investment.

¶Focusing its activities not only on tomorrow, but on the day after tomorrow.

This must be a cooperative venture among governments at all levels, because it centers on what I have called the "new federalism"—in which power, funds and authority are channeled increasingly to those governments closest to the people.

The essence of the new federalism is to help regain control of our national destiny by returning a greater share of control to state and local authorities.

This in turn requires constant attention to raising the quality of government at all levels.

The new strategy for the seventies also requires a strategy for peace—and I pledge to you tonight that we will have an effective strategy for peace.

This means maintaining defense forces strong enough to keep the peace—while not allowing wasteful expenditures to drain away resources we need for progress.

It means limiting our commitments abroad to those we can prudently and realistically keep. It means helping other free nations maintain their own security but not rushing in to do for them what they can and should do for themselves.

It does not mean laying down our leadership. It does not mean abandoning our allies. It does mean forging a new structure of world stability in which the burdens as well as the benefits are fairly shared—a structure that does not rely on the strength of one nation but that draws strength from all nations.

An effective strategy for peace makes possible an effective strategy for meeting our domestic needs. To place this new domestic strategy in concrete terms, let me cite a few examples of changes we in the new Administration have made or proposed since taking office.

We have proposed the first major reform of welfare in the history of welfare. . . .

We have proposed the first major restructuring of food programs for the needy in the history of the food programs. . . .

We have declared the first five years of a child's life to be a period of special and specific Federal concern. . . .

We have proposed the first major reform of the income tax system in nearly two decades, to remove millions of the poor from the tax rolls entirely, to close loopholes that have allowed many of the rich to escape taxation and to make the entire structure more balanced and more equitable.

We have proposed the most fundamental reform of the unemployment insurance system in the history of unemployment insurance.

We have proposed the first reform in the fiscal structure of federalism since the nineteen thirties. In proposing to begin the sharing of Federal tax revenues with the states—to be spent as the states see fit—we are putting our money where our principles are.

We have proposed, for the first time in history, a comprehensive and effective delegation of Federal programs to state and local government.

TWO COUNCILS CREATED

We have begun the first over-all reform of the organization of the Federal Government since the Hoover Commission. . . .

For the first time, machinery has been created to raise the problems of the cities and the problems of the environment to the level of formal, interdepartmental, Cabinet-level concern with the creation of the Urban Affairs Council and the Council on Environmental Quality.

There is another reform I have asked and to which I attach special priority as a matter of high principle: reform of the draft.

Until peacetime conditions make a shift to an all-volunteer armed force possible—while the draft remains necessary—it is imperative that we make it as nearly fair as possible, and that we reduce to a minimum the unnecessarily long period of uncertainty that now hangs over the lives of millions of our young people. . . .

If we are to make our choices effective, we need the machinery to translate wish into reality. . . .

It already is painfully clear that many hard choices will have to be made. Dreams of unlimited billions of dollars being released once the war in Vietnam ends are just that—dreams. True, there will be additional money—but the claims on it already are enormous. There should be no illusion that what some call the "peace and growth dividend" will automatically solve our national problems or release us from the need to establish priorities. . . .

In order to find the money for new programs, we will have to trim it out of old ones.

WON'T GO IT ALONE

One of the key points I want to make tonight is . . . Washington will no longer try to go it alone; Washington will no longer dictate without consulting.

This poses a new challenge to the states—not only to devise programs; not only to employ resources, but to choose the things for which they should be employed. . . .

The new federalism also recognizes the role of people—of individuals doing, caring, sharing.

As only one dimension of the new tasks we face, the best estimates are that America's population will increase by 100 million between now and the year 2000.

That means that thirty years from now, there will be half again as many people as there are today. It means that in this short span of time we have to build the equivalent of 50 cities the size of Philadelphia.

Or, to put it another way, the Committee on Urban Growth Policy recommended that we should begin planning now for 100 new cities averaging 100,000 in population, and 10 new cities averaging a million each. Yet even if we did this, it would accommodate only 20 per cent of the added population we have to plan for by the year 2000.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1969]
SIXTY-FIVE PERCENT BACK NIXON PLAN ON WELFARE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., August 30.—President Nixon's welfare reforms win bipartisan support from the American people at this time.

In a nationwide TV address Aug. 8, Mr. Nixon set forth his new domestic program, designed to reform the welfare system, to institute revenue sharing with state and local governments and to improve manpower training programs.

A nationwide Gallup survey conducted a week after the President's address shows favorable opinions outweighing unfavorable reaction by more than 3 to 1 among those aware of the proposed reforms.

To gauge initial public reaction to the Nixon welfare proposals, these questions were asked of a representative national sample of 1,532 adults between Aug. 15 and 18:

Have you heard or read about President Nixon's new welfare proposals?

All those who answered "Yes" (75 per cent) were then asked:

In general would you say you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of them?

	Percent
Favorable	65
Unfavorable	20
No opinion	15

Little difference in opinion is found on the basis of the age of respondents, region of country, income level or political affiliation.

Public opposition to the proposals stems mainly from the belief that the new system does not go far enough toward meeting the increased needs of the poor.

Earlier Gallup surveys have shown widespread public support for tax revenue sharing and federally funded day care centers, two key proposals advanced by President Nixon in his address.

A January, 1967, survey found 70 per cent of Americans in favor of having a percentage of federal income taxes returned to state and local government for use as they see fit. . . .

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Aug. 31, 1969]

POLL SHOWS MOST GOVERNORS BACK NIXON'S WELFARE PLAN

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO. (UPI).—Almost all the nation's governors, with one notable exception, give high marks to President Nixon's proposal for welfare overhaul, a UPI survey showed yesterday.

Only Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia indicated flat opposition. "It is much worse than our present system," Maddox said. "It will add millions of Americans to the welfare rolls."

The governors are gathering in Colorado Springs for an annual conference on state problems, ranging from a drying up of state tax sources to the comparatively new phenomena of disorders on the campus. Several states face chronic financial crises.

President Nixon will arrive at the meeting tomorrow afternoon and deliver a speech tomorrow night while governors are attending a formal ball. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew is expected to arrive today and stay until the meeting ends Wednesday.

The UPI poll sought the views of the governors as they left their state capitals on:

Welfare overhaul and Nixon's proposed revenue sharing with the states.

The chances of a constitutional amendment for direct election of the president.

The outlook on the troubled campuses.

A single theme showed through the replies: A large majority of the governors want more welfare help and revenue sharing than Nixon offered.

The governors indicated little confidence but a lot of hope that the worst of the campus disorders were over. An overwhelming number refused to predict how the constitutional amendment would fare in their legislatures. However, enough small states indicated the answer would be "no," to point to serious trouble for the proposal for the popular election of the president.

Forty-five replies were received. Three state offices referred to previous statements made by the governors on the questions. Only two preferred to make no comment until after the 4-day governors' conference which will deal with many of the questions asked.

The exception clearly proved the rule of support for Nixon's welfare and revenue sharing programs.

Of the comments on welfare, 43 governors favored the proposed overhaul entirely or with some suggested changes. One of the five dissenters was Maddox who predicted 22 million people would be on welfare by 1971. (The administration estimates the welfare rolls would increase from 10 million to 22.4 million under the proposed changes, largely because aid would be extended to the working poor.)

Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr. of Virginia favored "the objective of getting people off the relief rolls and onto payrolls and the work and training aspects of the President's proposals." However, he was troubled that "it appears the program would drastically increase the number of people on welfare in Virginia."

Maddox was opposed to revenue sharing with the cryptic comment that the Nixon plan added up to "peanuts." He said the federal government should "relinquish some of its taxing powers to the state. That would be far better than tax sharing."

The great bulk of the governors said they had no clear indication whether campus disorders would increase or decrease with the fall school terms.

Only 13 of the 50 governors would hazard a prediction on how their legislatures would vote on a constitutional amendment for the direct election of the president. Eight said the amendment would be rejected by their states; five believe it would be approved.

The Associated Press reported that Democratic governors generally count Edward M. Kennedy out of contention for the 1972 presidential nomination—but they aren't ready to take sides or forecast a successor for the Massachusetts senator as the party's front-runner for a challenge to Nixon.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 10, 1969]

MR. NIXON ON THE "NEW FEDERALISM"

We will know more about the "New Federalism," which Mr. Nixon expounded on Friday night, after he has sent his messages to Congress next week on the principal subjects involved: welfare reform, manpower training and federal revenue sharing with the states. But on the basis of Mr. Nixon's address and its attendant explanation by his aides, it is already clear that welfare reform is to be the centerpiece of his new policy and that Mr. Nixon has moved on this issue in a big, dramatic way.

The innovations he has recommended include not just the establishment of a standard minimum federal payment of \$65 per month to the blind, aged and disabled among welfare recipients, but also—and infinitely more important—the abolition of the destructive, discredited AFDC category altogether. That is the burgeoning, costly program which began as a widow's aid measure with the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, and which has developed since the war into a wholly unsatisfactory way of granting aid to the (largely black and largely urban) poor. Its terms put a premium on family disintegration and discourage work, and the payments it provides to women with dependent children fluctuate wildly from state to state. Mr. Nixon proposes to replace AFDC with a "family assistance plan" based on direct federal payments to families with children—whether they do or do not have other income and regardless of whether they are male- or female-headed—if their annual income falls below a certain amount. He would gear this program to job-training

and/or work requirements and supplementation of aid by the states. Because the plan encompasses the working poor, it would roughly double the number of persons in the country currently receiving welfare payments from the federal government.

It is hard to think of an issue that has attracted a more improbable constituency of interests and passions (most of them in conflict) than has our federal welfare program. Mr. Nixon is evidently aware of the crosspressures that have been generated. There are the academic planners who have promulgated a variety of negative tax and guaranteed income plans; there are the state legislators, desperate over the financial burden the AFDC caseload has imposed on state treasuries; there are the newly organized and militant welfare mothers themselves, escalating their demands; and above all there is that fellow of whom we have heard so much of late—the Middle American—who has been given to believe that his taxes are going down the drain to look after a bunch of lazy, promiscuous citizens who, unlike himself, won't work. On this last score, the inclusion of the working poor in the plan represents a highly desirable step toward defusing the social tensions that our welfare system has produced and toward making it more equitable as well. But even with this innovation and with his effort at neutralizing criticism via a bit of rhetorical flimflam (the name of the program was in hot contention up until its actual unveiling), Mr. Nixon must expect that he will take a lot of heat on his proposal from individuals and groups on all sides.

The degree to which the job training and work requirements are wise, enforceable, and actually meant to be enforced will be one focus of controversy. The amount of money requested is bound to be another. And there will be debate over many other matters—the operation of the system, its incentive or lack of incentive to stingy states to supplement federal payment, the total advantage to the welfare recipient himself. Doubtless these are all aspects of the plan that merit scrutiny. But for the moment it is important to receive Mr. Nixon's proposal for what it is: a recommendation to Congress for a sweeping and on the whole beneficent change in the way we regard our poor and in the way we deal with them. "I propose that the federal government build a foundation under the income of every American family with dependent children that cannot care for itself," Mr. Nixon said, "wherever in America that family may live." That is the critical part of what Mr. Nixon said, the sentence on which the new policy toward the poor turns.

It was just about eight months ago that Mr. Nixon's task force on welfare turned in what was then considered a pretty far-out, not to say flaming-liberal report, recommending that he consider a federal payments floor, national standards of eligibility, and other incremental gains in the existing system. A number of those who worked on the report (which declared a plan of this general nature beyond political feasibility) and a number who did not, came into government and pursued the matter there. Their twists and turns of thought led them to abandon the notion of improving an unworkable system and to fight within the administration for their conclusions. Reportedly, the position finally reached was not widely popular within the administration, and there is said to have been more than plenty of warning to the President that he was moving in an unpopular, impractical and financially insupportable direction. Mr. Nixon subscribed in the end to the minority view, and in our opinion he has chosen well.

[From the Hartford Courant, Aug. 10, 1969]

MR. NIXON'S BOLD SOCIAL PROGRAM

President Nixon bit off a large mouthful Friday evening when, in little more than

half an hour, he endeavored to explain to a largely unprepared nation a new social program involving fundamental and even revolutionary changes of both concept and execution. Inevitably, in disclosing his program which is admittedly both "controversial and expensive", he left many questions unanswered. He and his advisors have evidently considered thoughtfully and at length our present patchwork machinery for dealing with the whole spectrum of welfare and its allied problems. In the coming months, they will be called on to share their thinking with the public in detail. But in the meantime, no one can complain that the Nixon administration has not sought to deal boldly and imaginatively with some of the most pressing of today's social problems.

The President made three specific proposals. One of them would return the federal job training programs to the states and communities with the virtual abolition of the controversial Office of Economic Opportunity which would become an experimental hothouse for new ideas in the social field. As he said—and many others have said it before him—OEO "has suffered from a confusion of roles, and from a massive attempt to do everything at once." How Mr. Nixon plans to transfer the worthwhile job training programs to local control, he did not say except to promise that they would not be dumped on unprepared communities.

For a second of his proposals, Mr. Nixon came up with the textbook phrase, the New Federalism. This is the transfer directly and without strings of a stated but increasing part of the Federal Government's income tax receipts to the states, with part of it earmarked for local communities. Almost before the President had stopped speaking, such influential members of Congress as the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Wilbur Mills, were voicing opposition to unrestricted grants of federal funds. The once clear-cut distinction between federal and states' rights and responsibilities has long been eroded but enough probably remains to ensure a real battle.

But the Nixon proposal that led the newspaper stories and made the headlines yesterday morning—and probably raised the most eyebrows—involves the welfare system. Mr. Nixon would scrap the whole Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) program which is far and away the most important part of our national welfare structure. Under AFDC, poor families, without an employable father, receive joint federal and state grants ranging from about \$262 in Connecticut, which is near the top, down to \$39 in Mississippi. It would be replaced by a basic federal grant, which the states could add to, of \$1600 a year for a family of four without other income, with the important provision that most of any income earned by the family could be retained. Equally important, unemployed fathers and mothers would have to accept jobs or job training when available, and day care centers would be provided for mothers who were training or working.

The President was not understating the case when he charged the present AFDC system with breaking up homes, penalizing work and robbing recipients of dignity. The Kerner Commission on civil disorders charged that its failures "alienate the taxpayers who support it, the social workers who administer it and the poor who depend on it." It has long cried for overhaul if not complete replacement. It has burdened the states grievously: some \$38 million of Connecticut's last biennial deficit was due to state welfare, much of it because of the state's share of AFDC payments.

The replacement of AFDC would be net gain for the states and the recipients. But the practical problems of replacing it with Mr. Nixon's program are obvious. For all its

efforts, Connecticut has only a handful of acceptable day care centers; Mr. Nixon calls for thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands. He calls for payment of the benefits through Social Security; those concerned will need assurance that this does not cripple the casework approach. There are many, many other questions to be answered before that part of Mr. Nixon's social proposals wins general acceptance.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Aug. 10, 1969]

NIXON'S BOLD DEPARTURES

President Nixon's long awaited welfare program has taken pie out of the sky and put it on the pantry shelf. But Congress will determine the size of the servings, who gets them and when.

Whether Congress enacts any or all of the Nixon program this year or next, the fact that a President has proposed fixed basic income for the poor and sharing of federal income with the states shows how far these once visionary concepts have come. Their enactment, perhaps in modified form, now appears only a question of time.

Of the President's two major proposals, the revamping of the nation's welfare system is the most urgent and realistic. Everybody, the poor, the taxpayer, the sociologist and the bureaucrats who administer it can point to serious weaknesses in the present crazy quilt federal-state-local system of welfare. Not only has it served its clients and its funders badly, but many of the ills of national life can be traced to the unequal way it distributes aid to the needy. Its replacement by a more equitable, if more expensive, system is long overdue. President Nixon's program of fixed minimum income coupled with work and job training requirements is addressed to that need.

His plan for revenue sharing with the states simple on the surface, involves fundamental questions of federal-state authority and faces opposition from some key congressional leaders who will not easily be convinced of its wisdom. Win or lose on revenue sharing the President has posed the question, brought it out of the political science textbooks and laid it before Congress and the people. It can no longer be ignored as possible nourishment for financially anemic local government.

Specifics of the Nixon program will be spelled out in special messages to Congress this week and it is doubtful that any action will come before next year. In the interlude between proposal and possible adoption, the forces that generate false hopes and rising expectations will be at work. This is the danger of laying out a plan which has to be brought into being by others.

Those persons likely to benefit from the President's proposals—and in one way or another that could include most everybody—must realize that fixed basic income for the poor, more federal aid for local government and all the other changes Mr. Nixon spoke of are nothing but his hopes given voice. They won't materialize tomorrow.

Viewed as a turn toward more sensible, more compassionate and more imaginative ways to meet the challenge of rising welfare and local government needs, the Nixon program is one of promise. But it will be some time before it will buy anything at the grocery store.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 14, 1969]

REFORM IS NIXON'S WELFARE GOAL

President Nixon's \$4 billion plan to overhaul the nation's welfare system has come under criticism in and out of Congress.

The crossfire between supporters of the President's theories and those who oppose it should not obscure the basis of the proposal.

That is to attack the causes of poverty and try, ultimately, to ease the taxpayers'

burden of welfare payments rather than to perpetuate a state of dependency on the part of millions of citizens.

Statistics are dramatic but sobering. Relief roles are rising by almost 10% per year under a welter of local, county, state and national programs. Most of the increase is in the category of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. In 1958 there were 2.8 million AFDC recipients; in 1968 6.1 million. Over the same period, costs rose from \$815 million to \$2.5 billion per year. In all, government figures claim that 41% of nonwhites and 12% of whites in the nation qualify under the Social Security Administration's definition of poverty.

This is not to say that the President's sketched-out program is completely feasible or anywhere near complete.

But with almost one American in every 20 on some sort of welfare roll, the problem presses for a solution, not for more stopgap measures designed merely to sustain the poor.

The target has to be reform. Those who point up the plan's alleged shortcomings are doing their duty as long as they mix compassion for the needy with an awareness of the nation's capacity to support them. But the long-range goal has to be elimination of slums and ignorance and lack of employment opportunity and that's the Nixon approach which taxpayers can endorse.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 12, 1969]
NEEDED WELFARE CHANGES

President Nixon laid out a bold new blueprint in his televised address on welfare and other domestic matters.

It was much more than just the presentation of a package for aid to the underprivileged. It was, in fact, a call for revising the thrust of government, modernizing its operations and reversing the trend toward centralization.

"After a third of a century of power flowing from the people and the states to Washington, it is time for a new federalism in which power, funds and responsibility will flow from Washington to the states and the people," he said.

Mr. Nixon recognized that we are facing an urban crisis, a social crisis and a crisis of confidence in government. Nowhere, he said, has the failure of government been more apparent than in its efforts to help the poor.

In messages going to the Congress this week, the Administration will spell out its proposals in greater detail. Further refinement obviously will be made before actual legislation is drafted next month.

But the President has set forth the broad general outline of his approach. We find that approach imaginative, innovative—and a refreshing change from the past. The emphasis is on increasing the incentive of state and local governments and the people themselves.

The principal item in the Administration package is a complete replacement of present welfare procedures in order to end "unfairness in a system that has become unfair to the welfare recipient, unfair to the working poor and unfair to the taxpayer."

In essence the program Mr. Nixon advocates would be based on equality of treatment for all recipients, a work requirement and a work incentive designed so that working fathers would not be penalized because of their earnings. At present, a family with dependent children stands to gain more on welfare if the father is unemployed or deserts.

Thus the Administration is proposing an income maintenance program to aid the working poor, with benefits so scaled that it would always pay to work. That is vastly different from a guaranteed annual income which Mr. Nixon rightly observed undermines the incentive to work and establishes a right without a responsibility.

The President also proposes complete overhaul of manpower training services in order

to eliminate "a terrible tangle of waste and confusion." The third phase of his program is revamping the Office of Economic Opportunity to make it a laboratory for development of new ideas for helping people. And the fourth is a start on sharing of federal tax revenues with state and local government.

Costs will be high, and where the money is to come from has not been determined, but the question recurs: Can we afford not to meet those costs in this day and age? Can we afford not to take steps to correct a situation which is bringing state and local governments to the brink of financial disaster?

We think not.

[From the Kansas City Star, Aug. 12, 1969]
TACKLING THE GENUINE CRISIS OF THE
NATION'S WELFARE SYSTEM

President Nixon's first major domestic policy address to the American people—calling for sweeping changes in welfare, job training and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the initiation of a federal tax-sharing plan with the states and cities—was both timely and important. Final details of all the proposals are as yet unclear. But the President, in his speech Friday night and in the messages being sent this week to the Congress, has constructively drawn the outlines and provided a forum for debate.

First, Mr. Nixon proposed that the present welfare program, particularly Aid to Families with Dependent Children, be replaced by the family security plan. As Mr. Nixon accurately pointed out, A. F. D. C. has proved a colossal failure. It is a hodgepodge of federal, state and local laws and regulations, difficult if not impossible to administer justly. Spiraling case loads and increasing costs are driving already financially pressed states and cities to the brink of bankruptcy.

Yet the system does not meet the human, social or financial needs of the poor. It breaks up homes, penalizes work, promotes dependency, dulls personal dignity and is grossly unequal from state to state. Almost everyone—the recipients, the working poor, who help pay the cost but receive none of the benefits, and the taxpayer—is angry and disillusioned with the welfare system and believe it's time for a change. The President has recognized this.

Aid to the elderly, disabled and blind would continue to be administered by the states, but with the addition of a minimum federal payment below which no recipient's grant would fall.

But more important is replacing A. F. D. C. The President proposes that Congress institute a family security plan that would provide the working poor as well as the non-working poor, regardless of the presence of the father in the home, with a federally financed guaranteed annual income. A non-working family of four, for instance, would receive \$1,600 a year. More important, there would be incentives to work and increased job training with a \$80-a-month incentive—and in many cases a requirement—to participate.

Under the family security plan, eligibility would be based on financial need, not on the arbitrary and artificial set of criteria of the present system. The President's proposal would set a single minimum standard for welfare across the country, bringing payments in the 20 lowest paying and most poverty-ridden states up to the national average and providing some financial relief for states and cities paying above that average. The federal minimum would be merely a foundation upon which the states would be expected to build.

The President left many unanswered questions. Foremost among them is the relationship between the federal establishment, which would be providing a larger share of the money, and the state and local authorities, which have been responsible for many

of the inefficient and unfair welfare practices. This relationship will need to be carefully detailed in the ultimate legislation.

Mr. Nixon was less specific in his job training proposal. We have reservations about turning it over to the states. Like the present welfare system, it might turn into 50 divergent and ineffective systems. That would depend on its implementation.

Supporters of OEO can take heart in the President's proposal to make the antipoverty agency a laboratory for the innovation and testing of new programs to aid the disadvantaged. That was the intent of the original legislation and should lay to rest any suggestion that OEO is to be abolished.

The President's comments on returning a share of federal income tax revenues to the states and cities were vague and, in a sense, the outline for what would be only a pilot project. Yet the proposal could set up the machinery for a much larger future program and for a major change in American government.

Generally, the President's proposals, particularly those on welfare, move in the right direction, or so it seems to us. They attempt to deal with domestic problems of the highest priority. The package is complex and controversial, with elements drawn from many sources in both political parties. The mood of the country being what it is, the 91st Congress has some extremely important work to do this year and next.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 14, 1969]
BREAKING THE WELFARE CYCLE

There was plenty of straight talk and plain good sense in the welfare message President Nixon sent to Congress. It is a call for a basic reform of the federal welfare system. How much it will cost is not known. It may be more than Mr. Nixon estimates—\$4 billion.

But the effort should be supported by the American people because it is the most hopeful chance on the political horizon for improving the existing welfare apparatus.

"The present welfare system," Mr. Nixon told Congress, "has failed us. It has fostered family breakup, has provided very little help in many states, and has even deepened dependency by all too often making it more attractive to go on welfare than to go to work."

Mr. Nixon proposes a new approach "that will make it more attractive to go to work than to go on welfare, and will establish a nationwide minimum payment to dependent families with children."

The basic income which the program envisions—to be paid by the federal government—would give those families who cannot care for themselves enough to live on, at least for the necessities. Existing welfare payments vary greatly from state to state—from a high of \$263 a month down to \$39 a month.

Mr. Nixon proposes that dependent families who receive welfare payments be encouraged to go to work to earn more money. He would do this by allowing, say, a family of four to earn up to \$60 a month before their benefits would be reduced.

Further, he proposes to extend welfare payments available to the "working poor"—those who now are working but who in some cases are earning less than nonworkers on welfare receive.

The most glaring inequity in the present welfare system, the President maintains, is this exclusion of families who are working to pull themselves out of poverty.

His plan also would eliminate one of the most detrimental features of the existing system—the policy of forcing the father out of the house. In more than half the states, families headed by unemployed men don't qualify for public assistance, and in no state does a family headed by a father working

full time receive help. But if the father leaves, as many do, the families become eligible for assistance.

Mr. Nixon's plan would require all able-bodied persons who accept welfare payments to register for work or job training and to accept that work or training when it is available. Day care centers will have to be provided to permit mothers of school-age children to accept training or work. The idea is to smash the cycle of poverty which entraps many poor families.

Benefits for the aged, the blind, and the disabled—which currently vary from \$40 to \$145 a month among the 50 states—also would be supported by a federal minimum of \$65.

In sum, Mr. Nixon's proposal is a heartening new approach to a problem which has been growing for three decades. We are glad to see Mr. Nixon's recognition of the dismal failure of the existing system—a system which has seen welfare costs double since 1960 and the number of welfare recipients rise from 5.8 million to more than 9 million during a time of low unemployment. His new approach is both humane and practical.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Aug. 12, 1969]

A BOLD APPROACH TO WELFARE, POVERTY ILLS

President Nixon has proposed dramatic changes in the nation's approach to welfare and poverty. His reform package is strong medicine but the shortcomings of present efforts call for drastic remedies.

His plan is certain to receive an extensive going over in Congress. But the basic concepts should win approval as a promising alternative to an unpopular system.

President Nixon described the present welfare system as a failure. It displeases both those on welfare, and taxpayers who pay the bills. In numbers assisted and costs it is growing alarmingly—with no prospect for stemming the tide.

Initially the cost of the Nixon plan would be far higher because it would give more assistance to more people. In the long run it should also help more people free themselves from dependence on government aid.

The plan involves far more than welfare reform. About \$2.5 billion a year would be spent to give supplemental income to low-income families not now eligible for welfare. For a family of four with a father earning only \$2,000 a year, there would be a \$960 a year supplement.

This "family assistance" plan is a more ambitious anti-poverty program than the nation has yet undertaken.

While the concept is similar to the "guaranteed income" idea Mr. Nixon said it is not the same. The difference, he said, is that under a guaranteed income there would be no work requirement.

Under his proposals, employable recipients would lose their benefits if they refuse to accept training or employment. There would be an exception for mothers with pre-school children, who would not be required to work until the children reached school age.

They would find it easier to work before that time through the creation of an extensive system of day care centers. The centers could offer health and nutrition benefits to children.

The Nixon plan would put a "floor" of \$1,600 per year under the assistance to a family of four. One state pays only \$39 per month and others, mostly in the South, fall below the \$1,600 figure. Idaho wouldn't be affected since a family of four receives more than \$1,600 now under the aid to dependent children program.

Administration of the "family assistance" program would be federalized, under the Social Security administration.

Perhaps to offset the questions that such a step will raise, the President proposed to hand the federal job training programs to

the states. Presently there is too little coordination to the numerous federal programs, and these are not coordinated with state-administered efforts.

To help more people on welfare find jobs will require an expansion of job-training, as well as better coordination. This the President also proposes.

The President chose to offer a bold and far-reaching plan, rather than patchwork changes. His plan offers the benefits seen in the guaranteed income concept, while emphasizing incentives and opportunities employment.

It would extend assistance to thousands of low-income families in which the head of the family works. The family would be able to live better and the children should have a better opportunity.

Greater assistance would be provided to people on welfare in states where payment levels are too low. The concept of a minimum level would be fairer to the people involved, and might help ease the problem of migration of poor from the South to the northern cities.

The concept of welfare dependency as a temporary situation for people able to work would be strengthened. A work requirement could be enforced only by making job training available, and helping people to find jobs.

Present welfare and poverty problems stem from a combination of many factors, some beyond the reach of changes in any system. The Nixon plan is no panacea. But it appears to be far more promising than the present unpopular and discredited system.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Aug. 11, 1969]

NIXON'S PLAN OF INCENTIVES COULD MEND WELFARE FLAWS

President Nixon's new approach to the problem of assisting poor people makes a lot of sense.

"For the first time," he proposed, "the Government would recognize that it has no less of an obligation to the working poor than to the nonworking poor; and for the first time, benefits would be scaled in such a way that it would always pay to work."

This would cost more money—at least at the start. Not only would the government be giving financial help to some families not now eligible for it, but standards of assistance would be considerably raised in 20 states.

The long range benefits, as seen by the President, would be great. The plan, he said, "aims at getting everyone able to work off welfare rolls and onto payrolls."

"It aims at ending the unfairness in a system that has become unfair to the welfare recipient, unfair to the working poor and unfair to the taxpayer."

Those are goals that everyone can applaud. The question is: Will the specifics of the plan bring about the desired results?

Only time and experience will bring the answers. But experience has shown all kinds of flaws in the present jerry-built welfare system. Drastic changes are certainly called for.

Mr. Nixon spotlighted one of the worst defects when he pointed out that:

"The present system often makes it possible to receive more money on welfare than on a low-paying job. This creates an incentive not to work; it is also unfair to the working poor. It is morally wrong for a family that is working to try to make ends meet to receive less than the family across the street on welfare."

So his plan would call for some help to the working poor and financial incentives to non-workers to get jobs, if they possibly can. To help them qualify for employment, there would be more job training. To enable mothers to take jobs, there would be a major expansion of day-care centers.

Along with the overhaul of the welfare

program, Mr. Nixon suggested that the Office of Economic Opportunity concentrate on what he called "its innovative role." In other words, instead of being another welfare agency, the OEO would develop new programs which would eventually be "spun off" to existing agencies. Details are awaited.

The President ventured into new ground when he proposed that the federal government share a small portion—\$1 billion a year to start—of its revenue with the states.

This has been urged increasingly of late as state and local governments have come under heavy financial pressure but this is the first time a President has endorsed the idea.

Revenue-sharing may be an inevitable development but we find something contradictory in the President's description of it as "a step toward the new federalism . . . a gesture of faith in America's states and localities and in the principles of democratic self-government."

What the federal government disperses it must inevitably control in some measure and that seems to us to mean more centralization of power.

At any rate, revenue-sharing will get extensive debate before it is finally wrapped up with a lot of strings and delivered. Meanwhile, the proposal for overhauling welfare must be debated, too. We hope that a sensible plan, mainly following the President's guidelines, will emerge.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Aug. 11, 1969]

NEW HOPE ON WELFARE

With his sweeping welfare proposals, President Nixon has acted with refreshing boldness to reshape and revitalize a 35-year-old patchwork system that today satisfies no one.

Broadly speaking, the Nixon proposals thrust to the heart of the welfare mess. By realistically combining a compassionate national income floor with work incentives and requirements, the plan could help end the cycle of dependency for the poor themselves and reduce the resentments generated among the taxpayers.

The recommended national family assistance plan would for the first time insure that no family of four anywhere in America need live on less than \$1600 a year, or \$133 a month. This would help to correct the patently unjust state-by-state efforts, where monthly payments to such families range from New Jersey's \$269 to Mississippi's \$39.

An especially appealing part of the Nixon package is its great emphasis on work incentives. The proposals would not only encourage welfare recipients to gain needed training and become productive workers through a system of financial inducements, child-care centers and training programs; they would for the first time, nationally, give family assistance supplements to poor families already working.

Thus, the incentives would always make it "pay to work" as well as encourage families to stay together—contrary to two of the most grievous drawbacks of the existing system.

Congress, however, should read very carefully the countless details still to come, with respect to the proposals on manpower training and on the requirement that mothers of children above pre-school age must accept suitable jobs or training if able to. While this should be encouraged, an ironclad requirement that all head-of-household mothers of children still only six or seven or eight years of age must work, strikes us as excessively authoritarian.

And the President's very concept of a work requirement as a condition for getting income aid, while appropriate as a prod to adult malingerers, still offers no better answer than ever to the old question: What about the children of those who could work

but won't? And yet the work mandate, which separates his proposal from a fully guaranteed annual-income plan, could prove a key element in winning acceptance in Congress for this revolutionary restructuring.

The fourth part of the Nixon package would establish for the first time a long-overdue system of federal revenue sharing with the states. If the sharing formula treats fairly those states that have done most to help themselves, it seems eminently acceptable.

While the President's proposals are innovative in concept, and the funding (\$4.5 billion the first year) seems substantial, the impact on New York State is disappointingly modest. Thus, the estimated New York share of \$161 million means that a state with some 9 per cent of the national population—and one of the biggest welfare problems of any—gets less than 4 per cent of this outlay.

One obvious flaw which tends to produce this effect is the plan's apparent failure to give any heed at all to regional differences in living costs. Thus while Mr. Nixon rightly deplores the gross disparity in present welfare payments and declares that no child is "worth" more in one state than another, his very equating of federal dollar payments will make a child "worth" more in a state where it is cheaper to live than in one like New York where a dollar does not stretch as far. In fighting for equity for states like ours, it will certainly behoove our congressional delegation to insist on a cost-of-living differential that will equate federal payments in terms of REAL income and not just dollar signs.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 11, 1969]

SOMETHING DIFFERENT

Listening to President Nixon's "New Federalism" address on domestic matters, one marveled at how carefully he steered between the extreme positions of liberalism and conservatism. In the speech there is something that will appeal to almost everybody.

Predictably, however, we will hear cries from various quarters that it is too much or that it is not enough.

Already the professional "something-for-nothing" pressure groups are claiming Mr. Nixon's national welfare floor of \$1,600 for a family of four is totally inadequate and that a guaranteed annual income in the neighborhood of \$5,500 is the only acceptable solution.

And we expect that those fundamentally opposed to welfare payments for any but the most destitute will rise up in opposition to any plan that sets national norms for welfare.

Mr. Nixon's comments about returning power to the states and the localities were simply a sugar coating as far as his family assistance program is concerned. The idea of a federal income guarantee does not distribute power; it concentrates it. But his proposals to assign manpower training to the state and local governments and his tax-sharing plan do indeed tend to remove power and decision-making from Washington.

Furthermore, his executive decision to limit the money-wasting Office of Economic Opportunity to experimental job programs should please conservatives who see OEO as a symbol of anti-poverty inefficiency.

For some weeks, as this new welfare scheme leaked out, Washington pundits have been calling it a victory for Administration liberals, notably Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch and urban affairs expert Daniel P. Moynihan. Indeed their imprint can be seen in these proposals but the plan must be short of their expectations.

In this Administration, it is becoming increasingly clear, you win some and you lose some. Mr. Nixon is proving adroit at balancing positions and continues to avoid ideologi-

cal rigidity by maintaining flexibility. There is much in this plan that is offensive to orthodox Republicanism.

This newspaper over the years has supported the good, old fashioned philosophy that man is improved when he works for his bread and debased when he lives off of welfare doles. Our initial reaction, therefore, to the idea of an income floor was negative.

But second thoughts rushed in, prompted by the balance Mr. Nixon so carefully wove into his proposals. Basic philosophies sometimes have to bend to realities.

There are several realities that cannot be ignored. The first reality is that the present welfare system is a first-class mess. Dole rolls are lengthening rapidly even in this period of high productivity and prosperity. The system encourages the breakup of poverty level homes and discourages work by welfare recipients. Its unevenness contributes to the serious problems of the metropolitan states. And its funds too often flow directly down the drain and its costs stagger governments.

At least Mr. Nixon has put forth a new approach, one that closely couples work incentives and job training to welfare payments. And, unlike the present system, it allows the man of the house to stay at home, keep his family together, and try to work his way out of the poverty cycle.

Another reality is that the economy of the poorer states, like South Carolina, will almost surely benefit from an income floor. The lower levels of humanity will be lifted up, relieving somewhat the social and economic drag.

Still, the \$4 billion extra cost of the Nixon plan is worrisome and details have not yet been spelled out. Judgment must be reserved until Congress begins debate on these proposals. Stiff congressional opposition is assured and the Nixon plan will have to pass a stern test.

It is sufficient at this early stage simply to give the President an "A" for effort. Right or wrong, he has shown the courage to try something different.

[From the Nashville Banner, Aug. 14, 1969]
NIXON PLAN WOULD RETURN STATES' RESPONSIBILITY

The emphasis these days is on being as candid as one possibly can be; to "tell it like it is," as the saying goes. President Nixon obviously concurs with that sentiment because in his statement Wednesday on proposed federal revenue sharing with the states he told it bluntly. His words were strikingly clear, and powerful in their intent. They require no elaboration.

"In the last five years the federal government enacted scores of new federal programs: it added tens of thousands of new employees to the federal payroll; it spent tens of billions of dollars in new funds to heal the grave social ills of rural and urban America . . . Yet despite the enormous federal commitment in new men, new ideas and new dollars from Washington, it was during this very period in our history that the problems of the cities deepened rapidly into crisis."

The crises that confront all of America's state governments are the products of highly complex social, political and economic ills. As John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, pointed out on this page yesterday, the nation's cities are faced with strangulation unless the federal government begins to channel tax revenues back to state and local governments so that they, in turn, can come to grips with the problems that directly confront them.

Mr. Nixon's analysis of the dire situation faced by state and local government is refreshingly perceptive. The President visualizes his revenue sharing proposition as providing "encouragement and the necessary resources for local and state officials to exercise leadership in solving their own prob-

lems." It is exactly the opposite—concentration in Washington of the nation's fiscal resources—that for so long has deprived the states of an active role in the fight against contemporary urban and suburban maladies. With responsibility for solving these ills shifted to state and local officials, the general public will be permitted an increasingly decisive part in the administration of local agencies. The President's proposal, in short, seeks to return government to the people.

Briefly, the revenue sharing package would: Restore, by 1975, up to \$5 billion to the states. The size of the total funds to be shared would be a fixed percentage of personal taxable income annually in each state. For fiscal 1971 it would be one third of one per cent; and it would rise each year to a regular constant figure.

Provide funds among the 50 states from allocations based on each state's share of the national population. As an incentive to expand its own tax resources, a state whose revenue effort is above the national average would get a bonus above its basic per capita portion of revenue sharing.

Establish a set formula for the amount states must share with local government units. A local government's share would be based on its proportion of total local government revenue raised in the state.

Mr. Nixon's proposal is the third segment of his "new federalism" program which he launched last week in recommending sweeping overhaul of the welfare structure. By narrowing the gap between the people and the institutions dealing with their problems, the chief executive has made good on his promise to restore strength and vigor to local government.

Whether or not the Congress shares the President's confidence in the ability of the people to govern themselves wisely and share in the control of their own destinies, remains to be seen.

APPALLING NEWS THAT GOVERNMENT OF IRAN HAS DECIDED TO RE-LEGALIZE OPIUM PRODUCTION

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself today to an editorial that appeared in last Sunday's edition of the Evening Star concerning the appalling and disturbing news that the Government of Iran has decided to re-legalize opium production.

Such a decision by a government with strong ties to the United States is most regrettable. As a direct consequence, illicit heroin traffic in the United States will most assuredly increase and, with it, increasing instances of crime. The resumption of opium production cultivation in Iran will also seriously impede the effort of this country and other friendly nations to minimize the illicit trade in opiates.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert the Sunday Star editorial entitled "The Misery Trade," after which I will conclude with a few further observations:

THE MISERY TRADE

Turkey's decision to halt legal production of opium is as welcome as Iran's move earlier this year to restart poppy cultivation after a 13-year ban is regrettable.

The Iranians, who had managed to reduce their number of opium addicts from more than 1.5 million to 400,000, are going back

into business because prohibition resulted in an annual revenue loss of \$6 million, a yearly outflow of \$13 million in gold (the medium of exchange in this nefarious trade) and the flooding of the country with smuggled Turkish and Afghan opium.

But the mass of Eastern Mediterranean opium—from which "hard" drugs such as heroin and morphine are derived—is not intended for the local market. Its final destination, after refining in France and transshipment through Italy, is where the opulent users are: Right here in the United States.

The latest figures, furnished by the U.S. Bureau of Customs, are frightening. In the fiscal year ending June 30, more heroin was seized in New York City alone than in the entire nation the previous year.

The smuggling of hashish, a concentrated form of marijuana, was up 325 percent. The amount of confiscated cocaine—an alkaloid derivative of the coca leaf—more than doubled during the year.

Earlier this year, John E. Ingersoll, director of the Justice Department's new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, reported that drug-abuse arrests had increased 774 percent over the past eight years.

These are not statistics of little consequence, nor are they likely to be unrelated to last year's 16 percent increase in U.S. crime.

The 1961 United Nations narcotics convention permits Turkey, Iran, India, Laos, North Vietnam, Burma and Yugoslavia to export opium for medical use. But illegal production invariably has accompanied regulated growing. With synthetic substitutes rapidly replacing opium derivatives in modern medicine, there clearly is reason for revision of the convention in the direction of more restrictions.

Turkish growers and Premier Suleyman Demirel's government will be partially compensated for the lost revenues of the legal opium trade by \$12.5 million in U.S. financial and technical assistance over the next five years. Since American society is the big loser from smuggled opium, this arrangement makes sense.

Iran said earlier this year that its decision to re-legalize opium production was "provisional." Now that Turkey has banned production, Iran ought to reconsider its position.

Mr. Speaker, Iran has been experiencing economic and social problems resulting from its ban on opium production. Smuggled opium from neighboring countries, such as Afghanistan and Turkey, who did not follow Iran's example, caused the increase of opium addiction and a heavy drain on the gold supply. The ban since its institution in 1955, has meant an annual revenue loss of \$6 million which has not been adequately compensated for by foreign assistance programs. All these factors have inhibited the country's development. And in the opinion of Iranian officials, the present situation negates the objectives of the opium ban.

To alleviate their situation Iran re-legalized the cultivation of opium. Placing the production under strict governmental control, the government will only allow for the cultivation of enough opium to meet the needs of Iran. Exportation and illegal distribution is guarded against and offenders face severe punishment.

However, contrary to the Iranian intent, production means overproduction. The overestimate of the need of the country in order to meet the need of the country is the usual result of such programs. This is compounded by the un-

controllable possibilities to sow more than is allowed and to sell their surplus on the black market.

And the excessive amount of poppy harvested leads, in spite of governmental control, to divergent and illicit disposal. In fact, prior to the 1955 ban, the production of opium in Iran was not economically worthwhile unless part of the harvest was exported and exported into the black market.

Another factor that indicates that an illicit traffic of Iranian opium would develop is the accessibility and lower price than that of Southeast Asian and the higher quality—it has a 12- to 14-percent morphine content as compared with the normal 10 percent.

While recognizing Iran's right to resume opium poppy cultivation, and understanding of the circumstances that led them to this course of action, and respectful of their genuine attempt to control production, it must be stated that the advisability of this course of action is dubious. Resumption of opium cultivation will not be of benefit to Iran nor to other nations of the world which have problems of drug abuse. It will serve only to aggravate the problem it is intended to solve.

So, in view of Turkey's decision to halt the production of opium and in accordance with Iran's resolve to eliminate the "misery trade," the United States should request Iran to resume its policy of non-production with the same compensation arrangements of technical and financial assistance extended to Turkey.

APPOINTMENT OF MISS NANCY HANKS AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE ARTS

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join those observers who have already commented with favor on President Nixon's appointment of Miss Nancy Hanks as Chairman of the National Council of the Arts. Her outstanding record as president of the Associated Council of the Arts certainly qualifies her for this highly important Government post.

The meagerly funded programs coming under the aegis of the Council have already suffered a slowdown due to the prolonged vacancy in the chairmanship.

Thus, President Nixon's appointment can be hailed not only for the quality of Miss Hanks' expertise, but with a sense of relief that the work of the National Council can now proceed.

All over the country, cultural projects which have been awaiting a little financial help from the National Council can hopefully breathe a small sigh of relief that perhaps action is now on the way.

Not all of the petitioners will gain their grants, of course, but those that do will at least be able to move some steps forward.

I am aware of the requirements for budgetary restraint, and my voting rec-

ord in this Chamber clearly shows that I generally support economy measures.

But I have a strong belief that this Nation should not forsake its cultural talent. Those here who do not see it that way are probably bored by now at being told how handsomely other countries support their arts and native culture.

But it is true, and I feel we should have some strong governmental recognition of any of our art forms deemed worthy by the Council on the Arts.

Since this is such a sensitive matter, I am more than pleased that the President has selected such an eminent person as Miss Hanks to head this program. I trust her judgment, and I know that she will perform admirably in her role as arbiter of the Government's relationship to culture in this highly creative land of ours.

A DEDICATION TO THE FIRST LADY OF BEAUTIFICATION

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess I had the great honor and privilege as the Representative in Congress of the First Congressional—Redwood Empire—District of California, to host the dedication of a beautiful grove of majestic redwood trees in the Redwood National Park to our "First Lady of Beautification"—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

As reported in the national news media, this historic and momentous event was presided over by President Nixon, who was accompanied to the north coast area of California by his wife and family, President and Mrs. Johnson, their daughters and their husbands, and a host of prominent Federal and State officials.

Certainly, this was a great moment in history and a proud day for the people in Redwood Country, Humboldt County, and all Americans, as President Nixon and former President Johnson stood together to place in perpetuity the site originally selected by the National Park Service to officially dedicate the Redwood National Park. This specific grove was the site of the dedication ceremony and address delivered by Mrs. Johnson in November of 1968.

From the time Air Force 1 landed at the Eureka-Arcata Airport until, several hours later, it rose and disappeared from view on its return trip to San Clemente. I was constantly reminded that here was a living example of President Nixon following through on his inaugural theme of bringing this Nation together again."

This "family gathering" in the redwoods was more than just a gathering of first families—it was also a "family gathering" of Federal, State, and local officials; of prominent and respected conservationists; of leaders in business and the redwood industry; and of people from all stations and walks of life who want more than anything else to witness Americans going "forward together" once again.

Surely, togetherness was the theme on this momentous occasion as President Nixon opened his remarks by saying:

We are here today to dedicate this magnificent Redwood Grove to Mrs. Johnson under her name—the Lady Bird Johnson Grove. But also we're here, it happens by coincidence, on another day. It happens that President Johnson and I have several things in common: We both were born in small towns; we both served in the House; we both served in the Senate of the U.S.; we both served as Vice President; we both served as President of the United States. And, we both are very fortunate in the fact that we married above ourselves in Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Nixon.

In response to the President's remarks, former President Johnson delivered what many have described as "his greatest speech." From my vantage point, it was obvious that Mr. Johnson was relaxed and delighted with the spirit of cooperation and oneness that pervaded the entire proceedings.

In recognizing the deeds of a great former First Lady and paving the Nation's respects to his predecessor, President Nixon set an example for the Nation that, in my judgment, each and every American should examine closely if, in fact, we are truly going to get America "back on the right track." Certainly, this was a generous and refreshing gesture on the part of President Nixon and, in many ways, it reflected the "bigness of the man" who is now endeavoring to heal the Nation's wounds and solve its perplexing and awesome problems both at home and abroad.

I only wish that all Americans could have personally witnessed this open display of bipartisanship, the informality, and the obvious demonstration of good will that, once again, made all of those present very proud to be Americans and privileged to be in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point, two local news accounts that I think best summarize this history-making event that appeared in the Humboldt Times-Standard and the Arcata Union, both of which are local Humboldt County newspapers, following the dedication of the Lady Bird Johnson Redwood Grove:

[From the Arcata (Calif.) Union, Aug. 29, 1969]

"TREES FOR ALL THE TOMORROWS"—DEDICATION TO THE 1ST LADY OF BEAUTIFICATION

"One of my most unforgettable memories of past years in walking through the redwoods last November . . ."

So began a letter by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson to President Richard Nixon on July 30. And out of that letter a month later the eyes of the world focused momentarily on a small grove of redwoods north of Orick. For on August 27, 1969, the President of the United States, his wife, Pat, President Lyndon Johnson and his wife, Lady Bird, converged on Redwood Country and the significance of their visit insures that the big trees that surround us will never be taken for granted again. The Lady Bird Redwood Grove was dedicated.

Yet, although the event acted to turn both the people and the press of the county upside down, the event was a common occurrence to the national mass media. At the dedication site, a few hundred yards east of Bald Hills Road, members of the larger California networks quietly and methodically set up their audio and video equipment, while all around them members of the local

press tried to cover their excitement with nonchalance. It really didn't work.

Then a trickle of people began to arrive, the vanguard of more than 500 invited guests, including the children of Orick and the Humboldt County a Cappella choir. By 1:30 the crowd had congregated about the rustic podium. People talked in excited but muted tones, and they patiently waited.

"... Seeing the lovely shafts of light filtering through the trees so far above. Feeling the majesty and silence of that forest, and watching a salmon rise in one of those swift streams. . . ."

And they waited. They heard snatches of transmitted messages: "The plane has been airborne for an hour now . . ." And each person in his mind saw Air Force One winging northward. "They've landed at Arcata . . ." And everyone heard the cheers of 10,000 voices as the presidential party stepped from its silver jet and walked to the green Marine Helicopters. "They're driving through Orick . . ." And everyone saw the waving residents as the caravan drove northward on Highway 101. "They're here." And the crowd grew silent, expectant. First came the White House Press Corps, hastily trying to set up its equipment before the President arrived. One could hear voices speaking with German and French accents as the newsmen jostled for position.

Then almost suddenly, the party appeared. The two presidents and their wives led the contingent. Most everyone's eyes were on them, but it seemed that everyone also tried to search out the other members of the party—Governor Ronald Reagan, the Rev. Billy Graham, Mr. and Mrs. David Eisenhower, Major and Mrs. Charles Robb, Mr. and Mrs. Pat Nugent, and Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel. But in their searching they also saw Sen. George Murphy and Congressmen Don Clausen and Hale Boggs.

President Nixon looked as the crowd expected: neatly dressed in blue, taking casual steps, but his face rather flushed. Mrs. Nixon wore an off-white plaid suit, with her almost perpetual smile. Lady Bird was dressed in a two-piece yellow suit with a yellow and blue silk scarf. Mr. Johnson, wearing a grey suit looked greyer than ever, while Gov. Reagan looked more tanned than ever.

Secretary Hickel in introducing the honored guests said that being there in that capacity was a personal honor. In giving the invocation the Rev. Billy Graham equated the grove to a "great cathedral under the sky." Gov. Reagan said the dedication of the Lady Bird Redwood Grove was a step "in saving the spirit of America." Congressman Don Clausen regarded Mrs. Johnson as the "First Lady of Beautification."

But the program belonged to President Nixon and Mrs. Johnson. The President, in his brief presentation alluded to President Theodore Roosevelt whose love for the outdoors helped create the National Park System. "Roosevelt always received strength from going to the outdoors," he said, adding, however, that he "didn't go that far. I don't even own a surf board."

He said that a great grove such as the one being dedicated today offered a solitude "to a president—to any—so he he may get away from his everyday tasks."

Mrs. Johnson stated simply in acknowledging the honor that "today was a day to treasure always. . . ." that these trees would be here for all the tomorrows.

Concluding, President Johnson regarded the ceremony as "A day to always cherish, and always remember." He said that we all have a stake in this grove, "and the same love and feeling that is going into these trees belong to our children and our grandchildren." Concluding, he turned to President Nixon and said, "I am sure what we want to insure more than anything in this world is peace throughout this world."

The President then signed the proclama-

tion that dedicated the grove to Lady Bird Johnson and then led the crowd in two choruses of "Happy Birthday" to President Johnson, who on that day turned 61. And then they were gone, almost as quickly as they arrived. The ceremony lasted about an hour. The grove was almost deserted by 5 p.m.

Yet, in retrospect, it was the little things that may stick in people's minds also. The group of people that waited patiently from 1 p.m. until the President's arrival at 3:30, the children who sat in front of the podium, scarcely taking their eyes off the history that was being made. . . .

There were the secret service men, whose unsmiling faces and all-seeing eyes, stood about in the crowd, never relaxing even during the invocation and the lighter moments of the ceremony. Then there were the multitudes of silent phones hidden in the underbrush, but constantly being monitored; and the military aide who throughout the event brought notes scrawled on scraps of white paper to the President who quickly scanned them and stuck them in his pocket.

But what seemed most rewarding was that when the two presidents and their wives gazed out into the crowd, it seemed as though they were smiling and waving right at you, and you were suddenly not just a face in a sea of faces.

When it was over, people watched the presidential party leave down the sawdust-covered path. And when it was out of sight they turned their eyes to the towering trees above them.

"... all our problems seemed to fall into perspective and I think everyone of us walked out more serene and happier."—Lady Bird Johnson, July 30, 1969.

[From the Humboldt Times-Standard, Aug. 28, 1969]

FRIENDLY GREETING—AIRPORT MOBBED
(By John A. Read)

"It was worth taking a half day off without pay," said one.

"It was worth waiting a week for," said another.

"Nixon's my man," said a third.

That, generally, was the feeling of a good portion of the estimated 10,000-plus spectators who journeyed yesterday to visit the airport in McKinleyville at its most historic time: the combined visit of President and Mrs. Nixon, former President and Mrs. Johnson, Governor Ronald Reagan, and other dignitaries who came to dedicate the Lady Bird Johnson Memorial Grove.

Some were disappointed, because the sound system failed to bring President Nixon's and Johnson's speeches to them as they waited in the back rows. Even more probably were not able to see much of President Nixon and his party, because Mr. Nixon stood only on a baggage carrier a few feet above the crowd.

I WAS THERE

But for those who were able to view the tanned President from close range and for those who could have physically reached out and touched the smiling wrinkles in former President Johnsons brow, if it wasn't for the concern of flocks of secret service men, Wednesday will be a day they will always remember. Wednesday's pictures will be shown to children and grandchildren, and those who took them will remark, "I was there."

There were many reasons why the people came, and in truth, there was something for everybody at the well-planned event. Some came early, so early in fact that they slept overnight in nearby campers. They wanted to be the front liners on the chance that Mr. Nixon and the Presidential party might stop and shake their hands. Some were not disappointed.

Some came because they had never seen a president. One lady of 68, and another of

73, looked forward to the visit, as they had never had the opportunity to see the country's leader. "It's fine," one of them said.

Some were there because they couldn't resist the occasion of two presidents, plus a host of other dignitaries, in one place at the same time. As some of them commented, "I don't believe it has ever happened before." All agreed the visit would bring great publicity to Humboldt County.

But the Presidential party was not always the object of the greatest interest to some of the spectators. Some cared less about the President, preferring to see such sights as Air Force One, the Presidential plane, and Marine One, the Presidential helicopter. As one man put it, "I'd rather shoot 49 feet of film of Air Force One, and one foot of the President." Still others came only to see the Rev. Billy Graham. Of him, one woman commented that he "looked older than on television."

Apparently, most of those who came were from the local area, including Eureka, Arcata, McKinleyville, Hoopa, Fortuna, Rio Dell, and other towns in the county. Some were out-of-county but vacationing here, like the couple who discovered that the lure of two presidents was greater than the prospect of good fishing on the Klamath. This particular couple has been vacationing in the redwoods for 40 years, but apparently prefers living in San Francisco.

The ones who came early, came prepared. They brought picnic lunches and chairs and were ready to stay all day if possible. Those who stayed on until President Nixon returned from the dedication did end up staying until 5:30, making it a toss-up as to who was more tired: the crowd observing, or the literal crowd controlling the crowd—the Humboldt Sheriff's deputies, the California Highway Patrol, the Secret Service, and the numerous other police departments which sent men to aid in the visit.

Those who didn't come early found they had to park a considerable distance from the airport terminal, as a thousand people had gathered by 11:30 Wednesday morning. That number quickly increased to nearly 5,000 by 1:30 p.m. and doubled again by the time Air Force One taxied down the runway close to 3 o'clock.

IT'S COMING

Shouts of "It's coming!" greeted the modified Boeing 707 which is the plush Presidential jet, and a cheer went up from the weary, though patient crowd. There had been some activity to watch prior to the arrival of Mr. and Mrs. Nixon, and Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, such as Air West jets landing and taking off, the scurrying of the Presidential helicopters as they were brought out of the hangars, placed in position, and given one last dusting for appearance's sake, and even a car fire. But it was still a welcome sight when first the Air California chartered press plane, then the big blue and white bird bearing the Presidential seal, and the American flag on its tail, touched the pavement near the brown, grassy fields of the Eureka-Arcata airport.

The reception was overwhelming from a public relations standpoint. The well-engineered airport rally went off beautifully, supported by both those who politically support the President looked on quietly without demonstration, and those who actively worked to make the rally a success. Some 1,000 signs painted by the Teen Age Republicans were distributed prior to the President's arrival, on which were inscribed everything from "Ho, Don!" (Congressman Don Clausen) to "Groove with Nixon."

DISSENTERS OUTNUMBERED

Some dissenters were present, but these were considerably outnumbered by those who actively cheered President Nixon. The dissenters included the Humboldt Peace Center, which accused the dedication of the grove

as a token, "disgusting in the face of the death of thousands of American soldiers and Vietnamese soldiers and civilians," and another sign-holder who publicly proclaimed the message that "If you've seen one president, you've seen them all."

But by and large, these had no effect on the Nixon arrival, and his subsequent ebullient statements to the crowd. After shaking hands across the fence in his usual accustomed manner, going back to greet one enthusiastic youngster who cried, "I've been here since six o'clock!" Nixon told the huge audience that he was here for a special occasion:

"I'm going to the redwoods to dedicate a park and I think it is most significant that in the whole history of this country, there has perhaps been no first lady who in the field of beautification, of dedication to the preservation of the natural beauty of our country, has done more than Lady Bird Johnson—Mrs. Johnson."

THINGS IN COMMON

"We are here to dedicate this magnificent redwood to Mrs. Johnson under her name—the Lady Bird Johnson Park. But also we're here, it happens by coincidence, on another day. It happens that President Johnson and I have several things in common: We both were born in small towns; we both served in the House; we both served in the Senate of the United States; we both served as Vice President; we both served as President of the United States."

Here, the President paused, and added, "And we both are very fortunate in the fact that we married above ourselves in Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Nixon."

"And also today, I know that all of you will want to join us in wishing President Johnson a happy birthday. This is his 61st birthday."

At this the crowd began to sing "Happy Birthday" to Mr. Johnson, who was standing on a baggage cart along with his wife, Mr. Nixon, and Pat Nixon, the President's wife. Then the well-known Texan stepped to the microphone and said:

"We are naturally appreciative when the President and First Lady of the United States recognize and honor the work of what I believe to be a great woman. That's the best birthday present I could have. Thank you very much."

TO THE GROVE

Then the Presidential party, and the huge accompanying press corps, left for the Lady Bird Johnson Grove for the dedication ceremony by helicopter, and the hundred or so secret police, officers, deputies, and officials waited out the flight to the dedication site, the dedication itself, and the return trip to the airport.

When Mr. Nixon left the first time, many of the crowd abandoned the posts they had occupied since mid-morning, even though the Humboldt Mariachi Band was still playing. Then began a highway patrolman's nightmare: What was perhaps the biggest traffic jam this county has ever seen, as about three-fourths of the over 10,000 persons attempted to return from whence they had come. CHP officers found the traffic so bad they opened two lanes south on Central Avenue, thoroughly confusing some motorists who tried to drive as usual.

The traffic problem continued until well after Mr. Nixon had arrived back at the airport via Marine One. The President did not stop to speak to the one or two thousand persons who had waited out the interim period between the arrival and departure of Mr. Nixon, but went directly to his big jet, stopping only long enough to greet a Times-Standard reporter who personally presented the President with a copy of Wednesday's newspaper welcoming the Presidential party in bold, red letters.

PARTY WAS OVER

At approximately 5:30 p.m., the Presidential jet taxied down the 6,000 foot runway as the plane headed for the Western White House and an eventual planned trip to Mexico. The party was over, but the astonishment and disbelief of the spectators lingered on. Had they really seen two presidents, a governor, Billy Graham, and everything else?

Congressman Don Clausen, the man responsible in the first place for suggesting the visit, could assure that it had happened. He was ecstatic all day, but philosophized, "You do what you think is right, and sometimes it gets results."

Those "results" will be felt in Humboldt County for years to come. Most agreed with the statement of one woman interviewed earlier in the day: "I was praying that something like this would happen to Humboldt County," she said.

But the classic statement came from a member of one of the law agencies, who was reflecting the tensio: felt by the extensive security forces charged with the responsibility of keeping the President safe. As Air Force One cleared the Eureka-Arcata airport safely for the last time, one deputy commented, "That's the prettiest sight I've seen all day!"

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. JOELSON, A MAN OF CONVICTION, COURAGE, AND COMPASSION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to pay tribute to a cherished friend and an invaluable member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the Honorable CHARLES JOELSON, who is retiring from the House this week to become a judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Chuck's long and distinguished career has eminently qualified him for this post. Graduating Phi Beta Kappa from Cornell University and receiving an LL.B. from Cornell Law School, Chuck entered into the field of public service in 1949 as the youngest city counsel in the history of the city of Paterson. In 1955 he was appointed deputy attorney general of New Jersey in charge of the Passaic County prosecutor's office, and in 1957 was promoted to chief of the criminal investigation section for the entire State.

I had first known of Chuck through his uncle, a former mayor of Newark, but it was in 1960, when he first came to the House, that our close association began. And it is not easy now to bid him farewell. For in these 9 years he has earned the respect and admiration of all of us who have had the good fortune of working with him, and he has carved a permanent place for himself in the hearts of all who have been offered hope because of his deep devotion to the disadvantaged and the young.

"CHUCK" JOELSON is certainly one of the most progressive and innovative legislators to serve in the House. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in 1960, he was assigned to a special subcommittee on unemployment,

which was responsible for recommending the landmark Manpower Development and Training Act. Since 1962 he has served on the Committee on Appropriations, and it was altogether fitting that, in the closing days of his tenure, he mounted a formidable and successful campaign to restore to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill much needed funds for educational programs. For it is this area which is closest to his heart, and, as he so eloquently stated during that debate:

If I am remembered . . . I would like to be remembered as an advocate of educational opportunities for our youth . . . I think it is good Government. I think it is good politics. I think that is what the people want. It is our way of expressing faith in our young people, our way of acknowledging their potential, and helping them to realize it is to supply the money that I am urging.

Mr. Speaker, as he leaves the political arena, "CHUCK" JOELSON certainly will be remembered—for his deep convictions and his courage and compassion, for his diligence and his creativity, and for his quick, dry wit, which so often hit so true. His counsel and his advice will be sorely missed, but I know that he will bring to his new office the integrity, the sound judgment and unique talent that have characterized his service in the House.

I have been greatly privileged to hold CHUCK as a close personal friend, a man for whom I have the highest esteem. As he leaves now to take up the challenge of the bench, I wish him much happiness and fulfillment in the years ahead.

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Representative CHARLES JOELSON, of New Jersey's Eighth District is retiring this month from the House of Representatives to take up a new position as judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

He leaves behind him a commendable and significant record of achievement and anticipates I am sure, an equally distinguished career on the bench.

Although not obligated to sacrifice himself for others, CHARLES has done precisely that during his long and varied public career. He is a fine American and a dedicated public servant, who has courage, honor, the will to fight evil, and the strength of character to support causes in which he believes.

He has always been a strong defender of the Democratic Party, the Congress, and indeed all of our free, democratic institutions. His ability and wisdom will be missed in the House.

In the 9 years that it has been my privilege and pleasure to know Representative JOELSON, he has never lost his sense of proportion when dealing with vital legislation. Instead, he has maintained a steady, sure, and constructive outlook. This ability to remain calm under fire has made him the respected leader that he is.

As he undertakes the heavy responsibilities of judicial office, he takes with him the respect, admiration, and best wishes of those with whom he has served in Congress as well as of the citizens of his State.

Mr. JOELSON's eloquence is also exemplary of his outstanding character and the quality of his mind. He speaks in a manner that is plain, strong, and concise. Rejecting ornament, avoiding florid illustration, he is effective in the plainness of his propositions, in the refinement of his logic, and in the earnestness and energy of his manner. These are qualities which have enabled him during his tenure in the House to speak often, and always to command attention.

Mr. JOELSON's entire public career has been marked by dedication and constructive insight. Indeed, his clearness, sagacity, and boldness in dealing with State problems led the people of his District to select him as their Representative in Congress.

As a hard-working and valuable member of the Appropriations Committee, Representative JOELSON has made an outstanding contribution to the work of the Congress. He has tackled every assignment with enthusiasm and creativity. He has been mindful of details and conscientious in his preparation.

His demeanor as a Representative is appreciated and venerated by us all. No man is more respectful of others, no man carries himself with greater decorum, no man has greater dignity. Because these superior attributes are greatly needed in our courts today, CHARLES JOELSON will make a fine judge.

CHARLES JOELSON manifests a warm humanity, a capacity for friendship, a deep compassion, and a feeling of brotherhood—qualities of the highest value in a good judge.

CHARLES JOELSON's moral and social conscience, his dedicated service will be missed in the House. There will always be, however, a bridge of friendship and mutual respect existing between us and our colleague from New Jersey.

The people of New Jersey, furthermore, can rest assured that in him they have found a man who will dedicate all his energy and intellect on their behalf as a member of the judiciary.

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

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

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CHARLES JOELSON, who leaves us today to take his new position as judge of the superior court in Paterson, N.J., has given this body guidance, knowledge, and leadership that it can ill afford to lose.

Both as a personal friend and working colleague, I have found Congressman JOELSON of inestimable help in the areas of education and labor, and as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee.

His intelligence, his wide understanding of both national and international problems, and his conscientious attention to the duties of a Congressman have made him truly one of the outstanding Members of the House.

Congressman JOELSON recently capped

his 9-year career in the House with a brilliant display of leadership during the floor debate of H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1970. Due to the efforts of Congressman JOELSON, \$894 million was added to this bill to further the educational needs of our country. This is just an example of Congressman JOELSON's understanding of the needs of our times that I have long admired.

To say that I shall miss Mr. JOELSON, both as a friend and colleague, is an understatement.

Mrs. Cohelan and I wish him all the best in his new endeavor. The Superior Court in New Jersey is gaining a distinguished public servant and the House of Representatives is losing one of its ablest Members.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, CHARLES S. "CHUCK" JOELSON, is leaving Washington and the hallowed Halls of Congress to take his place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey. I do not want this occasion to go unnoticed, and join with the New Jersey delegation to pay tribute to him at this time.

He first came to the Congress in January 1961, having been elected as the Representative of the Eighth Congressional District on November 8, 1960. He served continually since that time, having been reelected to the 88th, 89th, 90th, and the present 91st Congress.

When I first came to Congress, in 1965, I found "CHUCK" JOELSON to be invariably straightforward and understanding, sensitive and courageous. He displayed complete and unwavering devotion to the public interest. His leadership has been distinguished by his insistence upon, and his own adherence to, the highest standards of intellectual and moral excellence. Since our districts adjoin each other, many of the problems are similar in nature, and it was a great pleasure to me to be able to solve many of them through a mutually cooperative effort.

I have found that one of "CHUCK's" great charms is his ability to disagree with you in such a pleasant and amicable fashion that eventual compromise of a position is possible. He could summarize an incomprehensible heavy legislative bill with one line of wit—succinct and to the point.

"CHUCK" JOELSON is known to us—his colleagues—as he is known to his constituents, as a man of integrity, responsibility, and energy. I know him further as a friend, counselor and an inspiration.

Congressman JOELSON's constituents know him as one who has always looked upon their problems and interests as his own problems and interests. They know he is never satisfied until every possible effort is made to solve these problems, honorably looking out for those whom he represents.

It is noteworthy that a man who has had such a distinguished career of public service and who could look to many more years of service in this House of Representatives, is leaving this responsible life for one of comparable responsibility of a superior court bench.

As we must greatly regret "CHUCK's"

departure from the House of Representatives, I believe that the Superior Court of New Jersey is gaining a man with broad experience and understanding. He will be an asset to the judicial system of New Jersey.

We shall miss his friendly voice in the coming years. I wish him every success in his new assignment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixture of joy and sadness that I join my colleagues to honor CHARLES JOELSON today. I am happy because he takes on a new role in which he will bring to the judiciary of New Jersey a responsible and progressive outlook tempered by many years as an outstanding legislator. I am sad, however, because those same qualities, enhanced by a remarkable wit and grace, will be lost to us in the House.

My colleague from New Jersey has served the people from his district well. And they have returned him to his seat every term since the 87th Congress with an outstanding plurality of their faith and trust.

It was my privilege to serve with him for many years on the Education and Labor Committee. There he actively established himself as an outstanding advocate of progressive educational programs.

While many in the Nation heeded the romantic lure of space exploration, "CHUCK" JOELSON was struck by the despair and agony of the cities. He deemed the victory over ignorance, poverty, and hunger to be of far greater importance than the flight to outer space. He has spurned the easy escape from the challenges to life on earth. He seeks the answers to the problems that face modern America, not in space, but in the streets, recalling our attention down to earth, back to home. He has told us:

There is more challenge in each square block of city sium than all the galaxy.

But more important than all the prose and poetry, my colleague has set for us an example in deeds. Thus, when he need have done nothing more, he took it upon himself to sponsor a package of vital amendments to restore cuts made in our educational programs. The victory of the Joelson amendments is indeed a fitting capstone to a brilliant legislative career.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I know the Governor always reflects upon his appointments and hopes to put on the bench a man who will bring credit to him by rendering honest, able service to the people. Governor Hughes, having served as a judge, has had a special interest in seeing that the public and the members of the bar respect his appointments. I have a strong feeling about these matters myself because as county clerk for 15 years I spent a lot of time working with many of our judges. We always had our problems and there had been one crisis after another.

Many of our judges have participated in the partisan political life and it is difficult for people to realize that when they become judges they leave behind their previous role. I have watched Democrats and Republicans on the bench for over 40 years and it is a pleasure to say that all of the judges that I knew rose to the

highest level in their conduct while on the bench and dispensed justice without regard to their background.

I am sure that our distinguished colleague, CHARLES JOELSON, will rise to the highest standards of our profession when he steps up on that bench. Justice will prevail. He has the intellect, he has the learning, he has the compassion, and he has the health to render many years of service to the people of New Jersey.

We all love the law and public service and I predict our colleague will be a credit to us all.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the late Speaker of the House, Mr. Sam Rayburn, once said that the House of Representatives is "the most critical jury in the world." A glib, articulate, personable man might conceivable palm himself off to his constituency—for a time—as something that he is not. But one simply does not deceive his colleagues.

The Members of the House of Representatives, who work closely with one another, day in and day out, have an almost unerring instinct for the quality of genuineness. We know when a man is sincere in what he says and does or when he is talking mainly for home consumption. We can discern with revealing clarity when he does his homework and knows what he is talking about.

It is rare, however, that one man can be so overwhelmingly liked and respected as is the case with our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative CHARLES "CHUCK" JOELSON.

"CHUCK" JOELSON is leaving the Congress to become a Superior Court judge in New Jersey. The Congress is losing one of its most valuable Members.

The greatest compliment the membership of our national legislative body can pay to one of its Members is that when he talks the rest of us listen. And, as clearly evidenced when "CHUCK" JOELSON recently led the campaign to aid the educational process in this country by infusing the needed money into the program, we all listened. And when the vote was taken, "CHUCK" JOELSON had won another victory—not for himself—but for the young people who will lead this country in the near future.

I have often sought guidance and advice from "CHUCK" JOELSON because he was always prepared to help others.

I have always admired "CHUCK" JOELSON's quick wit, as is often evidenced by his use of the 1 minute rule.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say "thank you" to "CHUCK" JOELSON, not just on my own behalf, or on behalf of the House of Representatives, and not just on behalf of the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey which "CHUCK" JOELSON represented so ably. Our entire Nation owes "CHUCK" JOELSON a "thank you" because we are a better country as a result of "CHUCK" JOELSON having served in public office.

I wish "CHUCK" JOELSON well in his new field of public service.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join in this richly deserved tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). From the very beginning of his service in the

House, "CHUCK" JOELSON gained a reputation as one of the most effective and knowledgeable Members of this body.

When Congressman JOELSON was elected to the 87th Congress in 1960, he had already established a record of considerable achievement. Following his graduation from Cornell Law School, he entered the practice of law with his father, the late Judge Harry Joelson. He served with distinction as the youngest city counsel in the history of Paterson, and subsequently as deputy attorney general and as chief of the criminal investigation section for the State of New Jersey.

During his five terms in the House, "CHUCK" JOELSON has worked diligently for the people of his district and, indeed, for all the people of this Nation. His colleagues have been particularly impressed with the leadership he demonstrated in his initial assignment on the House Committee on Education and Labor and later as a member of the Appropriations Committee. He has been particularly effective in the enactment of constructive legislation in the area of manpower training and development during his service on the Education and Labor Committee.

We in the Island State feel particularly close to "CHUCK" JOELSON as part of his military service during World War II was in the Far Eastern Branch of the Office of Naval Intelligence, and he was stationed for some time at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii.

I am happy to extend fond aloha to our distinguished colleague as he leaves the House to take a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey. As he turns to new endeavors, he and his family have my best wishes for continued success and happiness.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in praise of the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON, who now leaves us to ascend the judicial bench of New Jersey. His congressional career, marked by distinction, good will, intelligence, commonsense, and wit, was, regrettably, all too short. We are, indeed, sorry to lose him, but I am sure he will bring to bear on his judicial office the same high qualities which made him a distinguished Congressman. We wish him well and, knowing him as I do, I can say with certainty the ties of friendship and shared interests with his former colleagues will not be severed.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., from the 10th District of New Jersey, who has taken this special order in tribute to our mutual friend, the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON, of the New Jersey Eighth District, who is retiring from Congress to accept an appointment to the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

As lawmakers, we of the House of Representatives are of course delighted whenever a man of legal distinction assumes a seat on any one of the courts of the land. On these grounds, we hail the appointment of CHARLES JOELSON to the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey. Yet, as lawmakers, we also regret the loss to Congress of so distinguished a legislator, whose services in Washington have promoted the interests of jus-

tice throughout America over the past 9 years.

CHARLES JOELSON has not only ably represented the interests of his district during his tenure in the Congress, but those of his State and Nation as well. He has been a dedicated Government official and with wisdom and rare insight he has dealt with the major problems of the moment. As Members of the Congress, we have good reason to commend so outstanding a performance by a fellow Member, and to regret his departure from our midst.

Expert in matters both legal and economic, CHARLES JOELSON has become a highly valued member of the Appropriations Committee, on which he has served with distinction. And as a man informed on every issue of national importance, his personal force has had effect, repeatedly, in caucus, in committee, and on the floor.

By assuming a position on the New Jersey State Superior Court, he takes with him not only a knowledge of law-making, acquired throughout his years in Washington, but also of legal matters of every kind. Service in the Naval Intelligence, and the executive and legislative branches of Government on every level—city, county, State, and Federal—have thoroughly equipped him for judicial service of the highest caliber.

Having worked alongside CHARLES JOELSON during my tenure in the House, I have come to know him as a friend and to admire him as a colleague. He has the kind of interest and ability which renders him vital to the governmental process. As a friend, it has been the greatest pleasure to know him and work with him these past few years.

Mr. Speaker, all that the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON has accomplished here was beneficial to the interest of justice in America. What better background could be sought in the selection of a man for high judicial honors?

Congratulations, CHARLES JOELSON, on the occasion of your entrance to the judicial fraternity. My best wishes go with you for abundant good health and continuing success in your career of public service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to join my colleagues in honoring one of our distinguished members, "CHUCK" JOELSON, who is leaving to take a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

"CHUCK," who has served the Eighth District of New Jersey, the State of New Jersey, and the Nation in a dedicated, outstanding manner since the 87th Congress, will be missed by all those who have been privileged to serve with him. As a member of the Appropriations Committee he has contributed a great deal of time and effort in the consideration of funds for the many programs participated in by the Federal Government.

He will long be remembered for his work in the Appropriations Committee and in the House of Representatives. However, we will all remember his outstanding leadership in the first session of the 91st Congress when the debate began on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He was effective in securing approval of

full funding of educational assistance to the States.

Mrs. JOHNSON joins me in commending him for a job well done, and extending congratulations and best wishes on his judgeship appointment.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this farewell tribute to our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, "CHUCK" JOELSON. He and I came to the Congress at the same time nearly 9 years ago. We have served on the Committee on Appropriations together. And for most of this year we have been cross-hall neighbors in the Rayburn House Office Building. It has been a pleasant and good experience to know "CHUCK" JOELSON and to work with him on many of the problems facing our great Nation. He is a fine American who has served his people and the Eighth District of New Jersey with honor and distinction. He has my sincere best wishes as he leaves the House of Representatives to serve his State and Nation in yet another capacity, that of judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in honoring "CHUCK" JOELSON, who will shortly be leaving the House of Representatives for a judgeship on the New Jersey Superior Court.

I have been pleased to count "CHUCK" among my friends, and it is with mixed emotions that I join in today's tribute to him. His wit and trenchant humor are well known in this Chamber, and will be sorely missed after his departure. His successful handling on the floor of the package amendment to the Office of Education appropriation bill will stand as a monument to him, and will be long remembered both by supporters and opponents of the measure.

"CHUCK" will soon don his black robes for his position on the bench of the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey. I know that he will bring to this job wisdom and fairness, characteristics he has in abundance, and I am therefore gratified that my State will have the benefit of his talents. But I regret that it must necessitate his leaving the House.

It was an honor to have been his friend and associate in the House of Representatives. I know that I shall miss him.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, for 9 years, Congressman CHARLES S. JOELSON has distinguished himself in this body. His ability, integrity, and independence are well known to us all. He is now leaving the House of Representatives to take a seat on the New Jersey Superior Court. This is a great honor, one which he deserves and is eminently qualified.

I am sure that Congressman JOELSON will perform his duties on the bench with the same scrupulous concern for the public interest that he has for so long demonstrated in Congress. The House of Representatives is losing a man of consummate ability and unsullied character, a man for whom his colleagues have always entertained the most profound respect; a leader whose character has won admiration and engendered affection.

Our illustrious friend is well trained in the complexities of the law, having held many important judicial positions before being elected to Congress in 1960. At all times and in all his positions of trust, he

has never let the citizens of New Jersey down. At all times, his efforts have been motivated by wisdom, virtue, and patriotism.

We will cherish the memory of CHARLES JOELSON as a friend and colleague in this House. We wish him success in his new appointment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the last 7 years of the service of the gentleman from New Jersey, CHARLIE JOELSON, in these hallowed Halls of the House of Representatives have been as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I should like to make a few observations on this occasion of his leaving the House—voluntarily as we know, I might add—to take up another position of high trust in the judicial branch of his home State.

Membership on the Committee on Appropriations affords a unique opportunity for firsthand exposure to the operations of our National Government. In his relatively few years here, CHARLIE has served on subcommittees dealing with the budgets of the legislative and judicial branches and with four of the major executive departments—State, Justice, Commerce, and Interior—plus a number of related independent agencies.

But his interests and his efforts have ranged beyond these boundaries. It was only a few weeks ago that CHARLIE JOELSON reached what is perhaps the visible zenith of his career as a national legislator—in appropriation matters, certainly—when he successfully, through the so-called Joelson amendment, spearheaded the effort here on the floor to increase education appropriations by nearly \$900 million.

In this effort, as in some others, in committee and out of committee, for philosophical or other reason, we were on opposite sides of the question. We differed. We disagreed. But I must say that it has always been on a gentlemanly and friendly basis. This is readily understandable, because CHARLIE is a man of pleasant approach and affable disposition.

I have always found CHARLIE JOELSON to be a fair and reasonable man. He has understood at once the complexities and practices of the House and its committees; that these practices are a growth, not a scheme, born of long experience over changing time and circumstance. But he has had the courage of his beliefs and has spoken out for what he thought was right as he saw things.

Combined with a perceptive and incisive mind, these qualities of fairness of reasonableness, and of courage of conviction should go far in enabling him to render a high public service in the New Jersey judiciary.

Our form of government remains basically unchanged but the substance is under more or less subtle but continuous change as each new generation comes along, and this is well reflected here in this cherished citadel of freedom as new Members take the place of others. CHARLIE JOELSON has been a part of that continuous process; he has made his contribution. And at the ripe but young age of 53, he leaves to take on other duties of high public trust.

We wish him well.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we will soon lose the services

of a most able colleague when CHARLES S. JOELSON leaves Congress for a seat on the Superior Court of New Jersey.

I have had the privilege of serving with "CHUCK" JOELSON on the Appropriations Committee, where he was a member of both the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary and the Interior Department Subcommittee.

"CHUCK" is a hard-working and dedicated public servant, and the impressive career that he made prior to coming to Congress is a tribute to his drive and initiative. In all things he has done well.

Following service with the U.S. Navy, he moved from private law practice to the job of city counsel of Paterson, N.J. In 6 years, he was deputy attorney general of New Jersey, in charge of the Passaic County prosecutors' office. In 2 years, he was chief of the criminal investigation section for the entire State.

In 3 more years, "CHUCK" was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, serving first on the House Committee on Education and Labor in the 87th Congress. "CHUCK" JOELSON let no grass grow under his feet.

"CHUCK's" reputation as a man of action, ability, and dedication were clearly established long before he came to this great body. He continued to exercise these qualities as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and for this, he merited and received the respect of all who served with him.

His presence in Congress and especially on the Appropriations Committee will be greatly missed, and I certainly wish him every success in the future as he assumes his new judgeship on the Superior Court of the State he has represented so well.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with my colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman JOELSON, as he leaves the House to take a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

"CHUCK" JOELSON and I were freshman Congressmen in 1961. As new Members, we joined that special fraternity of eager, ambitious Congressmen who first must learn to walk before they can run. Of the incoming freshmen that year, I can proudly point to "CHUCK" JOELSON as one of the finest and one of the most able. During these past 9 years, we have had similar interests on many matters and have joined hands on many national issues. It has always been a privilege to discuss problems and possible solutions with him.

As the productive House career of Congressman JOELSON comes to a voluntary end, he leaves behind him an enviable record. He has won the respect of all of his colleagues for his fairness, his capabilities and for his diligence in carrying out his congressional responsibilities.

In the 87th Congress he served as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and since 1963 has been a valuable member of the House Appropriations Committee.

"CHUCK" JOELSON represents the highest qualities we can wish for in the men and women who serve the Nation as Members of Congress. He has given long

years of devoted service to his community, his State, and Nation. His concern for his fellow man, and his interest and hard work to make this Government serve the needs of all Americans, was expressed by his wise and courageous action a few weeks ago, which resulted in adding nearly a billion dollars to appropriations for educational programs. He was supported in this action by many of his colleagues whose concern about the special role of education in a democracy parallels his own.

"CHUCK" JOELSON leaves the House of Representatives with the respect, admiration, and affection of all who knew him. In elevating him to the superior court of the State, the people of New Jersey are securing the services of a gifted man of the highest caliber. He has my sincere good wishes for his future work, which can only be an extension of his remarkable career in this Chamber.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our most able and distinguished colleague, "CHUCK" JOELSON, is taking leave of this House to take a seat on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey. I am certain he will grace that court as well as he did his seat in the Congress. The gain of the judiciary of his home State is a loss for the people of this Nation. For no society can produce too many men like him.

Whenever the dispossessed of our land cried out, they struck a responsive chord in his breast. If justice had to be done, he was always ready to stand up and be counted on its behalf. If a cause that was right had to be represented, it never found his door or heart closed to it. To intellect and ability, he has always added compassion, sincerity, and a desire to set an example in his public life; others would do well to emulate.

Only a few weeks ago he led a fight on the floor of this House which succeeded in restoring absolutely essential funds for the benefit of education all across our land. Masterfully executed, this success is both a monument and prime example of the political and human philosophy of our colleague. It reflects his dedication, beliefs, and ability. Many others have sat here for far longer and accomplished far less.

"CHUCK" JOELSON will be missed because he always translated into legislative activity and through personal example all that is finest in our American dream. His actions personify it in an era when all too often in the public eye the exact opposite seems to be true. His work and career are in themselves a monument to what this body is supposed to stand for. Others among us have noted his example, and shall keep it in their mind's eye in times to come.

I know he will continue to set similar examples in the fruitful years to come.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this special tribute to our colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON, who will be leaving the House of Representatives to take a seat on the Superior Court of New Jersey.

"CHUCK" JOELSON began his political career at the early age of 33 becoming the youngest man ever appointed to the

city counsel of Paterson, N.J. Prior to the appointment, "CHUCK" practiced law with his father, the late Judge Harry Joelson.

In 1955 "CHUCK" began his career as a law enforcement official—serving first as deputy attorney general of New Jersey in charge of the Passaic County prosecutor's office and later as chief of the criminal investigation section for the State of New Jersey.

While he was proud of his years as a prosecutor, "CHUCK" was a man with a big heart. First elected to the House in 1960, he has been a particularly effective spokesman for broader manpower training programs and as a former member of the House Education and Labor Committee he worked on the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962.

For the past 7 years I have had the honor of serving with "CHUCK" on the House Appropriations Committee. His dedication and creativity have been great assets to our committee and to the Congress.

I wish "CHUCK" well in his new career. He has served his State and his country well and he will now join the select group of public leaders who have served in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and now the judicial branch.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to offer congratulations to a distinguished colleague, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, as he assumes the high honor and heavy responsibility of a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

It is a sorrow, however, to contemplate working in the House of Representatives without the wisdom, skill, and dedication of this esteemed legislator. The people of the Eighth Congressional District of the great State of New Jersey have been ably and unstintingly served by Representative JOELSON. The people of the United States have also been served well by a man whose vision and selfless effort have benefited the entire Nation.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Representative JOELSON was able to put his strength and his enthusiasm solidly behind measures he believed could enhance the quality of life in this country. His courageous efforts in behalf of education will long remain an outstanding example of the difference for good one man can make. All of us here today, and the millions of citizens we represent, owe Representative JOELSON of New Jersey, a lasting debt of gratitude for his devotion to the children of America. Without his hard work, much legislation in support of education might have languished without the appropriations sustenance needed to make it meaningful.

His own early record as a scholar tells us something of the motivation behind his lifelong interest in education. His career of service, as a naval intelligence officer, as an official in his home city of Paterson, as the holder of important posts with the State government of New Jersey, and, beginning with the 87th Congress and continuing until the present, as a Member of Congress, has demonstrated many times over the great abil-

ity and consistent humanity which will now serve the people of New Jersey from the bench of their superior court.

Knowing that his future endeavors will be continually excellent, I wish my respected colleague, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, great satisfaction in his new position.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman CHARLES S. JOELSON as he leaves the House of Representatives to take a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

As a Member of the House during the past 9 years, Mr. JOELSON has shown himself to be a dedicated and competent public servant. He has made important contributions to the work of this House, particularly as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am sure he will continue to serve the Nation and the people of New Jersey well in his new capacity.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to serve with Mr. JOELSON, and I wish him well as he begins this new chapter in his public career.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep personal regret—a regret which I know is shared by all my colleagues of this House—when I realize that we are saying goodbye to CHARLES S. JOELSON, the distinguished Representative of New Jersey's Eighth District.

I have had the honor and the pleasure of serving with "CHUCK" JOELSON in the past five Congresses, since he was elected in 1960. In all that time, one thing became certain: you could always find "CHUCK" JOELSON on the human side of the issue.

Though he served as a member of the Appropriations Committee, which necessarily deals in figures, "CHUCK" has always been interested in human beings; seeking new ways to help and never denying his diligent labor or his acute mind.

Now he will be departing from the Capitol scene to assume a judicial seat in his home State. I know his absence will be deeply felt within these walls. He has been a sincere, energetic, imaginative, and creative Representative of his district, serving all the American people.

I join my colleagues in wishing him well, with the reminder that the Third District of Pennsylvania is not far from Paterson—and the welcome mat is always present.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the markings of a fine judge are insight and fairness. The distinguished gentleman for New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) has these and more. By investing him with the robe and responsibility of a judge of the superior court, the State of New Jersey will be acquiring a temperament that is rare and able.

Since 1961, it has been my pleasure to serve closely with Mr. JOELSON. I have witnessed his intelligent reasoning and keen understanding—enriched with a touch of humor—unveil the real meaningful aspects of Congress' business. We served together first on the Education and Labor Committee and moved simultaneously to Appropriations where we worked together on the Subcommittee

for Interior and Related Agencies. I have witnessed his stewardship—faithful and good.

The distinguished gentleman had a solid background of education and experience in the law when he came to Congress and we benefited from his wisdom for nearly a decade. Now he is returning to his home State, New Jersey.

During the years ahead, justice in New Jersey will draw from this skill and knowledge. Congress will feel the loss. But the judiciary will be enriched.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROBINO) and other colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our friend and colleague, CHARLES "CHUCK" JOELSON, who has been appointed to the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Representative JOELSON and I have served together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and certainly he is an able, dedicated, and effective legislator.

He possesses the qualities of sound judgment and prudence that qualify him eminently for a position in the judiciary of the State of New Jersey.

Apart from his abilities, CHARLES JOELSON is a genial, personable, considerate person, and we shall miss him. As he takes his leave from the Congress, I want to wish him the best of good luck and success as he assumes his new career and new responsibilities with the judiciary.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a Member of the House of Representatives, CHARLES S. JOELSON, who is leaving the House today to become a judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

During his five terms in the House of Representatives, CHARLES JOELSON has been outstanding as a representative of the Eighth District of the State of New Jersey. Since I became a member of the Appropriations Committee in the 89th Congress, I have observed the intelligence and leadership that he has brought to his legislative responsibilities. He has made many contributions to the work of the subcommittee on which he serves and to the work of the entire Appropriations Committee. His recent achievement was sponsoring the Joelson amendment, which restored nearly a billion dollars in funds for education programs in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970. I was proud to cosponsor that amendment.

CHARLIE JOELSON's departure will be a severe loss to the Appropriations Committee and to the House of Representatives. However, his earlier career in public legal service has prepared him to continue rendering service to the people of New Jersey. I wish CHARLIE JOELSON good fortune as he assumes his new responsibilities, and I congratulate the New Jersey bench on this addition to its membership.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a first-year Congressman, one of the honors that has come to me has been to work with the distinguished Representative from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON.

I was especially impressed with his untiring and successful efforts in behalf of the education bill which passed in this session of Congress. The added amendments and increases to the education bill were a tremendous gain and benefit to the schoolchildren of the United States and will stand as a lasting tribute to the vision and sagacity of this great statesman.

Congressman JOELSON's dynamic leadership will be missed by the Members of the House of Representatives, and I join my colleagues today in wishing him well in his new responsibility as a Justice on the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to wish my distinguished colleague "CHUCK" JOELSON all the best in his new job on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

What is the superior court's gain is the House's loss. I have known "CHUCK" since he came to the Congress more than 10 years ago, and he always was conscientious in his work and concerned for his constituency. Certainly, they will miss him, too.

It is always regretful to lose a Member of long standing with the knowledge and experience such as is possessed by "CHUCK" JOELSON, but on the other hand I know that he will be a credit and a welcome addition to our judicial system.

As he goes from the legislative to the judicial branch of our government, I know that "CHUCK" will continue to serve what he feels are the best interests of our country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from New Jersey in paying tribute to our friend and distinguished colleague, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, as he leaves us to take his place on the bench of the superior court of the State of New Jersey.

While we will miss his great ability and talent in the House, I think it would be difficult to find a person more qualified for such an important judicial post.

A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Cornell, CHUCK JOELSON had a distinguished career in the law before he was elected to the 87th Congress. He held many important positions in his community, his county, and his State including that of deputy attorney general and director of criminal investigation for the State of New Jersey.

In his service in the House, our colleague from New Jersey has distinguished himself even more. He has made many important and valuable contributions to the work of this House through his many efforts as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations and undoubtedly he will be remembered for many years to come by educators and school people throughout the country for his outstanding leadership recently in winning passage for the "Joelson amendment" to the Department of Labor-Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. His hard work in restoring funds for vital educational programs contained in that bill resulted in perhaps the greatest legislative victory of this session.

All of us are going to miss CHUCK JOELSON's friendly smile and his ready wit

in debate. As he leaves to assume his new position we all join in wishing for him and his family the very best.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege for me to serve four full terms and during this session with our distinguished colleague, CHUCK JOELSON, who is leaving the House and will don the judicial robes of the superior court bench of New Jersey. He inherits the judicial temperament from his father, the late Judge Harry Joelson, with whom he entered the practice of law after his admittance to the New Jersey Bar in 1940.

Scholar, linguist, naval intelligence officer, attorney, city counsel, county prosecutor, criminal investigator, legislator, and now judge—round and round the wheel of fortune spins and where it will stop nobody knows. With dedication to every assignment, CHUCK JOELSON has climbed the ladder rung by rung that leads ever upward to greater service to his fellow man.

A product of Paterson public schools and Montclair Academy, the gentleman from the Eighth District reflected great credit upon his schools and his teachers by winning election at Cornell University to Phi Beta Kappa, the national scholastic honorary society, in his junior year and graduating with a B.A. degree, followed by an LL.B. from Cornell Law School.

Enlisting in the U.S. Navy in January 1943, and serving as an ensign in the Far Eastern branch of the Office of Naval Intelligence, our colleague displayed an uncommon linguistic ability. He mastered the Japanese language, and was assigned to Japanese language duties in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Appointed city counsel of Paterson in charge of all legal affairs of that municipality, CHUCK JOELSON in 1949 was the youngest city counsel in the city's history. In 1955, he was named deputy attorney general by the Governor of New Jersey, and in this capacity served 2 and a half years in charge of the Passaic County prosecutor's office. In 1957 he was promoted to chief of the criminal investigation section for the entire State of New Jersey.

With such an outstanding background in public service, it is not surprising that our colleague was elected for five successive terms to the House. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he was assigned to a special subcommittee which recommended the Manpower Training and Development Act, which was signed into law by President John F. Kennedy. He currently serves on the Committee on Appropriations.

I am proud of this outstanding Democratic statesman, and wish him continued good health, happiness, and success.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged this afternoon to make a few brief remarks about my good friend and colleague CHARLES S. JOELSON of Paterson, N.J., who will be leaving us soon to take his seat upon the superior court bench of New Jersey.

Knowing CHUCK as I do, I know that he will bring that same single-minded power of concentration, that same incisive intelligence to his new position that he

brought to his duties in the House for the past 8 years. I have come to admire that intelligence, idealism, and persistence, and I know that I shall miss them after he goes. This new honor—for a seat on the New Jersey Superior Court is indeed an honor—comes as no surprise to those of us who know CHUCK's abilities. He has distinguished himself as a committed member of the House Appropriations Committee, and most recently as the author of the now famous Joelson amendment, by means of which we were able to remedy severe cutbacks demanded by the administration in the Labor-HEW appropriations.

Perhaps a few words about that amendment, since it is fresh in our memories, will serve to illustrate the ability and determination of the man. All during the time of the consideration of the administration Labor-HEW budget request, all of us were besieged with letters urging our action to increase the requested appropriation so that vital domestic programs in manpower, library services, health services, vocational and higher education, could continue. But the House Appropriations Committee was subject to double pressures, since they were well aware of the administration's interest in holding down domestic spending. Congressman JOELSON, with the support of his Democratic colleagues on that committee and in the House, introduced substantial amendments to the appropriations bill, and worked energetically to assure passage of those amendments. In all honesty, we can attribute the continued viability of many of our domestic programs to his energy, his determination, his farsightedness, and his commitment to a better America.

So I congratulate the State of New Jersey in having appointed a superior court judge who has amply demonstrated his commitment to what he sees as right and necessary, and his energy and intelligence in arriving at those ideals. I finally congratulate CHUCK JOELSON, a distinguished Congressman, on his career thus far, and on a future which cannot be anything but bright.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in offering my congratulations to Congressman CHARLES JOELSON, who has worked long and hard both on the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the House to support forward-looking programs and to urge a relevant order of priorities for our Nation.

He has most recently proven his commitment by amending the Labor-HEW appropriations bill to provide an additional \$1 billion for education. The entire academic community, as well as those less privileged who may with these funds receive the opportunity to be educated, will remain deeply indebted to him for this courageous and constructive action. I am glad that Mr. JOELSON's last effort in the House furthered the cause of education, and I heartily commend him for his leadership in this area, which is consistent with his past record of defending the rights of all.

This record speaks for itself. Although we in the House will miss him, the people of New Jersey will indeed be fortunate to have his wise counsel and fine judgment

on the bench of the superior court of New Jersey.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in these well deserved tributes to our colleague, "CHUCK" JOELSON, but sad at the occasion.

Since coming to this House, I have invariably enjoyed my contacts with the delightful gentleman from New Jersey. On occasion we have worked together on projects of special mutual interest, and this was always a pleasure.

Like so many others I have savored the pithy comments, combining humor and commonsense, that characterized "CHUCK's" participation in floor debate.

This year the success of the Joelson amendments to the education aid bill was a tribute to the gentleman's vision and determination, a fitting climax to his career in the House.

Mr. JOELSON's departure should cause all of us in the House to look critically at ourselves, especially at our rigid traditions, and wonder why the House could not hold so talented a Member.

In any case, the gentleman—and few deserve the term so fully—will be sorely missed.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my many colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding service of my good friend, CHARLES JOELSON.

Through five successive Congresses I have had innumerable occasions to work with CHUCK JOELSON, and I shall miss having his advice and counsel and friendly help on all kinds of things.

It pleases me, however, to know that my friend has been honored by the State of New Jersey to serve on its superior court. I know the court will be honored with his presence, and I wish him the greatest success and happiness in his new career.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Representative CHARLES JOELSON, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, will be leaving us shortly to assume a new career—that of judge on the bench of the superior court of this home State.

I know he must have mixed feelings about such a move. For 9 years CHARLES has sedulously and effectively represented the Eighth District of New Jersey. On the other hand, I am sure he is challenged by the opportunity to serve his State in judicial robes.

He returns to New Jersey as a public servant who is known for his loyalty to truth and to the honest conviction of his own mind. He has deceived no man; neither has he permitted his own heart to be deceived by false influences or faulty judgments.

He has never paused to consider how far any step which he was about to take would lead to his own personal advancement; he has never calculated what he might lose or what he might gain by his advocacy of, or his opposition to, any particular measure. His inquiry, rather, has always been: "Is it right? Is it in accordance with the Constitution of the land? Will it redound to the permanent welfare of the country?" When satisfied upon these points, his determination has been fixed; his purpose, immovable.

Our courts need the kind of personal integrity that is characteristic of Representative JOELSON. The genuine sincerity and devotion of his service in the House

will not be forgotten. Our loss will be sustained by the knowledge that Mr. JOELSON will continue to contribute his outstanding abilities to the service and cause of justice and the Nation.

I therefore wish our good friend and colleague, the best of prosperity and Godspeed in his new career.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without extending my sincerest congratulations to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), as he leaves to become a judge of the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey.

Governor Hughes has made a wise selection which has been duly confirmed by the State legislature. But the gain for the judiciary in his home State is a great loss for the Congress and the Nation.

In his nearly 9 years in the House, the gentleman from New Jersey has made an indelible mark, not only in his work on the Committee on Appropriations, but also in other fields of interest, particularly in education, labor, health, and welfare.

Indeed, it was just 2 months ago, during debate on the fiscal 1970 appropriations bill for labor and health, education, and welfare that he distinguished himself by leading the successful fight to increase the allocation of funds for education.

Our colleague realized the great impact that would result for our school systems across the Nation if the proposed cuts in funds were allowed to prevail. I was proud to march behind him in his most significant and effective drive to put the education allocations in proper perspective.

He has been a most effective member of the full committee, but it should be noted that he was not a member of the subcommittee which did the spadework on the labor-health, education, and welfare money bill.

Indeed, his own committee attention had been focused in previous weeks on another major appropriation bill which cleared the House just 10 days earlier, the bill providing fiscal 1970 funds for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies.

In connection with that bill, the gentleman from New Jersey also played a conspicuous role. I refer to his floor amendment which was adopted by voice vote to increase funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The gentleman from New Jersey and I see eye to eye on several other matters. He and I both have been outspoken right along against the extent of special treatment given the oil industry through the oil depletion allowance. Finally, the House has approved a reduction and I hope sincerely that the Senate will back up our action in the weeks ahead.

He favors tax incentives for business, but not selective incentives as exist in the oil industry. He believes—and I agree—that industry needs reasonable tax help to encourage expansion and development, to develop new jobs and to train employees for today's employment demands.

Although a lifetime native of New Jersey, I am proud to observe that he came to upstate New York to gain his bachelor's degree and his law degree at Cornell University.

He has not had previous experience on the bench, but he has had plenty of experience in front of the bench, as a prosecutor in his home county, as a deputy State attorney general, and as the director of criminal investigation for the entire State of New Jersey for 2 years before he came to Congress.

CHARLES JOELSON has been a credit to the Congress and it has been an honor and a pleasure to have worked with him here throughout his congressional career.

I join with his many friends here on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in wishing him well in his new role as a member of the judiciary in his home State. I am certain that in his new work he will be a credit to the judicial profession as he has been to the nation as a distinguished and respected Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in this appropriate tribute to "CHUCK" JOELSON who was sworn in today to a seat on the superior court of New Jersey. Although we will miss Congressman JOELSON as one of our Members here, it pleases me, as I know it does many of the other Members of this body, that he leaves us to take another post that will be of service to the public. And, at a time when the judiciary sometimes finds itself as one of the public institutions of this great Nation of ours under attack, "CHUCK" JOELSON's appearance in the robes of a judge can only be counted by that institution as its good fortune. One of the fundamental foundations of our Nation is justice—equal and fair—and "CHUCK" JOELSON will be a part of that guarantee as written in the Constitution.

Although "CHUCK" JOELSON and I sat on different sides of the aisle, and our viewpoints and opinions often differed on the questions before this Chamber, I counted myself as a friend. I hope he felt the same. I will miss his sense of humor, which he could ably use to put a point across for his side of an argument, or which could help calm some of the frayed nerves of this body during a debate. Again, I think this facet of his personality, and even his doggerel poetry from which we benefited here, will help serve the ends of justice from behind the bench.

It was only a month ago that the House passed the Joelson amendment on the education bill to help insure the quality of education to which we have committed ourselves for our children. In his 9 years in Congress, and for the 4½ years I have known him, "CHUCK" JOELSON can list other accomplishments. The Joelson amendment for education, being recent and of major importance, and in which I was pleased to join with him, was in itself, however, a mark that stands as part of this tribute.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from New Jersey and my other friends to honor our distinguished colleague, CHARLES S. JOELSON, who is leaving the House of Representatives to embark on yet another step in service to his district, his State, and the Nation. He will take a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Since his election to the 87th Congress, CHUCK has served the people of Passaic County extraordinarily well. He has served the people of the Nation by striving to improve the quality of life for all Americans. He has proposed and supported legislation and appropriations for vital social programs. He has tried to correct the inequities in the tax structure, has worked to bring a good education to every child, and has fought for aid to the underprivileged.

He sees the potential of this great land and of each individual within it and has worked to realize that potential.

I know that CHUCK JOELSON will carry his vision and ideals with him to the bench, by enforcing and defending the Constitution and laws that make our country great.

Mr. Speaker, we will sadly miss CHUCK JOELSON in the Halls of Congress. I realize that through his dedication and knowledge, he will accomplish many good deeds as a judge of the New Jersey Superior Court.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL TO PLACE BORDER TOWNS OFF LIMITS TO SERVICEMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 it was revealed that the Department of Defense had sent to all military commands and areas adjacent to the Mexican border some strange instructions. They were told to prepare for putting off limits to servicemen all Mexican border communities such as Tijuana, in Baja California.

In addition to my own congressional district and that of the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY), both of which border on Baja California, other Members representing districts in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas have been concerned about the long-range effect of this order, not only on relations between the two countries, but the effect upon men who serve our country in uniform.

I talked about the matter late this morning with the Assistant General Counsel to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Frank A. Bartimo. Mr. Bartimo was appointed chairman of the Pentagon's Drug Abuse Control Committee, in line with the overall Drug Abuse Commission appointed recently by the President.

I told Mr. Bartimo that in fairness to him and to the Defense Department I wanted to include his views and the Department's views with regard to this point, in today's RECORD. I asked him to

send me a fact sheet, which he has done, representing the Department's efforts to fight drug abuse.

I shall later ask unanimous consent to include it with my own remarks, and the remarks of colleagues, on this subject.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I am wondering if the gentleman induced from the Department of Defense any information about the influence of drugs, marihuana, amphetamines, and such, from Vietnam?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. No. The action of the Department of Defense thus far, or the prospective action, concerns only these installations which are within the borders of the United States and adjacent to the Mexican border.

Is the gentleman aware of a problem in that connection?

Mr. COHELAN. I would call to the attention of the gentleman that, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Treasury, only about a month ago we were in San Francisco, Calif., where we reviewed some of the fleet post office activities there in relation to parcels that are coming in from Vietnam. It was a shock to the committee then, as it was 2 years ago, to find that many of our returning veterans are bringing in packages filled with what are known as reefers and pillows, with marihuana, various guns, and some ammunition—sometimes live ammunition—plastic materials and things of that kind, which of course is rather shocking. I mention this to stress the volume of drugs that may be coming into this country because it would seem, from what we were able to gather, that such materials are available in Vietnam, and apparently there is some use of them.

I would add to this, for the information of the gentleman, that only a year or two ago our committee received testimony from the Customs Department which did a spot check in the Port of New York and in the Port of San Francisco.

Of the total amount of packages that were coming in, 27 percent, as I recall, were illegal. It, of course, included very substantial quantities of drugs—and when I say drugs I really should withdraw that, I mean marijuana, and it of course came principally from Vietnam.

I would finally add that there are some rather awkward ways being used to bring this material in which is quite a surprise if you have not been aware of it before. The volume of material—the amounts of the material that were coming through is also surprising.

Mind you, we did have a 100-percent check in the period that I am talking about. But the rest of the time, it is done on a random sample test, by special investigators.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. The same as it is done by customs officials at the international border.

Mr. COHELAN. Yes; the customs officials at the port. They are very, very clever at picking out an obvious illicit

bundle. But this material is coming through in great volume and some of it is getting by the inspections.

I would hope that while the gentleman is investigating the delicacy of the problem as it relates to relations between the United States and Mexico and the effects it may have on his district and other border districts we would also have the defense department examine the problem vis-a-vis Vietnam.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. In the context that the gentleman has mentioned this, I assume the gentleman's point is that drugs are easily available, or seem to be easily available to men stationed in Vietnam?

Mr. COHELAN. Of course, I am not making any case for drugs or the drug traffic in amphetamines or marihuana or whatever you want to call it—obviously. But I do think there should be better enforcement, and I mention it to the gentleman because both in his own area and in other areas where troops are established, this is going on. I think we should exercise better measures of control as best we can.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. I join in extending my congratulation to my colleague, the gentleman from California, for bringing this matter to our attention.

I would like to ask the gentleman a series of questions that are somewhat predicated upon my belief that the action that you have brought to our attention was improper and to that degree the questions may be biased. I do not know. Can the gentleman tell me who is the drug abuse officer? Is this an officer—or who is this?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. He is a civilian appointee and an assistant general counsel, Mr. Bartimo, from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALDIE. Is this a new office in that area?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes, it is. As I indicated, it was established in line with the President's Commission.

Mr. WALDIE. How long has this particular gentleman held this office and how long has this office been in existence—I suspect a very short time?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I should emphasize that this is in addition to his other duties. He was not brought in especially to police narcotics.

Mr. WALDIE. Then perhaps, to make the question more direct, how long has the gentleman been involved in or connected with the investigation into the drug traffic between Mexican cities and America, and particularly between Mexican cities and our American servicemen.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Unless this information is contained in this statement which runs to four or six pages, which I shall introduce and which I have not thoroughly digested myself because it arrived so recently, I do not know that I can tell you. But suffice to say that the order emanated from Washington, and the order was not in accordance with the recommendations of the command in the 11th Naval District of Southern California.

Mr. WALDIE. Can the gentleman tell

me this, based upon the gravity of that sort of order, I presume there are statistics which would show that great numbers of American Navy personnel are being subjected to drug abuse through sources obtainable along the border in the cities of Mexico; is that a correct assumption?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. May I say to my colleague, I can give him information as it relates to my area, it being the first area that is targeted for the implementation of this off-limits order.

Shore patrol records indicate that only about three-tenths of 1 percent of the servicemen who go to Tijuana are arrested there, on offenses of all kinds.

Last December the shore patrol counted 19,130 members of the Armed Forces who crossed the border. Of the 40 who were arrested in Tijuana, only two were charged with drug offenses.

From January to May of this year, an average of 22,000 servicemen a month have visited Tijuana, of whom about 70 per month have been arrested for all causes.

There is not yet a breakdown of the number of arrests in this more recent period for drug violations. According to the 11th District legal authorities, no servicemen attached to the district have been convicted of drug violations in Mexico since last March, when three were given short sentences on such an offense. Less than 1 percent of all military personnel in the San Diego area have ever been arrested by our own American authorities for drug violations.

Mr. WALDIE. I presume he would also have prepared statistics to indicate how many of San Diego naval personnel have been arrested or involved in drug usage in San Diego itself, compared to those arrested or involved in drug usage in Tijuana or those arrested or involved in drug usage in Los Angeles, compared with those arrested and involved in drug usage in Tijuana. I presume that those statistics, given the assumption that the man has made a complete and exhaustive inquiry into this problem, would be available. Are you aware of that?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. No; I am not aware of those specific statistics. But the gentleman, like some of our other California colleagues, is aware of rather alarming statistics with relation to young people as a whole—estimates running from 15 to 25 percent who have either experimented with or are regular users of marihuana and dangerous drugs.

Mr. WALDIE. The reason I asked the question again is to point out what seems to me to be either sloppy and inefficient investigation or hypocrisy or an attempt to capitalize upon an issue that is a troublesome issue to the American public by making a dramatic gesture which has no reality or relevance to the solutions needed. I would suspect that naval personnel in San Diego are far more involved with drugs in the city of San Diego and the city of Los Angeles, just based upon the testimony that was given to the ad hoc committee upon which you, I, my colleague to my right, Congressman ROYBAL, Congressman TUNNEY, and Congressman HANNA served. If that is so, abuse of drugs in

American cities on the border by naval personnel exceeds that in the Mexican cities. Would it then be a logical assumption that the Navy would place Los Angeles or San Diego off limits to naval personnel?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. This would seem to have abundant logic.

Mr. WALDIE. It would have about as much logic as placing Tijuana off limits to naval personnel, if the statistics are as you have cited.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. And it would be even more enforceable.

Mr. WALDIE. It would be a lot more enforceable, and keep them out of American cities.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes; because the shore patrol is not permitted to roam the streets of Tijuana. Indeed, servicemen are not permitted to go across the border in uniform. They go in their civilian attire.

Mr. WALDIE. The other thing that troubles me is that if we can keep American naval personnel out of Tijuana or other American border cities because of the prevalence of drugs in that area—and a prevalence, by the way, which I fully accept as being in existence; the portion of the argument I do not accept thus far is that prevalence is being used or made available to American service personnel to the degree the action taken would indicate. Apparently there is no evidence that that is the case—but if we are going to place those cities off limits to American service personnel, we ought to look at where the supply in those cities comes from, and it does not come from Mexico, since we have been able to ascertain that most of it comes from American manufacturers.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. The so-called dangerous drugs are drugs which are prescription drugs on our side of the border.

Mr. WALDIE. Which is the drug-abuse problem. When they use the term "drug-abuse problem," they really talk about amphetamines and barbiturates, not marihuana or heroin. It is those drugs that are the primary problem; the amphetamines, the barbiturates. It is abundantly clear, at least from what testimony the attorney general of the State of California gave to the ad hoc committee and from what we have discussed here, that the American manufacturers are producing those pills in such quantity as to equal almost 100 pills annually for each man, woman, and child in America for medicinal needs. Those pills go into Mexico legally, but illegally come back across the border. If the Navy wants to make a dramatic gesture for public relations and for no other purpose, which seems to me to be an exercise in sophistry, they ought to make a move against the American manufacturers that permit this abuse to occur.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. The gentleman will recall from testimony before our ad hoc committee that these large shipments of dangerous drugs go without any licensing procedures into Baja California, without any accurate record of the need, and that they come pouring back illicitly to where they started—inside the United States.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, just in closing, may I remark to the gentleman

that the testimony of the Mexican authorities before this ad hoc committee was extremely convincing to me as far as their dedication to preventing these drugs from getting into the hands of illicit trade. I was extremely impressed by their dedication to that problem.

As the gentleman has revealed this problem in his area, it does seem to me we are dealing not with an irresponsible action on the part of naval personnel, but with an irresponsible action on the part of a political appointee—and I suspect the irresponsibility stems from his desire to make political capital of tragic circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time to discuss this subject today.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman will be interested to know that the San Diego Union on Saturday of last week carried an article quoting top Navy commanders in San Diego as being "boiling mad" over the instructions they had received. They charge that the gentleman in question in the Pentagon had flown in the face of their recommendation to take a precisely opposite action—to withhold any order for placing the border communities off limits.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that. It confirms my belief that the Navy is a far more trustworthy agency in this matter than are the political appointees who are seeking to capitalize on some pretty tragic situations.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN), for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. Also I associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) with regard to the dangerous drugs actually being manufactured in the United States and being taken to Mexico and then being brought back to the southwestern part of this country.

Testimony before the committee clearly indicated this was the case. For example, just a few weeks ago, 6 tons of dangerous drugs were confiscated along the border cities. Almost all of the 6 tons were traced to three large drug companies in the United States. It is also true that some of these drug companies actually have subsidiaries in Mexico.

But the truth of the matter is that most of this junk comes back to the United States, with the result that in my district and in other districts in the Los Angeles area one can clearly understand how it can be easier for students to get dangerous drugs than it is for them to get cigarettes.

This is corrupting the lives and the welfare of students in the city of Los Angeles.

What is being done about it? Surely the closing of the border to servicemen is not the answer, it is in fact ridiculous. This is not a logical step and one that will definitely not curtail the traffic of dangerous drugs along the border.

But what can be done, is to propose and to pass legislation that would make

it mandatory that companies that manufacture drugs record all items they manufacture and export to Mexico or to any other country. There should be some kind of record or register so that officials can actually trace all of the dangerous drugs and narcotics being sent to Mexico and other countries.

It is also true the Mexican officials are very cooperative, as we heard in testimony before our committee. Mexican officials we were told are actually burning poppy fields and the marihuana fields in Mexico. Recent testimony by the chief of police of the city of Los Angeles—just a few days ago—indicated it is now harder to get marihuana in the city of Los Angeles and the State of California due to the action taken by Mexican officials.

So I join with the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN), in protesting this ridiculous order.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Is not the gentleman also a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee which deals with Latin American affairs?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes; I am a member of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Is the gentleman concerned over the possible effect of an order like this on our relations with a neighbor nation, especially as we move toward a meeting of the two Presidents?

Mr. ROYBAL. I am very much concerned about it. I am surprised that whoever is responsible for this order did not take this into consideration.

If anything is to be done along the border it must be done I believe in concurrence with the Mexican Government. They are just as anxious to do something about this problem as we are, and I believe a little bit more concerned. If anything is going to be done with regard to the border it must be done with their concurrence.

It is my understanding in this particular instance there was no consideration given to Mexico or anyone else, that this was done by an individual apparently seeking headlines more than seeking results.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. At least seeking some activity to make it look like something is being done.

I feel after talking with Mr. Bartimo, that there is no reason to doubt his sincerity. I happen to disagree passionately with him. I believe he has not considered all the factors being brought to light in this discussion.

Mr. ROYBAL. He has particularly not considered the effect it will have on our relationship with the Mexican Government, and this is most important.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Obviously.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. I want to congratulate the gentleman from southern California on his taking the time by special order here today to comment on an executive order which I understand has been made, probably well-intentioned but which I believe rather misses the mark.

As the gentleman knows, I am on the Armed Services Committee of the House. We have not really concerned ourselves

with the effect of this particular order, but I believe we well might.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Like certain other orders, it came down around our heads at a time Congress was not in session.

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes. As I understand it, the net effect would be to place the whole country of Mexico off limits to only a portion of the citizenry of the United States, to wit the Navy Department; or is it the entire military?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Well, around El Paso it would be the soldiers from Ft. Bliss. In southern Arizona it would be Air Force personnel. In San Diego it is mainly Navy men.

Mr. LEGGETT. Undoubtedly the intention of this order is to control narcotics traffic, but I would say if the intent is to control narcotics traffic by limiting U.S. military personnel from crossing the border of a friendly nation, I as a member of the House Armed Services Committee sincerely resent the implication. The implication, of course, is that narcotics are being traded in and dealt with commercially rather freely by military personnel. I believe the gentleman has done some special research with respect to military involvement on the border in illegal narcotics activity; has he not?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. This has already been made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. LEGGETT. I believe the evidence to date is relatively nil; is that not correct?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Certainly it is much less than the incidence in the population at large.

Mr. LEGGETT. It would seem to me if we are concerned about military activity in narcotics, they ought not take action in this respect obliquely, but they ought to file their charges and let us vindicate the members of our military.

If we are going to place foreign countries that some of our military might involve themselves with off limits, then let us place Mexico, Puerto Rico, Canada, and all of South America off limits, as well as Turkey, where I know they grow a lot of this grass and some of the other stuff. Also I know we have bases in Italy. Let us do a complete job on it. Then I say if we are using the border crossing at Tijuana and Juarez and some of these other areas rather prolifically in transporting narcotics, let us not just zero in on the military unless we can prove a case against them. Let us close the border to all Americans. We have plenty of executive authority to do that kind of thing. We have done it with regard to some countries.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I was hopeful, also, that the gentleman might address himself to the discriminatory and paternalistic nature of this impending order. Here we have taken men, many of them not by their own choice assuming the uniform of their country, and are telling them that they are somehow less worthy to be trusted beyond the borders of their country than some 16-, 17-, or 18-year-old kids who may go into Baja California. I wonder if this does not put a special smirch on military service, and if it is not in effect a declaration that they are second- or third-class citizens.

Mr. LEGGETT. The direct implication is that they can go to Vietnam, 38,000

of them, and can fight and die there for the principles of our Constitution, but when they come home they are second-class citizens of a type and do not enjoy the rights that regular people enjoy, and they have to be kind of kept in their kennel. I resent that implication. I think our service personnel are entitled to the presumption of being innocent which is supported by our Constitution. This kind of innuendo, unless they have facts to support it, to back it up, I would severely resent. I hope we can repeal the order and restore the status quo, which I understand the Navy Department wants to do.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I can certainly speak for the Navy command at the local level. I have explored that matter thoroughly with them. The action taken here in Washington ran 180 degrees counter to the recommendations and advice of the responsible naval officials in the 11th District.

Mr. LEGGETT. This is a very severe situation in the United States, speaking of narcotics, as we found out with respect to the 400,000 young people who, I think, had a so-called freakout in up-State New York a few weeks ago. I would hope that this matter would not be made a political issue, Republicans and Democrats alike, and people on both sides of the aisle can unite in an effort to take meaningful steps to control narcotics utilization, traffic, et cetera. However, to go out willy-nilly and do something like this, particularly aiming it at our military, without facts to support it or back it up, I do not think is a correct action.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I think you have summarized it very well. Everyone who spoke on this subject this afternoon and certainly those of us who are parents deeply hope that we will be able to address ourselves to the true causes of this national plight and, to the extent that we are able to do so as legislators, will take steps to remove those causes.

Mr. LEGGETT. I wish to commend the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I was late in arriving on the floor, and I wonder if the gentleman could enunciate to me the basic thrust of his comments, because, as the gentleman knows, for quite some time, I joined with the gentleman in the well in trying to get the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to come to your area for the purpose of permitting Congress itself to hold hearings on this question of drug traffic coming across the border in your area. As you know, the gentleman in the well told me he was somewhat disgruntled at the fact that, since he was a member of the committee, he himself could not get the committee to come out there.

Could the gentlemen tell me what took place that prompted the gentleman to make these comments?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. About 10 days ago, I will say to the gentleman from California, the Department of Defense put all border area military commands on notice that they might shortly implement an order to place Mexican communities

off limits to servicemen. The command in the local area, which has been cognizant of all aspects of this problem, feels that such a step would solve no problems, while creating additional problems. Yet its view was completely unheeded by the Department of Defense authorities responsible for announcing this order.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Was this a DOD directive?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I see. I heard reference to the fact that it was an Executive order.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. It was not an Executive order as such.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I just wanted to clarify this because I too have been working, frankly, with the Department of Justice and the Office of the Attorney General, as well as working with the gentleman in the well, to try and get some specific action because it has been just too long that no response has been given to this basic border problem.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. And, here, now I join the gentleman in renewing our request to the chairman of our committee to move in on this. We have the jurisdiction and we can hit this traffic where it needs to be hit, which is on the American side of the border.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I could not agree more, but I gather that all of the recommendations were made in a rather negative sense with reference to the administration and the executive branch, when in actuality your efforts and mine have been to have the Congress take the initiative and do something about holding these hearings so we can develop the kind of record necessary, but up to this point for reasons probably better known to the gentleman in the well who is on the committee, we have not been successful in getting the kind of hearings to focus attention on this matter.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Let me reassure the gentleman that in my district, at least, which the gentleman knows is not a one-way political area, there has been no partisanship and reaction in response to this at all. There has been general resentment—expressed, for example, in the newspapers, which lean toward the gentleman's party rather than mine—which clearly reflects the views which have been expressed on the floor today with regard to this particular order.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's response to that question because I am deeply concerned about this problem. There are a number of people who have come up into our congressional districts and as the gentleman knows we have the so-called awareness program which focuses attention on the drug problem. It is one of the biggest problems we have in America and I am for doing anything that will bring about a solution to this traffic which is not being checked.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has again indicated to this House his vigilance in respect to the interest of the constituency he so ably represents and his readiness to speak forthrightly in defending those interests.

In this particular instant it is obvious that a large number of service personnel serving and living in the San Diego area will suffer inordinant restrictions on the ruling that the Pentagon has recently set down denying border access to Mexico for those stationed in the San Diego area.

I would bow to no man in this House as regards to my opposition of drugs. I have expressed my views on this subject, I have introduced legislation, and served on an ad hoc committee investigating it. However, in order to get immediate exposure to action on the problem the administration has in this instant fallen into a path of least resistance so often followed by other administrations. The quickest avenue of attack is not only the most nonproductive in this instant it is not even substantially meaningful. The servicemen are the most vulnerable to immediate action by the administration on any kind of program that seeks to curtail and restrain citizens. Already by dint of their service they have restricted rights as citizens. Further diminution should be predicated on a very strong showing of need and a positive expectation that the action taken will assure a substantial result in solving the problem stated to justify action.

In this case it would appear that the Defense Department has brought on line a ton of restriction without demonstrating an ounce of justification or even a grain of possible expectation in terms of diminishing the problem of drug importation. If in fact the border holds such dangerous potential for drug importation as requires it being closed to all servicemen, then certainly it ought to be closed to all juveniles. The only evidence we have seems to indicate that at the present time the juveniles are the greatest offenders in providing transportation for illicit dangerous drugs.

We would join in the hope expressed by Congressman VAN DEERLIN that the Pentagon will reexamine its hasty action and initiate full hearings and develop data both on justification and on their grounds for expectation that the drastic action taken will provide a substantial decrease in the dangerous drug traffic.

We venture to predict that if such patience is exercised factual presentations received from service personnel immediately in the area will convince the mind capable of reasonable assessment that other avenues of action should be explored before implementation of this very recent order—should be required.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this Defense Department document with the remarks that have been spoken on this subject this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

(The document referred to follows:)

FACT SHEET—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DRUG ABUSE CONTROL COMMITTEE, MAY 29, 1969

The Department of Defense is keenly aware of the problems associated with the use of marijuana and drug abuse in the armed forces and the nation. We are resolved that the man in uniform shall have an intelligent, informed understanding of the dangers of drug abuse. We are committed to strict

enforcement of the proscriptions against the sale, use or possession of marijuana, narcotics and the dangerous drugs.

The problem in the armed forces, however, should be placed in its proper perspective. Recognizing that we have, of course, no control over pre-service experiences of our service personnel with marijuana and drugs, we do nonetheless realize that service enlistees and inductees are segments of the civilian community with respect to their habits, attitudes and associations. With this in mind, where detected, potential enlistees and inductees with a prior record of drug abuse are not being accepted into the armed forces. Some escape detection and upon induction, they, and all personnel of the services are required to undergo an educational program designed to give them a greater awareness of the dangers of drug abuse than that to which they have theretofore been exposed. In addition, military disciplinary enforcement procedures for drug abuse are, we believe, more certain than those to which the serviceman's counterpart in the civilian community may expect to experience.

Statistics available to us which are closely monitored indicate there is virtually no addition to the so-called hard narcotics and a low rate of incidence to all drug abuse in the armed forces. Nevertheless our most recent statistics do indicate an increase in drug offenses since 1965. Although low, the rate of marijuana violations is higher than other drugs. For 1968, our statistics reflect that world-wide a fraction less than 5 military individuals per 1,000 were involved in investigations for marijuana violations. It is undoubtedly true that some offenses go completely undetected. While it is not possible to offer a supportable estimate of the number of offenses which are wholly unknown to military authorities we are confident that the suggestion that 50 percent of the troops in Vietnam, or any of our service people wherever stationed, use marijuana regularly is a gross exaggeration. Because of the unique environment of military life, which is characterized by close personal association and by strict supervision of those in the ranks by noncommissioned officers, doctors, and line officers, it is altogether unlikely that any great number of persistent drug or marijuana users could go undetected for any protracted period of time.

Evidencing his concern at the illegal or improper use of drugs by members of the armed forces, the Secretary of Defense, by Department of Defense Directive 1300.11, announced world-wide Department of Defense policies for the prevention and elimination of drug abuse by all service personnel. In general the directive initiated and made mandatory a comprehensive program of education and enforcement on drug abuse. Designated as overall responsible for the program is the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs). He is advised by the DoD Drug Abuse Control Committee composed of representatives from each branch of the services and headed by the Assistant General Counsel (M&RA). The committee maintains close coordination and liaison in its efforts with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Bureau of Customs, the FBI, the Post Office Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All military services have specifically implemented the DoD Directive on drug abuse with detailed prohibitions and procedures.

Clearly marijuana presents the greatest problem from the standpoint of frequency or extent of use—and we are concerned when as few as one per thousand may be involved with its use. Drug abuse is a matter of serious concern. No military establishment, where security is always vitally critical and relies on the team concept, can risk having even one member of the team mentally unbalanced even for a moment through the voluntary use of any dangerous drug.

Since marijuana is a plant that will grow

almost anywhere, particularly in certain areas of the world, such as the Republic of Vietnam, Mexico, and the Middle East, it is a readily marketable crop and brings a quick profit to those individuals peddling it. This is true even though under the laws of most nations, illegal possession, or sale of marijuana is a crime. In the Republic of Vietnam our Services are working closely with the local authorities and enforcement of the Vietnamese marijuana laws is increasing in effectiveness. Other cognizant agencies of our Government are also focusing on this problem and are cooperating with representatives of such nations to control and eliminate the illicit growth and traffic. An example of such cooperation was the recent action taken by the Republic of Vietnam authorities. On October 8, 1968, Prime Minister Tran Van Hough by Circular 195, directed that increased attention and strong measures be taken by the mayors, province chiefs and national police to punish marijuana violators with a view to eradicating completely the marijuana and opium traffic. It is expected that this action will result in increased police activity and increased cooperation between Vietnamese and our military enforcement personnel.

To further the Department of Defense's comprehensive educational program on drug abuse, distribution has been made of 133,000 copies of a basic reference handbook for commanders, "Drug Abuse: Game Without Winners," 3,500,000 copies of an informative drug abuse pamphlet "Drugs and You" distributed on a one-per-man basis to each serviceman, and some 140,000 copies of a drug abuse poster. These publications have now undergone a second printing. The handbook for commanders is on sale to the public at the Government Printing Office at fifty cents per copy. It has become a best seller and has been received very favorably. We have gotten many letters commanding the Department of Defense for this "excellent, interesting, and informative publication."

Widespread service publicity on the facts attending drug abuse and the consequences that can reasonably be expected to follow, is being maintained via service newspapers, unit publications, prepared films on the subject, and armed forces radio and TV panel discussion shows. For example, the *Army, Navy and Air Force Times* devoted the May 21, 1969 edition of its weekly supplement, *Family*, to an interview with the Chairman of the Department of Defense Drug Abuse Control Committee. The two page spread has been favorably received by our troops in the field. Several letters to the editor of the publication have requested permission to reproduce the article for distribution throughout the command. All of these requests have been honored. It is interesting to note that this publication has a subscription list of over one-half million with a readership of over three million.

The Navy produced color film, "Trip to Where" is receiving wide distribution and use. Two hundred eighty-six prints of the Navy film are being used by the Army in drug abuse orientation and training schools.

The Air Force's color film, "The Hang Up" has also been released and is in extensive use. A third film, exclusively dealing with marijuana, and wholly based on factual incidents occurring in the armed forces, has been written and is being produced through the joint efforts of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces and the DoD Drug Abuse Control Committee.

Requirements have been established that all persons entering the armed forces are to initially receive drug abuse orientation training, as well as supplemental refresher training and, prior to any departure for an overseas area, special drug abuse education directed towards the particular drug hazards in the area of overseas assignment. Further, the Department of Defense Directive 1300.11 has been recently amended to require that an entry be made in the appro-

private personnel record of each military person indicating that he has received instruction and education in the area of narcotics, marijuana and other dangerous drugs.

Continued and increased involvement of the legal and medical professions, and the clergy, in the drug education program is being emphasized. In the enforcement area generally, investigators are receiving specialized and expanded training in drug identification. A pilot study conducted by the Army indicates training dogs to detect and locate marijuana by smell is feasible, and such a dog training program is being developed. X-ray fluoroscopes to "look" for narcotics and other contraband in parcels and packages are being used. Consideration is also being given to the utilization of narcotics and marijuana detection devices based on neutron activation analysis and bioluminescent micro-organisms. A Drug Intelligence Center is being organized to provide centralized direction and control of intelligence on drug abuse, as well as a cadre of highly trained investigators for deployment in high incidence areas on request.

We are of course concerned about the potential dangers of drug abuse among United States personnel in Vietnam. To combat these risks, positive steps are being taken. Monthly reports from each branch of the service from Vietnam and Thailand reflect on a name basis the facts and circumstances of every marijuana case investigated by the service investigative agencies. In this connection every known user or possessor of marijuana is immediately investigated by trained criminal investigators. Their reports are closely scrutinized and reviewed by the staffs of the military departments and by personnel in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Actions by our in-country commanders include the following:

1. Special marijuana/narcotics investigation teams have been established at selected field offices to investigate and ferret out sources of supply and to apprehend offenders. Special teams are also available to instruct commanders and troops in identification and detection of marijuana.

2. Orientation classes are being conducted for all new arrivals to stress the moral, medical, social, and legal penalties associated with the possession or use of marijuana.

3. Command chaplains are using lesson plans that integrate information on marijuana in the character guidance program.

4. A continuing program of education, using all informational media available, stresses the harmful effects of marijuana and the penalties involved for conviction of marijuana violations. For example, recently, our narcotics expert in South Vietnam in cooperation with our Armed Forces Radio and Television people have made video tapes and radio spot announcements relating to narcotics and drug abuse. It is planned to use factual excerpts from military service incidents detailing instances of personal injury and dereliction of duty resulting from drug abuse. These spot announcements we believe will have an educational and deterrent effect.

5. Joint investigative squads of Vietnamese police and United States service agents are being used to investigate, define and eliminate the use of marijuana.

6. A new Criminal Investigation Division (CID) laboratory has been established in Vietnam. This laboratory has the capability of analyzing suspected substances for the presence of marijuana. Experts on the laboratory staff are available to testify at court-martial trials, thus increasing the certainty of conviction for offenders and enhancing the deterrent effects of prosecutions. Recently a break-through has come about in expert testimony in laboratory analysis proof at court-martial trials. The so-called NARCOBAN Test Kit has been developed by a commercial organization. This is a relatively inexpensive kit which covers most narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs and can be used with a

minimum of training by investigative personnel. More importantly, the tests are accurate and acceptable as proof in court of the particular narcotic, marijuana, or dangerous drug. This breakthrough should save many hours in expediting courts-martial trials and also result in savings of thousands of dollars. The military departments are in the process of purchasing these relatively inexpensive kits for use world-wide.

7. Through the cooperation of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, we have secured the use of a very senior trained narcotics agent for the Republic of Vietnam. He is assigned to the MACV staff and is working closely with our military personnel. Further, he will also assist the Republic of Vietnam in coping with problems in the narcotic, marijuana and dangerous drug field. His reports will assist us and give us an additional tool for coping with these problems in the Republic of Vietnam.

The above actions are a partial indication of the importance which the Department of Defense and the military departments attach to the prevention and elimination of drug abuse. Drug abuse may primarily be a danger to the user, but in the military services, the drug abuser is a potential danger to the security of every individual. As such the elimination of drug abuse is a matter of concern and involvement for each service individual, as well as for the command.

FRANK A. BARTIMO,
Chairman, DoD Drug Abuse Control
Committee.

REFERENCES

DoD Directive 1300.11, February 2, 1968, "Illegal or Improper Use of Drugs by Members of the Armed Forces."

Drug Abuse: Game Without Winners—A Basic Handbook for Commanders, DoD Gen-33, DA Pam 360-530, NAVPERS 15234, AFP 34-2, NAVMC 2620, GC-173.

Drugs and You—DoD FS-51, DA Pam 360-602.

Navy color film, "Trip to Where," AFIF-177.

Air Force color film, "The Hang Up," AFIF-189.

AMBASSADOR C. BURKE ELBRICK

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House that between 1:45 and 2 p.m. this afternoon, the Honorable Charles Burke Elbrick, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, was forcibly abducted, and his whereabouts are presently unknown.

According to the report which the State Department received, Ambassador Elbrick was kidnapped while in transit between his residence and the U.S. Embassy in Rio de Janeiro. I am further advised that his abductors also took the Ambassador's chauffeur and car, but the latter was subsequently found abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, this latest act of terrorism violates the basic canons of international practice. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have urged the State Department to make the strongest possible representation to the Brazilian Government to take every step to assure Ambassador Elbrick's safe return.

The personal safety of this distinguished public servant, a career Foreign Service officer, is uppermost in our minds, and I am certain that my colleagues in

the House will join me in our most earnest hopes and wishes for his prompt and safe return.

While our hearts go out to the family of Ambassador Elbrick in the anxiety and grief which this event is causing them, we must not forget that the task of coping with such acts of terrorism continues to preoccupy many Latin American governments and deserves our careful consideration and assistance.

MICHIGAN'S MIGRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker—

No man of conscience could fail to be moved by the incredible tales of neglect and abuse in Michigan's treatment of migrant farm laborers.

This is the opening sentence in an editorial which was recently run by the Detroit Free Press at the conclusion of a 4-day series of articles on the incredible conditions facing agricultural workers in Michigan.

The Free Press editorial continues to recommend that the Congress "extend effectively the laws protecting workers—minimum wage, work condition regulations, social security coverage, the right to bargain collectively—to farmworkers."

As the sponsor, in both this Congress and the 90th Congress, of legislation to extend the protection and obligations of the National Labor Relations Act to agricultural workers, I welcome the support of the Free Press in this cause.

The articles, which appeared in the Free Press during the period August 17-20, tell a grim story of exploitation, neglect, and inhumanity. These articles, by staff writers Mary Ann Weston, Ed Ice-nogle, and Ralph Orr, speak for themselves. The story they tell, in the words of the Free Press editorial, "is too abhorrent and full of shame for a progressive State such as Michigan to condone."

I want to commend the Free Press for performing a valuable public service in the continuing quest for justice for the people who harvest the food we eat.

I include the articles and the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 17, 1969]

LIFE, WORK ARE WRETCHED IN STATE'S FARM CAMPS

(By Mary Ann Weston)

About 50,000 migrant farm workers—men, women and children—flood into Michigan each summer to hoe sugar beets and beans and pick strawberries, pickles, cherries and tomatoes.

The migrant stream, a pitiful human caravan, rolls from state to state, following maturing crops, its members largely unnoticed, ignored, excluded by affluent, upwardly mobile America.

In Michigan, migrants live in camps where conditions are rustic at best, wretched at worst.

Ninety-two percent of 48 migrant camps recently surveyed had no running water in the houses; 42 percent had leaky roofs; 74 percent had no working refrigerators; 40

percent had no bathing facilities; all had privies instead of flush toilets.

Migrants are victimized by an economic and social system that keeps them in virtual peonage. They call themselves "campesinos," and it's a good word. For they are, in many ways, peasants.

Their work is brutalizing and back-breaking. In the sugar beet fields they hoe and pull weeds by hand. Among pickles they stoop all day long, pulling the sticky, prickly vegetables from the vines. Cherry pickers perch on ladders and grab the fruit from trees.

For all this, nearly half the state's agricultural workers earn \$3,000 or less a year.

Migrants have little control over their destinies. "The migrants' existence is at the mercy of growers, large processing companies, social service departments, state agencies and benevolent organizations . . . (they are) American citizens who are always going to or returning from someplace, but really belonging no place . . ." said General McCants, housing relocation specialist for the United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc. (UMOI).

Two-thirds are Mexican-Americans—Chicanos—many from "El Valle"—the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. Others are blacks and white from the South. A few, who are not migrants in the true sense, come from nearby cities.

Most Migrants come from Texas in rusty pickups or crowded buses. Facing unemployment at home, they are lured by tales of work and good wages in the fields.

Good wages are elusive, however. The state-established piece rate for tart cherries, for example, is 70 cents for a lug, which weighs 27 pounds. According to the Rural Management Center at Michigan State University, it takes the average workers almost three-quarters of an hour to pick one lug.

Mostly, they're large, close-knit families, sometimes as many as 15 members. The father is the unquestioned head. If the older sons are married and have families of their own, they generally contribute their earnings to the common fund.

The younger children may be cared for by an old grandmother, or, if there is enough work, the kids join their parents in the fields. Child labor laws don't apply to most agricultural work.

The migrants come to Michigan in May or June, leave in August or September. In between, they move with the crops.

A family might move from a camp near Unionville, where they hoe sugar beets, to a camp near Keeler where they pick cherries and pickles, to a camp near Erie where they pick tomatoes.

There are, Dr. Daniel Sturt, director of the Rural Manpower Center, said, an infinite variety of movements within the larger migrant stream.

When they get to Michigan, migrants unload their belongings in camps, which might be anything from neat rows of freshly-painted wooden cabins to a shed that recently sheltered livestock.

A total of 1,822 camps were licensed by the State Health Department as of Aug. 1, 1969. Until 1965 any hovel could be called a camp. There was no state licensing at all.

Now, in licensed camps, you see things like this:

There's a camp in Tuscola County near Unionville with a licensed capacity of 135 and no running water. Water is brought in every few days in a big tank.

There is one spigot that drips into a mud puddle. There is no drain. Residents said the tank is rusty inside, making their water rusty. There are no showers.

State regulations require neither running water nor showers, although showers will be mandatory after 1971.

The camp is owned by the Michigan Sugar Beet Co. Its president, Ernest Flegenheimer, explained that three attempts were made to dig wells for the camp, but all three brought

up salt water. He indicated the camp would not be used next year.

The camp consists of a cluster of green-painted wood cabins—you can not dignify them by calling them houses—and some out-houses in which the refuse reaches to within three feet of the toilet seats.

Inside a typical cabin there are stains on the board walls where rainwater came in. The shack, about 20 by 20 feet, is divided into two rooms by a plywood partition.

Successive families have decorated or defaced it, according to their whims. There are religious pictures and a crucifix and some homesick person scrawled, "Mercedes, la reina del valle" (Mercedes, queen of the valley).

Mercedes is one of the Rio Grande Valley towns that many migrants come from.

In one room is a rough open cupboard, an equally rough board table and wooden benches.

On a shelf attached to the wall are three gas burners for cooking. There is no oven. In the middle of the room is a wood-burning stove where provisions are stacked. A refrigerator is in the corner.

In the rest of the available space and in the second room there are beds—cots really, low iron bedsteads which were once painted white, with thin mattresses.

Ten people sleep in these two rooms.

At the camp owned by Walter Runge in Berrien County, four of the six shelters (leaning wooden shacks) were closed by the health department this spring. To get a license for the remaining two, the owner was ordered to dig a new privy, according to Robert R. Kaukola, a State Health Department official.

More than a month later the only indication of compliance was a three-foot deep hole, the beginning of a new pit.

The camp residents—two black families from Louisiana who came to pick strawberries—used the old privy.

The two families were jammed into the two usable shacks—weathered wooden structures covered with imitation asphalt siding.

The shacks each had one small window and one wooden door. With the door closed, it was dark and stifling.

Between these hovels and the four declared uninhabitable runs a ditch of stagnant, insect-breeding water. Flies swarm around rusty trash cans. The trek from the shacks to the privy is an obstacle course of mud puddles.

Sometimes it is a question of who has first priority on buildings, migrants or livestock. A Grand Traverse County farmer named Oliver Tompkins, for example, converted a cattle feeding shed next to his barn into a shelter for cherry pickers.

According to the State Health Department, three or four migrant families were living there when the so-called camp was inspected July 30. The inspectors reported manure-spattered plywood partitions separated the families.

There was no ceiling in the shed and the partitions did not reach to the roof. The floors were cement; there was little furniture. The place smelled of manure.

Health officers ordered the owner to vacate the shed and correct the violations. When he did not, they asked and got a warrant against him Aug. 4.

Grand Traverse County Assistant Prosecutor William P. Long said the case will probably come to trial sometime in September, after most of the harvest is over.

Near Erie, in Monroe County, the Antonio Ortega family of 15 spent several weeks in a small barn, which also housed stacks of bushel baskets used for picking tomatoes.

Insects and rats, said Ortega, claimed the baskets for home.

But the Ortegas were hardly in a position to move: They'd come north from Texas on a vague promise of work in the sugar beet fields, but when they arrived there was no work.

They stayed in the barn for almost a month before two men in the family were given a day's work tearing down an old barn.

Health department regulations will not require migrant camps to have shower or bathing facilities until 1971. In 1968 only a third of them did, according to the Annual Progress Report on the health department's Agricultural Labor Camp Licensing Program.

Sometimes even showers are a mixed blessing. In a camp near Capac, the showers are on a small hill at one end of the camp's two rows of dreary cabins. Water from the showers collected into a mosquito-breeding swamp in the middle of the camp.

Most migrants drift at one time or another to the rich fruit-growing regions of Western Michigan. There are 343 camps in Berrien County licensed to accommodate 10,133 migrants. In neighboring Van Buren County, there are 261 camps with a licensed capacity of 12,623.

During the cherry and pickle seasons, migrants pour into the camps, hoping for little luxuries like privies where the refuse pits have been treated with lime, cabins with adequate ventilation, or camps on high ground away from swampy, bug-infested areas.

But sometimes the migrants find camps like the Longshed Camp, a depressing collection of four weathered, unpainted wood cabins along a rutted road that is dusty or * * *.

The Berrien County camp, owned by Walter Schaeffelfeld, has a license that makes it legally habitable. It also has a frayed electrical cord in one of the cabins that spews sparks into the dry wood roof and an out-house so infested with rats children from the camp are afraid to use it.

"This is awful," complained a Detroit mother, who with her husband and seven children, trekked to the area to pick fruit.

She leaned against one of two double beds in the cramped one-room cabin. The cabin was no more than 15 by 20 feet, but it held the two beds, a battered refrigerator, a gas burner, a dresser and nine people.

Like many migrant shacks, there was no running water. Water came from a hand pump across the road.

"We need a bathroom, running water," the woman said. "It's not fit for nobody."

Generally, migrants pay no direct rent for their shacks, though they often pay for equipment and other things, such as cooking gas, electricity, hoes, mattresses and mattress covers.

Most migrants are trapped in a cruel economic cycle which draws them north each year, buoyed by hopes and rumors that work is plentiful and the wages high and this year will be a good year.

There's a little work in Texas, they say. They hope to make enough up north to keep up payments on their homes and cars in Texas. Sometimes they do. Often, they return with only a few dollars in their pockets.

For example, pretty, dark-haired Adela Sanchez, 24, came with her family from Falfurrias, Tex., because they heard of better work in Michigan.

"We have an uncle who came last year. He was getting pretty good money, and we were not doing well in Texas," she said. So the family—all seven—came to a camp near Bach in Huron County.

But there was not as much work as they hoped. "Next year I don't know," said Miss Sanchez.

Six workers in the "Garcia" family (an assumed name) netted a total of \$57.37 each for five weeks work in the sugar beet fields.

There are 14 in the family. The workers, whose earnings were recorded by a Civil Rights Commission staff member, labored from eight to 32 hours a week. There never was enough work to keep them busy full-time.

The six workers—mother, father and four oldest children—grossed \$862.62. But food,

insurance and other things reduced their earnings to \$344.22.

"I think this is about typical," said Santiago Rios, a field worker with the Civil Rights Commission's migrant project. He said none of the families on which he collected data made over \$500.

Many families get advances from growers' groups to enable them to come from Texas to Michigan and these, too, must be repaid out of earnings.

Sugar beet workers are advanced a living allowance of \$6 to \$10 a week per adult and about half that for a child. The sum is so low many families seek government food stamps or surplus commodities to make ends meet.

Theoretically, migrants bargain with employers to get a fair price for their labor. In practice, however, they have little bargaining power.

Take the case of Jose, who would not tell his last name because he feared retaliation.

Jose and his family spent last June and July in a camp near Capac called the Jewel Camp.

"They told us in Texas they would give us \$27 an acre. Up here they said \$15, and now we have to fight for \$14 an acre," Jose said.

"The boss took us out to a farmer, who wanted to pay too little," he said. "It was a bad field. I said: 'No. We won't do it for that much.'"

"So the fieldman brought us back and said he would take someone who was willing to work. We didn't get another job for two weeks."

Most migrants who work sugar beets think they work for one of the big processing firms. In fact, said Flegenheimer, whose Michigan Sugar Co. of Saginaw is the largest sugar beet processor, migrants are employed by individual farmers in whose fields they toil.

Michigan Sugar merely performs a service for the farmers by keeping track of the migrants' wages and paying them out of money the company pays farmers for their beet crops, according to Flegenheimer.

This means migrants seldom work for one employer long enough to be eligible for Social Security or workmen's compensation.

The farmers or Michigan Sugar, which owns many of the migrant camps, keep track of the workers' deductions and earnings. At the end of the beet season they get a check and a "settlement sheet" listing earnings and charges. That is the only time they get paid.

Pickle and cherry workers get paid every week or two. But sometimes employers use another gimmick to keep their workers in bondage.

They withhold what they call a bonus from migrants' wages a portion of the workers' regular earnings held until the end of the season to make sure he stays.

One migrant family, working near Traverse City learned of the death of a relative in Texas. They asked the grower for \$1,000 the family had earned, so they could go back to Texas. The grower said no.

Another family, living in a Monroe County camp, got a call that the wife's mother was gravely ill in Texas. The call came to the farm owner. He told the caller the wife could not come to the telephone, would not be allowed to leave the camp and could not receive any more telephone calls.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 17, 1969]

A FATHER SAW HIS BABY DIE

(By Ed Icenogle)

Raymond Caro's first-born son died this summer.

A doctor said the baby died of dehydration. Caro, a 20-year-old migrant farm worker, said the baby died because the hospital in Watervliet would not admit his son.

Raymond Caro watched his baby die, slowly. Panicked by the child's continuous vomiting and diarrhea, he had taken Raymond Jr. to the hospital.

He said a nurse there refused to admit the infant. She talked with a doctor over the phone, describing the baby as having no temperature or apparent vomiting and diarrhea, Caro said.

Caro, reticent like most Mexican-Americans when faced with bureaucracy, left the hospital.

That was Sunday evening.

By 5 a.m. Tuesday the baby was dead. The mother of the nine-month-old infant wandered away from their migrant camp, dazed and possibly in shock. She was found several days later at an Indiana relative's home.

Caro sent his wife back to her Texas family. Now he's working alone, trying to make some money and pay the \$42 he still owes for the baby's \$100 burial.

"The superintendent of the hospital apologized for the death of the baby and said it wouldn't happen again," said Caro, a handsome, sad young man whose quiet English is softened with Spanish accents.

The hospital administrator, Mrs. Aileen B. Miller, denied that Caro was given an apology or told "it wouldn't happen again."

"The nurse reported the temperature to the doctor," she said. "The baby didn't seem to be critically ill."

The only difference between the treatment of the Caro baby and the child of a local resident, Mrs. Miller said, was that the doctor probably would have previously seen the local baby and known its medical history.

A social worker who attended a meeting between Caro and Mrs. Miller said the baby's death is typical of the migrant in Michigan.

"I think it is significant. If a city councilman came in and was turned away, he would insist," said Anderson Hewitt, program coordinator of Michigan Migrant Ministry, a project founded by the Michigan Council of Churches.

"But the farm worker is reserved and meek," Hewitt said. "He won't press it. He won't say, 'You give me the service or I'll sit here until you do.'"

Raymond Caro didn't press it. Hospital procedure required a doctor to admit the baby, but no doctor was there and apparently the nurse did not think the baby ill enough to call in a doctor.

Baffled by being turned away from the one place he knew could heal sickness, Caro took his son home and waited.

"But the thing that got to me the most was the man I worked for," Caro said. "He didn't even express a condolence."

Mexican-American migrant babies die at nearly double the rate of other Michigan infants. Four hundred migrant infants out of every 10,000 die before they are 12 months old.

For the state as a whole the figure is 220 out of 10,000.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 17, 1969]

A DREAM VANISHES, A BATTLE STARTS

(By Mary Ann Weston)

Jose Hernandez, 19, brought his wife and two little girls from Mission, Tex., to Breckenridge, Mich., in a broken down school bus. A labor contractor had told him he'd earn \$130 a week weeding pickles.

After a month in a Michigan migrant camp Hernandez's shiny dream of hard work and good wages had rusted into a nightmare of enforced idleness, squalor and frustration.

In that time he netted exactly \$5. He then decided to "do something for my people."

Hernandez, a good-looking young man with curly brown hair, took his wife, Yolanda, 17, and their daughters, 19 months and eight months, out of the camp and to the Detroit headquarters of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC).

Hernandez now works for the union, trying to organize his fellow migrants.

The Hernandez family earns expenses, room

(sometimes the gym of a Catholic school, sometimes the home of another organizer), board and little else.

For Jose Hernandez, that's a big gain.

There were about 40 people besides the Hernandezes on the rickety bus from Texas. Hernandez thought the contractor would give them money for food. He didn't know the money would have to be repaid.

Hernandez reluctantly took \$10 to buy powdered milk for the babies. That's all they had to eat on the trip.

They rumbled into their "camp" near Breckenridge during a downpour. It was a sodden collection of tumble-down shacks in a weedy field.

"The grass was up to your neck. There was no heat. There were holes in the floor. The roof leaked," Hernandez said.

The Hernandez family and another one—eight people in all—crowded into one two-room shack.

It had no running water, no bathroom, no laundry. The refrigerator worked sporadically. Rain came in through the roof. The family shivered in the spring chill.

There was no work.

A baby in the camp got sick. Its mother asked the contractor to take her to a nurse or doctor. "Do you have money?" the contractor asked.

The mother shook her head. "Then you can't go," he said.

In their 29 days in the camp, the Hernandezes worked only three, and only one of those days was a full eight hours work.

"There was nothing to do," Hernandez said, "but lie around and complain, complain."

When Hernandez asked for his pay, the contractor gave him a check for \$47 and told him to sign it over. Hernandez did. The contractor took the check and gave him \$5.

Hernandez took his family from the camp to the union headquarters in Detroit.

"I'm fed up," he said. "I'm fighting. Not just for me, but for my people... I've been working on farms, getting pushed around. I don't want this to happen to my kids."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 17, 1969]

A BIG GROWER'S CAMPS: FLIES, MOSQUITOES, ILLNESS

(By Ed Icenogle)

Joe Hassle says he runs a "big, happy home."

His "home" is a 3,000-acre Van Buren County string of farms with 15 migrant labor camps and nearly 1,200 migrant workers and their families.

Joe Hassle is one of the biggest growers in Michigan. His camps are some of the worst.

People who work with him and against him, describe Hassle in many ways: Rich, powerful, eager—and other things not even remotely printable.

"I started with 80 acres," Hassle says in animated words and gestures. "Now it's over 3,000 acres. Last year we produced over a million pounds of cherries and 10 million pounds of beans."

"The only way to make it is to get bigger and cut corners."

But some of the migrant laborers who work there say that they are the corners he is cutting.

"We will never, never in our lives go back to the Hassle camp," said the wife of one worker. "We don't want anything to do with that farmer."

Four of her children were sick this summer, she said, because of living conditions in Hassles Krohn Camp.

Krohn Camp is a cluster of 35 wooden cabins, secreted from sight by trees and heavy undergrowth. It borders a swamp, and the mosquitoes are as thick as flies—which are as thick as the swamp mud.

"The flies would swarm the food," one

laborer said. "You put a piece of meat on the table and the flies would just swarm it. You couldn't even keep the mosquitoes off the face and mouth of the babies."

This migrant, who earned \$126 for two months work, is convinced the conditions there caused the sickness that hospitalized his infant daughter for a month.

Social worker Don Folgueras, a summer worker for United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc. (a federally-funded program), suspected the Krohn Camp water supply was causing the sickness. He attempted to take a water sample, but Hassle saw him and ordered him out of the camp.

"I told him if he came back, I'd put my fist through his teeth," Hassle said. "He came back, so I did what I told him I'd do."

Folgueras, an Albion College student, said several days after the incident through still-swollen lips that he had returned to the camp to visit a family with sick children.

Hassle called him a "long-haired —" and belted him.

The grower hit him twice in the face and then kicked him when he bent to pick up his eyeglasses, Folgueras recalled. Witnesses confirmed Folgueras' account.

"The boy wasn't doing nothing but trying to help," one migrant said.

"The second day," Hassle said, "I didn't give him a chance to say anything." The day before the incident, the youth had told Hassle he was from the "Health Department."

Although Folgueras did not strike back or defend himself, he was booked by Van Buren County Sheriff's deputies for trespassing and being a "disorderly person."

"Hassle is getting too big, too fast," said Robert R. Kaukola, a state Department of Public Health six-county coordinator of labor camp licensing. "If only Joe and others would just hire one or two people to maintain the camps . . . to see that the work's done."

However, Hassle said he doesn't have surplus money to put into migrant housing. He already spends \$20,000 a year on it, he said.

"This is one of the top farms in the area," he said, "but we don't make a lot of money. We just keep going."

"We've worked hard, pushing hard, had some lucky breaks. I can't complain."

But several migrants have complaints.

"Hassle paid us only \$1 for bigger-than-regular lugs," one said. "Last year it took two buckets to fill a lug with cherries. This year it took four buckets."

In six weeks at a Hassle camp, another worker reported earnings below the \$150 minimum needed to credit his Social Security.

But Hassle insists "the migrant is happy." "This is a big, happy home," he said. "They help us and we help them."

"Why, 95 percent of the farmers think more of their migrants than their own kids," he said.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 18, 1969]

POLITICS AND WEAK LAWS LET GROWER ABUSE HARVEST HELP

(By Ralph Orr)

There are four things the migrant worker should do to make top dollar in Michigan: pray for a bountiful harvest, work his tail off, put his wife and kids to work alongside him, sleep in the field at night.

Because of loopholes in both the state and federal minimum wage laws, which theoretically "cover" him, this is his best bet.

The pay floor legislation is typical of the few laws on the books that benefit migratory workers—full of fish hooks for the worker and escape hatches for the employer.

The State agencies that enforce the laws are understaffed, underfunded and thus generally lax in forcing growers to comply.

Some of the legislation, which was innocuous in the first place, was later amended

to weaken violation penalties, delay its effective dates or otherwise emasculate it.

The minimum wage law is a case in point.

It was enacted in 1964 to cover all employers who hire four or more workers at any one time, including farm employers. It raised the minimum wage in three stages to \$1.25 hourly, which became the state floor Jan. 1, 1967.

It applies only to workers between the ages of 18 and 65. Legally, the grower can pay the teen-ager or retiree whatever he chooses.

One year after the bill was signed, and before the 1965 harvest season, the law was amended to permit piecework rates for harvest workers and exclude them from coverage until the rates had been set.

"This is the way we always have paid them. It gives them more incentive," farm lobbyists insisted.

Setting of the rates was delegated to the Wage Deviation Board, an agency created by the act to do exactly what its name implies: establish deviations from the minimum.

But since the nine board members knew little about harvesting, the job of making labor studies was farmed out to the Rural Manpower Center of Michigan State University.

Its studies were not completed until June 15, 1967, when piecework rates for picking 22 fruits and vegetables became effective. This was 30 months after all other workers came under the minimum-wage umbrella for the first time.

The law specifies that the rate be based on the pickings of the "average, diligent" worker, but requires that he cannot receive less than \$1.25 hourly.

The fact is, he often does receive less when the pickings are slim at the beginning or end of the harvest season. A teen-age girl picking pickles near Keeler early this month worked 1½ hours and earned 50 cents. The piecework rate is .019 a pound.

Another gimmick empowers the wage board to determine the value of lodging and other fringe benefits provided by the farmer. He then is allowed to deduct an amount equal to their value, up to a maximum of 25 percent, from the earnings of one wage earner per family.

The employer is allowed a credit of eight cents per hour for single worker occupancy of a living unit or four cents per hour for multiple worker occupancy. If the living quarters happen to have certain adornments, the farmer can deduct more.

If the migrant father licks out and gets a cabin so commodious as to have pressure water (4c), toilet (2c), shower (10c), his employer could deduct 16 cents from his hourly wage, leaving the migrant \$1.09 hourly.

(In a burst of compassion, the board once ruled that no housing credit would be allowed for "sheet metal shells" that become ovens in the Michigan sun.)

Thus, forced to import workers because few people in Michigan would work the low wages, the farmer can charge the worker "rent" for the often less-than-habitable quarters he provides to keep the migrant here until the harvest is over.

The only way to beat that deal is "to sleep in the fields," said State Sen. Sander Levin, D-Berkley, who has done his share of jousting with rural legislators.

The federal wage law, which applies principally to larger growers, is little better than Michigan's. The floor for farm laborers is \$1.30. The federal law has the same loose provision that allows the farmer to deduct from wages the "reasonable cost" of lodging and other facilities.

Neither law has overtime provisions. And the worker cannot bargain for premium pay because he is protected by neither the National Labor Relations Act nor the State Labor Mediation Act.

Wages for hoeing and thinning sugar beets, a big Michigan crop, are set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on a piecework basis under the Federal Sugar Act.

Until 1968, when a hearing was held in San Antonio, Tex., public hearings on Michigan beet scales were held in the winter—when the migrants were back in the South, and could not testify.

Carlos Chavira, a migrant who has been summering in Michigan beet fields for 16 years, had his best year in 1968 when he, his wife and three of his 11 children made \$1,800 in two months and three days.

The migrant is not eligible for unemployment compensation.

Even the Social Security Act is weighted against him. It requires deduction of the Social Security tax (and payment of an equal amount by the farmer) only if the migrant earns \$150 or more from the grower in a year, or if he works for the grower on 20 or more different days in a year.

Short harvest seasons for each crop virtually rule out coverage. Many farmers simply ignore the law, seldom even ask for the worker's Social Security number.

Harold Cole, manager of the Social Security branch office in Monroe, said the Social Security issue is moot in any case. "The average life expectancy of the migrant is 49 years," he said. "He seldom lives to collect the benefits."

Neither state nor federal statute prohibits their working on hazardous farm jobs or while school is in session.

Farming is the third most hazardous industry in the nation, yet workmen's compensation for the Michigan farm worker did not begin until 1967. The migrant is protected if he has worked for an employer 35 or more hours per week for five consecutive weeks. Here again, short crop seasons often rule out coverage.

He is covered only for medical or hospital costs if hurt on the job and cannot receive the weekly disability benefits other protected workers get. He can sue the grower if he loses a leg under a tractor, but the law gives the farmer so many defenses it is almost impossible for the worker to collect.

The legislature did enact a law to license and regulate farm labor camps in 1965, and in general the Health Department's labor camp unit has tried to enforce it.

But the act was gutted when it was amended later to reduce the penalty for violations from a high misdemeanor to a normal misdemeanor.

This took such actions out of circuit courts, where clogged dockets often delayed proceedings, and put them in local courts, where justice was more swift.

What it also did was put cronyism in the picture. In rural communities where everybody knows the judge, the few farmers brought to justice (only six were taken to court in 1968) sometimes get off with a \$15 slap on the wrist for letting their camps become pigpens.

One grower was fined \$5 by a rural jurist for a camp violation. "This is frustrating," said Norman Papsdorf, chief of the labor camp unit.

Most of the 50,000 migrant workers who are harvesting Michigan's fruit and vegetable crops this summer will reap their own grim harvest of misery and poverty.

Nomads who move from state to state and crop to crop, they have no money, no power and no voting rights.

"They are not even second-class citizens," said State Rep. James Bradley, D-Detroit.

"They are conscience-wringers who exist in a society not geared to people on the move," said Dr. Daniel Sturt, director of the Rural Manpower Center.

But if they prick the consciences of some Michigan citizens, it is not for long. They are here today, in Texas tomorrow.

"That's the trouble, they are the constituency of nobody," said State Sen. Roger Craig, D-Dearborn, one of those who believes Michigan owes more to the workers who cultivate and pick her \$152-million fruit and vegetable harvest.

There are many reasons why the migrant is a nameless victim of exploitation.

The major one is the understandable fear of rural legislators and some of their suburban colleagues that progressive laws would add to the labor costs of the Michigan farmer and put him in an unfair competitive position with farmers growing the same crop in a less progressive state.

Farm Bureau lobbyists cultivated that fear. The result, for years, was total inaction. From 1957 through 1964, the Legislature considered 16 migrant bills. None passed.

Since 1964, the year the minimum wage law passed, 12 "migrant labor laws" have been enacted. While the total sounds impressive, most of the laws are not. Besides the workmen's compensation and labor camp laws, this is the box score:

In 1966 the Legislature delayed the effective date of the workmen's comp provisions one year, until May 1, 1967, so insurance rates could be studied.

In 1965 the Legislature appropriated \$15,000 to operate elementary school classes for migrants' children on an experimental basis. The funds never were used.

The Legislature in 1965 ordered the Department of Agriculture to adopt safety rules for certain vehicles used to convey migrants to and from work. A year later the lawmakers decided this should be done by the Department of Commerce.

In 1966, the Legislature approved establishment of at least two overnight rest camps for migrants. Although federal money for this project is available on a matching basis, the act never was funded.

Another 1966 law requires emigrant agents (crew leaders) to file weekly reports listing workers, wages, transportation arrangements and other terms of employment. Few such reports are filed by the crew leaders, some of whom cannot read English.

A 1966 appropriation bill approved reimbursements to counties providing hospital services to migrants or indigent people with less than one year's residency in Michigan. In 1967-68, the reimbursements totaled \$106,330—an average of about \$2 per worker.

The act also increased the allotment for urban and rural day care centers. In 1967-68, the Department of Social Services spent \$32,244 to regulate and counsel day care centers operated by volunteer groups.

In 1967 the Legislature again weakened workmen's compensation coverage for some farm workers by requiring that they be employed at least 13 consecutive weeks in a year. Previously, the 13-week period did not have to be consecutive.

Last year the Legislature established a seven-member Commission on Agricultural Labor to "seek to improve living and working conditions" of farm workers. Gov. Milliken's appointees include four growers or processors, one state employee and only two men representing workers.

The migrant bills introduced this year would fill a bushel basket.

Only one passed. It required an employer to pay migrant workers at least every two weeks. This outlaws the withholding of "bonus" money until the final payday, which migrant leaders say is a way of keeping them in bondage.

The bill, which was not signed by Gov. Milliken until Aug. 5, also specifies that migrant workers and domestics be given an itemized statement of earnings and deductions. For most migrants, this was legislative hilly-gilding: the minimum-wage act already required such statements.

This year's migrant bills were bottled up in the Senate by Republican-controlled committees. But there is little evidence that simulates. But there is little evidence that simulates House were pushed enthusiastically.

Harold Cole, the Monroe social security aide, believes only Congress can solve the migrant dilemma.

"There should be total federal jurisdic-

tion over the migrants and all their problems, on the interstate commerce theory," he said. This would eliminate unfair competitive advantages between states, he contends.

Until then, it is likely that what one Michigan legislator calls the "boondocks philosophy" will prevail in Michigan and other farm states.

That philosophy was expressed several years ago at the Wage Deviation Board hearing on piecework rate for picking blueberries, which the board had set tentatively at 13.8 cents a pound. "Blueberries are as American as Thanksgiving Day, and paying somebody 14 cents a pound to pick them is a radical idea," one grower testified.

The board set the rate at nine cents a pound.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 18, 1969]

LEVIN URGES STATE ACTION ON MIGRANT LABOR PROBLEM

State Sen. Sander Levin, D-Berkley has urged Gov. Milliken to confront the migrant worker problem by calling a broad-based meeting to map action for the 1970 legislative session.

"The time is overdue for a concerted attack on the unsolved problems facing the migrant worker," Levin said in a letter to the governor.

Levin, Senate minority leader, said Sunday his concern was "deepened" by disclosures in the first of a Free Press series on the migrant dilemma.

He said the action meeting should involve the executive and legislative branches of the state government, both political parties, the public sector and migrants themselves.

Levin criticized Gov. Milliken's failure to include migrants in his new Task Force on Migrant Labor, headed by Dr. John Dempsey, the governor's special assistant for urban affairs.

"The task force does not include any representatives of migrant workers, or legislators or any of the private agencies vitally concerned with migrant worker problems," he wrote.

The task force, comprised of directors of seven state departments and commissions, is the third group to study the migrant problem.

A commission appointed in 1964 by former Gov. George Romney conducted a two-year study.

Levin was co-chairman of a joint Senate-House committee that investigated work camps and interviewed growers in 1965-66.

"We need the end of study committees and the beginning of faster action," Levin said. "The time for action is now."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 18, 1969]

THE MIGRANT LABOR CYCLE IS INEVITABLE AND ENDLESS

(By Ed Icenogle)

For tens of thousands of the poorest Americans, migrant farming is total life.

It is seldom voluntary. Few set out to be migrant farm workers, to stoop over dusty acres of pickles and strawberries, to climb rickety ladders and pick handfuls of cherries, to live in fire-trap rat holes. The migrants have no choice.

If migrant farm work is an inevitable choice for many of the rural poor, it is also a permanent one.

Once he is in the stream, the endless biological cycle engulfs the migrant for life. Each winter in the Rio Grande Valley, it means no job, little money and discrimination because of the workers' Spanish surnames. Each summer in the fields of Michigan, it means trying to scratch enough money from the earth to put the family through another winter.

Each generation's pattern is much like another's.

The migrant child is born into poverty, delivered by the vegetable-green stained hands of a midwife trained by birthing as many as nine or 10 children of her own. He cries in a world that deserves tears. Rats, mud, manure, insects; sickness, heat and young people quickly old.

His parents were forced from their meager sharecropping jobs by mechanization, by advancing suburbs, by new man-made lakes for 15-foot, 40-horsepower motorboats.

The child somehow lives. At the age of 8, he joins his parents in the fields. He grows into a classroom of beets and strawberries, not books and schools.

He meets, weds the black-haired, brown-eyed daughter of another migrant, and they bring forth children to continue the cycle.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 18, 1969]

LAWS PROTECTING MIGRANTS WEAK AND POORLY ENFORCED

The Michigan minimum-wage law allows a farmer to make cash deductions from migrants' earnings for lodging he provides, but only if the plumbing and other luxuries are "immediately contiguous to the family space."

The question asked by critics of the law is what is contiguity?

Tart-tongued Myra Wolfgang of Detroit, one of three employee representatives on the Wage Deviation Board and one who would like to plug the loopholes in the law, has an answer.

"Presumably, they could find a labor department inspector with two weak kidneys and the urge, and point him toward the privy. If he makes it, the privy is contiguous," she said.

The fact is that the Labor Department has only 12 claims adjusters to cover the entire state and none has time to measure the adjacency of outhouses to migrants' cabins.

Like other agencies enforcing the laws touching migrants, the Labor Department is underfunded and undermanned.

The Legislature has been just as reluctant to loosen the state Treasury's purse strings as it has been to adopt meaningful migrant labor legislation.

Another agency short on manpower and funds is the labor camp unit of the Department of Public Health, charged with sniffing out violations in the farmers' work camps.

Norman Papsdorf, chief of the unit, is operating on a \$160,700 budget for 1969-70 to cover salaries and expenses for a staff of 16 that includes six full-time and six seasonal sanitarians.

Because the short growing seasons make it difficult for them to check the 2,500 camps, he also can hire local health authorities to make inspections at \$15 each. Last year, when he issued 2,443 camp licenses, local inspectors checked 1,003 camps.

Said one legislator: "So out in the hinterlands, where everybody is kissin' cousins, the inspector can let the farmer off with a scolding if the outhouse is full and the place is crawling with flies."

But the Labor Department has no such auxiliary force.

"We have to act on a complaint basis," said a department aide. "We don't have the manpower for spot checks on the minimum wage or piecework payments."

In the last fiscal year, the 12 men made 30 investigations of claims by farm help.

None of the 12 speak Spanish, the language of many Mexican-American migrants. None of the department's literature is printed in Spanish. "Imagine the average campesino trying to read the minimum-wage law in English," said one inspector.

Because of the porous wage floor law and poor enforcement that inevitably is the re-

sult of low appropriations, the grower, as one wage board member said, "can pay the worker what he damned well pleases."

What usually happens is that the migrant gets a handful of bills and is told, "Here's your pay."

Almost universally, employers fail to give migrants itemized statements of wages and deductions.

Some illegally deduct a sum for "insurance" to cover workmen's compensation premiums. Almost without exception, they fail to post copies of the minimum-wage act as the law requires.

But the shorthanded Labor Department can do little about it.

"Why have the minimum wage law at all if there is not enough money to enforce it? If a grower ignores the law, he has a competitive advantage for being a non-conformist," said Dr. Daniel Sturt, head of the Rural Manpower Center.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press,
Aug. 18, 1969]

SENATOR ZOLLAR KILLS BILLS AIDING MIGRANTS; HE'S A GROWER

(By Ralph Orr)

The huts in the migrant labor camp on I-94 east of Benton Harbor are 8-by-12-foot sheet-metal structures with peeling green paint and no insulation.

Heat waves shimmer over them in the summer sun. The garbage overflows the uncovered trash cans.

The camp is better than some, worse than others. It is owned by State Sen. Charles Zollar, R-Benton Harbor.

Zollar is not a big Berrien County land holder. County records show he owns 70- and 168-acre tracts. But his district—Berrien, Cass and part of St. Joseph counties—has farmers who hire large numbers of migrant laborers.

Berrien County alone has 343 labor camps with a capacity of 10,133 people, more than any other county in the state.

Charley Zollar is the chief Lansing spokesman for the farmers who own those camps, and for migrant employers elsewhere.

As chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, he can torpedo legislation that would be costly to them as growers and taxpayers. And he has.

His committee was the graveyard this year of three migrant measures. They died when Appropriations failed to report them out.

Senate Bill 907 called for an \$80,000 appropriation to establish two overnight rest camps for migrants in southwestern Michigan.

S-908 asked for state payment of non-residents' hospital expenses, under Title 19 of the Medicaid Act, if their home states refuse to reimburse Michigan counties.

S-909 would have waived residency requirements and required the state to reimburse counties for all welfare benefits paid migrant workers.

Zollar comes on strong when the Legislature considers welfare aid to non-residents, even though migrants sometimes are forced to get food stamps and often do not have the money to get back to Texas after the Michigan harvest is over.

When the U.S. Supreme Court last April struck down the one-year residency requirements for welfare benefits, Zollar trumpeted that it would bankrupt Michigan.

"It is a tragedy, indeed, that the federal government continues to shove things like this down the throats of taxpayers when they are trying to get out from under their oppressive burdens," he said.

(Zollar unabashedly added to their "oppressive burdens" in 1967, however, when he used his company plane to carry himself and other senators on six round trips to Mackinac Island for which he handed the state a \$1,998 tab for mileage. One round trip coincided with a Republican rally.)

Affable in the Claghorn tradition, with a shock of white hair, partial to black string neckties, Zollar is not disliked even by liberal colleagues.

"He is a solid conservative, but not a nasty one," said Sen. Sander Levin, D-Berkeley, Senate minority leader.

"He is a fiscal conservative still trying to adjust to changing times," said Sen. Coleman Young, D-Detroit.

But they all agree that when there is farm legislation in the hopper, Charley Zollar tends the store.

He turned up at an Administrative Rules Committee hearing last March 4 when new, stricter labor camp regulations were being discussed.

He objected to one requiring separate, annual licensing of each labor camp, and to the procedures to be followed if a new camp operator takes over.

"Too vague," he said of a rule requiring a "first-aid facility" in each camp. (Travel-type first-aid kits will be acceptable.)

He questioned the requirement that refrigerators be provided to migrants. (The labor camp unit of the Department of Health conceded that "central refrigeration" would be acceptable.)

He fought workmen's compensation for farm workers and was successful in helping amend this legislation after it was passed. The amendment he supported weakened the law.

But he struck out on Senate Bill 17, which he introduced in 1967 along with 23 other senators.

It would have removed a section giving migrant workers medical and hospital coverage if injured on the job, and would have inserted a section giving them medical and burial benefits.

Said a Democratic senator: "What they were saying was, 'Amigo, we won't pay your hospital bill if you are run over by a tractor, but we'll pay your burial costs if you die.'"

Zollar, who grows strawberries and nursery stock, led the forces that amended the state minimum-wage law to provide for piecework rates for picking fruits and vegetables.

"Charley and his farmer constituents wanted the migrant paid for what he picked, not for the time he spent in the fields," said a colleague.

"He made his point. He is a very articulate exponent of the piecework theory, and keeps insisting that the plight of the migrant is overemphasized," said Sen. George S. Fitzgerald, D-Detroit.

Zollar isn't anti-everything.

In 1967, he defended the expenditure of \$3,000 to \$5,000 to renovate and refurnish a lounge for state senators.

Measuring 12 by 25 feet, it is bigger than the cabins he provides his migrants.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press,
Aug. 19, 1969]

FLEDGLING MIGRANT UNION IS SEARCHING FOR ITS ALLIES

(By Ralph Orr)

A two-story brick building surrounded by soybean fields on U.S.-25 just south of Erie (in Monroe County just north of the Ohio line) is the Michigan headquarters of the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC).

The building once housed a restaurant named El Patio, a name that struck a chord with the handful of Mexican-Americans directing the fledgling union's efforts to organize migrant workers.

The office furniture is Early Hand-Me-Down, scarred and wobbly. There is a telephone with two extensions, but no typewriter, because there is no money for such a luxury.

On one wall is a blown-up photo of Cesar Chavez, the contemporary Spartacus who has

led the California table grape boycott and the fight to unionize vineyard workers.

Although there is little money, there is hope, and Chavez sparks it from far-off California.

Julian Herrera, named by Chavez to direct migrant organizing in Michigan, speaks of his appointment as though it were a papal commission. Herrera's assistant, Juan Melendez, speaks of their visit with Chavez a year ago as though it had been a papal audience.

"We are nothing but free slaves, like Cesar says, but, it will not always be this way," Herrera said.

And Melendez added: "the people will do it."

The two best hopes for the campesinos are government and organized labor.

Government has failed them. The Michigan Legislature's efforts, in the last analysis, have been half-hearted. It has been guilty of backing and filling, never facing up to the problem, and many of its members admit it.

Nationally, the federal government has failed in the most vital area by consistently refusing to give farm laborers the protection of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

A simple amendment would require farm employers to bargain collectively with elected worker representatives, a right the NLRA gives to nearly every other American worker.

AFL-CIO leaders have called "unacceptable" the Nixon administration's alternate proposal.

It would create a special board to deal with farm labor and provide for a cooling-off period to delay strikes at harvest time.

"This would leave the workers powerless," a union spokesman said.

It is clear that leadership in this area must come from Congress.

Two bills were introduced in the Michigan Legislature this year to bring farm workers under the Michigan Labor Mediation Act, a carbon copy of the NLRA. Both languished in committee.

Barry Brown, director of the state Department of Labor, while acknowledging that the migrant problem is serious, said a Michigan statute to require collective bargaining would "create a competitive problem between states and work to the disadvantage of Michigan growers."

Legislators share that fear. They argue that higher labor costs for harvesting a bushel of Michigan apples, for example, would give Washington apple growers more of the market.

While the debate drags on, the migrants—living on starches and rummaging through the stacks of used clothing given by church groups and made available at El Patio—are still in what their leaders call peonage.

They are turning to the UFWOC, but not pell-mell, because many are afraid. But inexorably, the roster is growing.

"I am convinced that it is only a matter of time before these workers are organized," said State Sen. Roger Craig, D-Dearborn, after attending a UFWOC rally near Keeler.

Craig saw the fear, however. Heavy rains in June and July kept migrants out of the fields for days at a time. Many had to seek welfare or federal aid.

They are worrying about earning money to get back to the South, not about next year, and don't want to alienate the growers with union talk.

They are leery of job displacement through mechanization, too, a fear cultivated by growers and some state agencies.

There is vague talk of a strike in the Monroe County tomato fields when the harvest peaks there, and an accompanying one-day sympathy "camp-in" by migrants throughout the state.

But many wonder if the UFWOC is strong enough and its communications good enough.

A boost from the AFL-CIO would help, but Herrera has not seen the color of the union's

money, nor have any AFL-CIO or United Auto Workers Union officials been seen around El Patio.

The UFWOC's chief benefactor has been the Detroit Catholic Archdiocese, which has given more than \$5,000 for rent, organizers' gasoline and other expenses.

None of the money went for salaries. Herara, who works full-time in a Monroe stoker plant, takes occasional leaves to work for the UFWOC but receives no salary.

Melendez, on leave from a refinery job, has been more active, but lives out of his car when he is in the field and sometimes has no meal money.

He feels that both the AFL-CIO and the UAW are awaiting outcome of Chavez's talks with growers in California, where both organizations have made heavy financial commitments, before offering help elsewhere.

Melendez, who was once stopped on a country road by four angry farmers and was later threatened by a hammer-wielding pickle grower, believes 1970 will be the year.

"We are not going to wait for these labor relations acts," he said. "We want union recognition and a contract. If they refuse to bargain, we'll keep our people out of the fields."

He talks about a grand plan to organize the migrants in Texas this winter, so that they will be union-oriented, card-carrying members when they trek northward next spring.

"We'll be organized when we come back," he said. "We will be heard stronger and louder," he said.

"No longer can we come north depending on the generosity of the company or the rancher."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 19, 1969]

SENATOR TRIES MIGRANT LIFE

(By Mary Ann Weston)

State Sen. Roger Craig, D-Deerborn, spent three hot, punishing days laboring in the fields near Keeler, in Southwest Van Buren County, sharing the life of a migrant farm worker.

Craig, a member of the Senate Labor Committee and a candidate for governor, went unrecognized among the migrants. He tape-recorded a diary of his experiences.

"I have been hospitalized for feeling better," he said at the end of the first day's work.

Disguised in an Emiliano Zapata mustache, old shirt and overalls, Craig lived in a migrant camp owned by Ferris Pierson of Dowagiac, a grower who is a member of the governor's Commission on Agricultural Labor. Pierson did not know who he was.

Craig's shack was "a 10-by-12 foot unit with corrugated steel on the outside and lateral sheets of dry wall on the inside held together by bare two-by-fours."

The only furnishings were a two-burner stove and a bare mattress on the floor. Craig had to borrow a light bulb for the single socket.

The windows, he said, were "only framed holes with screens over them." There were holes in the screens.

The other shacks, he said, "are incredibly small and almost completely unfurnished, except for wall-to-wall migrants—men, women and children."

Many migrant camps have no showers. Craig's did. "(They) are right across from . . . indoor toilet stools over an outdoor privy site. The stench is unbearable . . . I can't imagine anyone showering there and coming out feeling clean," he said.

He said he saw no government inspection certificates in any of the cabins or lavatories.

"I have held many jobs in my lifetime, in-

cluding ditch digging and jack hammer operations on construction," Craig said. "But no job I have ever held is as physically taxing as the 'stoop labor' involved in picking pickles."

He worked with a crew of about 50, mostly Mexican-Americans. The youngest was 9, the oldest in his 60s.

"The midsummer sun beats down on us as we gather the cucumber vines together, turn them over, first one way and then the other, for removing the pickles" he said.

"Vines from neighboring plants in other rows have to be separated . . . The vines are coarse and rough . . . some pickers use gloves. Most apparently prefer not to."

In the hot fields, the workers' only water came from a communal cup—a tin can. "It may be unsanitary, but under the blazing sun cool water is extremely refreshing," Craig said.

Toilet facilities were equally primitive, he reported. "Occasionally one of the migrants, man or woman, would walk into the apple orchard adjacent to the pickle fields and seek relief . . . One little boy today, rather than waste the time walking all the way to the woods (a good quarter mile), just turned his back on the majority of the crew and urinated in the field."

Craig and Ruben Alfaro, Midwest regional director of the Bishop's Committee for the Spanish Speaking, who worked with him, were promised \$1 for each bushel of pickles. But 10 cents of each dollar was held back to be paid at the end of the season.

Alfaro explained the system this way: "The extra dime you are supposed to get automatically . . . is withheld (and) called a bonus. Of course you work for it. You do everything you are supposed to do for it but if you leave early . . . the grower or the contractor steals a dime out of every dollar you are supposed to make."

According to Craig's accounting, he earned \$27.25. But he got only \$26.70. He figured he averaged \$1.08 an hour the first day, 90 cents an hour the second day and "a fantastic" \$1.55 an hour the third day. (Craig and Alfaro turned their earnings over to the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.)

Craig was not asked his Social Security number and did not get a statement of his earnings and deductions.

He made less than the state minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour.

The minimum-wage law says a worker "of average ability and diligence" should get a piecework rate not less than the minimum hourly wage.

There's no protection for workers of less than average ability like Craig, or like the little girl who worked an hour and a half for 50 cents.

Children commonly worked alongside their parents.

One day after work, Craig noticed "dirty, tired little migrant children . . . returning to their shacks, while right next door at the luxurious ranch-style home of the grower, his children in complete baseball uniforms are playing catch, apparently getting ready for a game."

A migrant explained to Craig the economic advantage of a working family.

"He went to great lengths to explain to me that the man should never leave his family behind because they will cease to regard him as the father and will not turn their earnings over to him."

"He pointed out, the additional amounts of money I would have been able to make . . . if my family were there."

One day, a 9-year-old boy was overheard describing the astronauts to his father as real "hombres." The father said they should try picking pickles. Then, he said, they'd find out if they were real men or not.

The boy later told Craig that when he

grew up, he wanted to own his own truck "so he won't have to do any work."

The grueling work left Craig "sore in places I didn't even know I had muscles." But there was a psychological hurt, too.

"There is in this process," he said, "a dehumanization . . . Not until the end of the full day of picking . . . was I ever asked for my name."

Then, "in order to get credit for the 19 half-bushels I picked, the trucker was required to ask. No other information has been asked or given."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 20, 1969]

FIND NEW PROBLEMS IN CITIES: MANY MIGRANTS DROP OUT

(By Ed Icenogle)

Jose Gutierrez followed the chain of crops in Michigan for years, living in shacks and working for 50 cents an hour rather than sitting idle and hungry in the Rio Grande Valley.

Gutierrez always chose work over welfare. So did his wife and their four children. The children, who every year left school early and returned late so that they could finish the harvest, have worked since they were old enough to drag a lug of pickles across the dusty fields to the collection trucks.

The crops were a chain, linked by their times of maturation and location. Jose followed a generation-old pattern, migrating from thinning sugar beets, to hoeing cucumbers, to picking cherries, pickles, tomatoes and finally apples.

But this year the chain was broken. Cherry harvesting, mechanized by a \$20,000 giant which shakes the cherries from the trees, needed only a fraction of the migrant labor it once did.

So Gutierrez had a three-week lapse between hoeing and picking pickles.

Those three weeks, he found, were the difference between getting by and going hungry.

The migrant stream, glutted with a surplus of workers swept Gutierrez into a stagnant pond of poverty.

Jose Gutierrez is not one person. He is thousands of migrants, undereducated, underemployed and unfamiliar with anything but the cruel chain of crops.

Of the 50,000 migrant workers who leave Texas every summer to follow that chain through Michigan, hundreds of families like the Gutierrezes are leaving their southern homes permanently behind.

An estimated 1,000 families, mostly Mexican-Americans from the Rio Grande Valley, but also a few Appalachian whites and Deep South blacks, are "settling out" of the migrant stream every year.

Rather than returning to the jobless winters with meager wages scrimped from the Michigan growing season, these settlers stay, hopeful of filling labor shortages in Detroit and other urban areas.

With fewer crops to work, many have no choice but to drop out of the migrant stream.

"There is a chain of crops, and movement from one crop to another, and one state to another," explained Grafton Trout, Michigan State professor of sociology, who is completing a three-year research study involving the transition of Mexican-Americans from migratory farm life to urban settlement.

"If any piece of this chain is broken, then the whole chain falls apart," Trout said.

Trout's research included 700 migrant families who settled outside of Detroit—mainly in Saginaw, Flint, Lansing, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo and Adrian.

Of the migrant stream dropouts, Trout said, half locate in Detroit. Here they join a Latin-American community of 65,000.

The rest typically settle in rural areas where they have worked the crops, later mov-

ing to larger cities with better work and housing and a people of similar culture.

For most it is a big step to leave behind family and cultural ties in southern Texas. Their adjustment is slow and sometimes unsuccessful. Many have never lived in urban areas before.

The adjustment problems of the families, whether in Detroit or the outstate area are similar, state social service agencies indicate.

The primary area demanding adjustment is employment.

"How can you expect the nomadic migrant to function in industry?" asked Gerry McCants, housing relocation specialist for United Migrants for Opportunity Inc. (UMOI). "What does he know of relations with foremen, about deduction and Blue Cross-Blue Shield?"

"There are other aspects . . . like, why should he go to work every day? In the fields, if he doesn't want to work, he just doesn't work. He doesn't understand why (in industry) he has to call in."

McCants, a 27-year-old doctoral student at Michigan State, is from Detroit. He was born and raised in the Inner City, but was "appalled" by the migrant camps when he first saw them. Now he is working in relocating migrant families with UMOL, a federally-funded program.

Even in Detroit it is difficult to find jobs for many of the settling-out migrants.

"First of all, we try to identify where to place an individual with no command of English," said Gustavo Gaynett, coordinator of Latin Americans for Economic Development, a community service agency opened this year by the Detroit Archdiocese.

"We usually manage to get some employment for him," Gaynett said, "but not the kind that lends itself to economic mobility."

Problems besides adjusting to the eight-to-five factory life face the Mexican-American father. According to McCants, most men need tutoring in money budgeting, savings, credit and basic skills.

The second major adjustment for settling migrants is housing. Since most Mexican-American families have at least three or four children, and often twice that many, suitable housing is limited.

"When you go to rent, the first thing they ask is 'How many kids you got?'," said Mrs. Mamie Gonzales, a Berrien Springs housewife. Her husband Arthur settled his family there in 1967, the last year the family worked in the fields. Now he has a job as a mechanic in a local garage.

"But what can you do when they ask that," she said. "God give them to us and we can't give them back."

McCants said many of the smaller urban areas have acute housing shortages, and although work is plentiful, there are few adequate places to live. Gaynett agrees: homes for the large families are difficult to find in Detroit, too.

In addition to work and housing, the Mexican-American family has a host of other adjustments to make. The wife, for instance, must learn meal planning, shopping, and community relations, McCants pointed out.

"Like, how is she even supposed to know what cleaning compounds to use on toilets, if she has used outdoor toilets all her life?" he said. "The things which make a home a home in the American dream are all new."

Youth, too, have adjustments to make. Schools are especially rigorous for Mexican-American students, since they are learning in a foreign environment, he said.

"If the parents dropped out of school at the eighth grade, how can they give support to the kids?" McCants said.

McCants urged bi-lingual school counselors, small groups, and enlarged Head Start programs for the children.

"What we need is a complete family uplift from poverty," he said. "A whole program, not a piecemeal attack."

In the face of those problems of poverty, one expert believes the settlers generally are having qualified success.

"In terms of occupational mobility and income, I would say that compared to the circumstances they left in Texas, they (Mexican-Americans) are extremely successful," Trout said. "That doesn't mean they are far above the poverty level, just that they're doing better than in Texas."

But, regardless of their success in social adjustment, the former migrants have become an increasing and lasting segment of Michigan's population.

"They are a permanent addition to Michigan," Trout said. "There is nothing to go back to in Texas."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 20, 1969]

AS WE SEE IT: SHAME OF MIGRANT LABOR IS TOO HORRIBLE TO IGNORE

No man of conscience could fail to be moved by the incredible tales of neglect and abuse in Michigan's treatment of migrant farm laborers. It is too abhorrent and full of shame for a progressive state such as Michigan to condone.

And yet the most distressing fact about the revelations in the Free Press series on migrant labor is that we have heard it all before. This newspaper has told this same grimy story before. Churchmen have protested before. Reformers have sought action before.

The conscience is stirred, the society is shamed—and the latest governor's study commission studies on.

Then the same dreary excuses come again. The same vested interests work their will in the Legislature. The same silent conspiracy in rural Michigan undercuts the state's efforts to enforce the law. And agriculture, here and elsewhere, goes on enjoying the special dispensation from society that permits such scandalous mistreatment of people to continue.

Does it have to be that way? Will the abuse of farm workers go on until mechanization reaches the last orchard and sheer economics does what consciences refuse to do?

Surely the sovereign state of Michigan can do better.

Gov. Milliken can do more than study the problem to death.

The Legislature can break out of the grip of the likes of Sen. Charles Zollar, himself a one-man vested interest, and go see for itself, as our reporters did and as Sen. Roger Craig did, just what society is condoning.

The Michigan delegation in Congress can be the equalizer, helping to rouse the conscience of the nation to extend effectively the laws protecting workers—minimum wage, work condition regulations, Social Security coverage, the right to bargain collectively—to farm workers. Farmers have had special problems that make them difficult to blanket in under federal protection, but machinery is changing all that.

The bureaucracies, federal and state, can be given the power they need to assure that every grower who claims the right to employ people must provide them with certain minimum standards essential for human dignity. The farmer has always argued that his special problems and special needs make it impractical, but we feel confident he will find a way if the governments stop temporizing.

All this is not to say that the Legislature or the Congress can make grower and migrant march hand in hand into some bright, shiny new era. The result of reform may well be further mechanization of farm work and the elimination of farm jobs. If so, so be it.

Society then has a responsibility to see that these pitiful workers—like other misused persons who have been washed up on urban shores by the great population tides—

have an opportunity to build a decent life, to get paid an honest wage for honest toil. Mere regulation of what they now do will not assure them a decent life and deliverance from hard labor.

That, however, is no excuse for the conditions we have permitted in the orchards and vegetable fields. We cannot, any longer, evade one problem by invoking another. The world is not nice and neat, and we must deal with it as we find it.

In the field of migrant labor, in Michigan, we find it so horrible that action can no longer be postponed.

MANDATORY OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1969, I took the floor to present my views on the inequities of the mandatory oil import control program and to announce my intention to introduce legislation providing for its gradual elimination over a 10-year period.

Later, on May 1, 1969, I introduced H.R. 10799, which, I am proud to say, was cosponsored by 53 of my colleagues.

Since then, there have been a number of developments which provide further support for the growing demand to eliminate the quota system.

The most important development is that Assistant Attorney General Richard W. McLaren, Chief of the Antitrust Division at the Department of Justice, has recommended that the entire quota system be abolished. The recommendation was made to the Cabinet Task Force on oil import controls.

I consider the McLaren statement the first encouraging sign that the executive branch may finally be moving toward the position many of us have been urging it to take for years.

Mr. McLaren stated that the present system "imposes serious costs on the economy"—costs which "would not appear to be necessary for the attainment of any reasonable national security goal."

The so-called national security argument is the sole justification offered for the import control program. The theory is that import control is the only way to reduce dependence on foreign imports and assure sufficient supplies for emergency need.

On March 16, 1959, less than a week after the import program was created by Presidential proclamation, I was one of the first Members in either House to take the floor to condemn that action. I said then that no convincing case had been made for the "national security" need, and that the American people were entitled to "something more than a general conclusion hidden under the pious hoopskirt of national security."

Mr. Speaker, I take no pride in having predicted then that the spiraling costs of protected oil would put a great burden on the consumer and our economy in general. It took no brilliant economic analysis to predict the price increases.

And the grim figure now available—that the cost over 10 years has approached \$50 billion—is not one for any of us to point to with pride.

As I pointed out in my April 1 speech, there is solid evidence that American resources alone are fully adequate to meet expanded needs in a time of crisis.

First, our domestic oil supplies are more than ample, with approximately 300 billion barrels located underground, good possibilities of future discoveries, and virtually unlimited potential from shale oil.

Second, it has been shown that domestic oil prices are grossly inflated and that substantial reductions could be made without endangering the health of the industry.

Third, the overall efficiency of the domestic oil industry would be substantially improved by the impact of free and open competition with foreign oil imports.

Mr. McLaren agreed with this, when he said that what is needed to meet such emergencies is "an industry conditioned by competition to react quickly to market changes."

Even if we accept that some government action is required to guarantee petroleum sources in a time of crisis, the plain fact is that the quota system has not worked. As the McLaren statement noted, after more than 8 years of the import control program, our available oil capacity "barely sufficed to cover our expanded demands" during the 6-day war in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues' information, I include at the close of my remarks the summary of Mr. McLaren's submission to the task force. Another recent development has provided additional evidence that, despite dire predictions from industry spokesmen, our domestic oil industry can be expected to compete effectively with foreign oil, once quotas are removed.

A staff study, recently prepared for the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls, has concluded that "at current world prices," Alaskan north slope crude oil "could be sold competitively at any point in the continental United States, even if all U.S. oil import quotas were removed."

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this prediction does not take into account the even greater savings that can be expected if a passable route for giant tankers can be found through the "Northwest Passage." Many of us, of course, are anxious for the success of the current voyage of the *SS Manhattan* to establish such a route.

The task force study concludes that, if the Northwest Passage is economically feasible, "north slope crude oil could be sold competitively" in northern Europe as well as Japan.

I want to remind my colleagues at this point that my bill, H.R. 10799, takes fully into account the need for a transition by providing for a gradual phasing out over a 10-year period.

While the national security argument has been further discredited, and new evidence of the oil industry's ability to prosper without quotas has been presented, there have also been new indications that the costs of the current program, both to the consumer and to the

general economy, are even greater than many of us imagined.

In recent testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, it was stated that the annual cost may now reach \$7.2 billion a year, and that abolition of quotas could reduce gasoline prices by 5 cents a gallon and home heating oil prices by nearly 4 cents a gallon.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to again commend the outstanding service being performed by the Senate subcommittee in its hearings on Government intervention in the petroleum industry. For the information of my colleagues, I also include at the close of my remarks an excellent account of this committee's latest hearings in the New Republic of August 30, 1969.

Just as serious as the cost factor in my own New England region is the ever-present threat of shortages in home heating oil that has prevailed over the past 10 years. The specter of a new and serious shortage has been raised again in recent alarming testimony before the Hart subcommittee. Mr. Arthur T. Soule, president of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, stated:

We foresee in the coming winter a serious supply gap and shortages that may approach the crisis condition of 1967-68, when, despite claims to the contrary, there were physical shortages of oil at the cargo and wholesale levels in the Northeast during intervals over a two-month period.

Surely, no one here needs to be reminded that, for New England with its harsh winter climate, this is not a matter of mere comfort or convenience; it can be a matter of survival.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this new evidence of support for the abolition of our mandatory oil import control program will lead all of us to redouble our efforts to that end. I have today renewed my request that the Ways and Means Committee begin hearings on my bill promptly.

This body should not allow itself to be deluded into supporting a program whose only defense is the mere fact that it exists. It has been with us more than a decade now and time has only lent it an artificial stature. Age has not improved it. Unlike the bouquet of fine old wine, this program offers us only the stench of failure.

The referred to material follows:

VIEWS OF THE ANTITRUST DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ON THE MANDATORY OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

This Division is concerned with fostering competition in our economy. Since restraints on the operation of supply and demand, whether State-imposed on domestic production or Federally-imposed on imports, impair the competitive process, substantial justification for such restraints should be demonstrated. Accordingly, any program to assure petroleum supplies for national security needs should be carefully devised to minimize interference with the forces of competition. Any such program requires, initially, a clear determination of our national security requirements for oil. In this connection, the concept of national security requirements for oil may be variable. It is critical to provide oil in sufficient quantities to defend against aggression. It is desirable to insure continuing levels of domestic supply in the event imports are reduced because of war between

foreign powers. However, in weighing the costs and benefits of various alternative plans as to oil imports in the light of the critical nature of the various national security needs, equal consideration must be given to the need for a strong and competitive industrial structure to provide the economy with adequate energy supplies efficiently and at low cost, both in normal and emergency periods.

The present import control system imposes serious costs on the economy. There are the obvious direct costs to consumers of oil which arise from shielding the domestic industry from the impact of, and the consumer from the benefit of, much lower foreign crude prices. Part of these costs, moreover, stem largely from the sacrifice of competitive pressures, which in turn could stimulate cost efficiencies in domestic production and greater competitive vigor in our crude and product markets. These costs would not appear to be necessary to the attainment of any reasonable national security goal. Because of our pervasive need for oil, there is an additional impact arising from misallocations at every step in the economy stemming from the cost of oil and oil products.

The benefits of the import control program seem less clear. Its stated purpose is to prevent disruption of our domestic industry by protecting it from foreign oil and thus to preserve in being a healthy domestic industry to assure sufficient supplies for emergency need. As a result of such protection, and the benefit received by refiners from the cost advantage of such imports as are permitted to enter, the industry is supposed to be stimulated to develop such reserve productive capacity as may be needed for a national emergency.

The benefits achieved by this means in practice, however, do not seem to warrant the costs involved. In the two Middle East emergencies of 1956 and 1967 it was found that physical facilities developed and available (although apparently adequate on paper) were inadequate to deliver fully for our use the reserve productive capacity which had been built up. In 1967, after some eight years of mandatory import restrictions, the excess productive capacity available, given the production and transportation facilities then in existence, barely sufficed to cover our expanded demand during a comparatively short emergency period.

We believe that sufficient domestic oil reserves for use in an emergency can be most adequately assured by a two-fold approach: first, an industry conditioned by competition to react quickly to market changes; and second, a Government program specifically designed to assure the existence of sufficient reserves and physical facilities with which the industry can expand production quickly. A competitive industry would be able to convert efficiently from foreign sources of oil to domestic sources. The Government program would support the competitive industry by assuring continuing exploration and the availability for expansion of reserves and physical facilities, while avoiding the anti-competitive consequences of the present import quotas and state market demand production limitations. This combination would have significant advantages over the present system.

At present a complex of State and Federal incentives and regulations contributes substantially to cost-inefficiencies in domestic production and inadequate competitiveness in crude oil and product markets. State market demand production limitations, in particular, attempt to achieve equilibrium between demand and available supply, with the effect of keeping control of supply in the hands of existing producers and maintaining the present domestic price structures. The import control program preserves this *status quo*.

Improvement in competitive conditions by change in the present system of controls, or by their elimination, would in our view be

of significant benefit to the nation's interest in low-cost energy supplies, efficiently produced and distributed both in normal and in emergency periods. Imports entering more freely in competition with domestic production would lead domestic prices to decline toward world levels. Some immediate changes in the domestic industry would be entailed, particularly if import restrictions were not phased out carefully, though immediate reduction of our total existing resource base would probably be minor. There could well be some turnover in the composition of the industry at the production level and perhaps to a minor extent in refining. Expansion in the industry, both in terms of exploration and construction of physical facilities except for refineries, probably would lessen in the absence of government incentives. The industry, however, would be tougher, healthier, and more competitive, better able to provide for our needs more efficiently and at lower cost; at the same time, domestic oil reserves, both known and presently unknown, would be conserved.

By contrast, the import control program is merely an indirect mechanism which, especially in light of the experiences of 1956 and 1967, may or may not achieve the stated security goal. Indeed, by limiting imports, it may even be self-defeating by encouraging faster use of our domestic oil.

The import quotas themselves do nothing to preserve this country's domestic oil reserves. The preservation of reserve productive capacity is maintained, if at all, by state regulatory action which is made possible by the existence of the import restrictions. The state regulations are aimed at objectives, such as conservation, which differ in some respects from the general national interest in maintenance of adequate security reserves of oil. It would appear more desirable to insure the existence of adequate reserves by methods under the direct control of the National Government. Whatever method of Federal control is used, whether subsidy or some other means revealing the cost of the oil security program, the program could be set apart from normal industry operations and designed to interfere with normal competitive activity to the least possible extent.

We believe strongly that the two-fold approach described above is the most desirable alternative. Perhaps the Government program of incentives for exploration and for construction of physical facilities could be financed in part by a low tariff on imported oil. In this case, the domestic price of oil would fall to a level equal to the world price plus the small duty; in addition, such a tariff might provide a modicum of temporary price support for the nonintegrated, independent domestic producers.

If, however, it is determined that some pervasive restraint must be imposed on imports in order to meet our security needs, the device of a protective tariff would be preferable to import quotas, though not without administrative difficulties. If specified ceilings on the amount of foreign oil imported were to be required, then allocation of available imports by auction rather than administrative distribution would give freer play to normal competitive forces. Either of these alternatives, providing for wholly neutral, nondiscriminatory treatment, would lead to less competitive distortion in the domestic industry than the present system.

Finally, if continuation of an import quota system without auction is decided upon, we would suggest several changes to dampen its anticompetitive impact. We would eliminate historical factors, for example, from the computation of individual quotas, and base the quota on the total volume of crude or products used by the participant in the most recent available period. The program would thus be open to both refiners and marketers in terms of their need for particular products. Of great importance would be amendment of the program to permit cash sale of quota oil.

The present system of exchange, by requiring barter and prohibiting sales of imported oil, has no discernible purpose related to national security needs. If, at the very least, open price markets could be established for imported oil, this alone would have a beneficial effect on the competitiveness of the domestic industry.

JOUSTING WITH OIL

(By David Sanford)

Americans pay between five and seven billion dollars a year in excess costs for fuel oil and gasoline because of protectionist oil import quotas that keep cheap foreign oil off the market. The cost of fuel oil is inflated by about four cents per gallon; the cost of gasoline five cents. The car owner who buys 700 gallons of gas a year—which is about average—pays about \$35 in overcharges. Families who heat their homes with oil lose \$59. Senator Philip Hart, whose exhaustive hearings on the oil import quotas have gone unreported by *The New York Times*, ignored by TV, and buried in the rest of the press, wonders why no one is upset by something that costs us more than Nixon's ABM—at least \$50 billion in the last decade.

The Administration itself is of two minds about oil import quotas. The Interior Department, which administers quotas, has released a staff study predictably taking the industry position against eliminating the quota system. In substance it says that doing away with quotas would make domestic oil uncompetitive with foreign oil, would therefore lead to a decline in domestic oil production and an oil emergency if supplies of foreign oil were ever cut off. But the opposite view is taken by Richard W. McLaren, Assistant Attorney General, who recommends that quotas be eliminated. This, says McLaren, would encourage the oil industry to operate efficiently and be "of significant benefit to the nation's interest in low-cost energy supplies." "The present system," McLaren argues, "imposes serious costs to the economy, higher prices to consumers," and is not necessary "to the attainment of any national security goal."

Everybody knows about the oil depletion allowance which makes the oilmen richer than they ought to be. The import quota program is another monumental boon to the oil industry, but it has had less attention.

The oil-import control program was imposed by Eisenhower in 1959, ostensibly to protect the national security. Imports were to be limited to just over 12 percent of domestic production in order to assure that there would always be enough US oil production to satisfy the country's need in the unlikely event that foreign oil were suddenly cut off. Under the program as enunciated by the President, the Interior Department was given the authority to assign quotas to specific businesses, primarily those with refineries in operation before 1959. Interior can take away a quota assignment and put companies dependent on foreign oil out of business. It can grant temporary emergency quotas when oil is short and issue quotas to firms operating in so-called "free port" subzones where oil may be imported. Because refineries most often are located near the sources of oil, import quotas are assigned most generously to companies in oil-producing states. Elsewhere, where refineries are few and far between as they are in New England, the Southeast and Great Lakes regions, quotas are niggardly or nonexistent. The system is irrational but it accomplishes its real objective—protecting the major oil companies from competitive intrusions by foreign oil.

The operation of the quota system is best understood in terms of the effects it has on its victims. Senator Hart's latest round of hearings focused on the plight of Hawaii, New England, and the petrochemical industry, which are extreme but not atypical examples of distress.

Hawaii, for example, is in the grip of the

import quota system and the Standard Oil Company of California. Hawaii depends for energy exclusively on oil, which is not produced in the state, but must be imported. Standard Oil owns and operates Hawaii's only refinery. Seven oil companies, including Standard, sell gas and oil retail in Hawaii. All of them buy gasoline from Standard's Honolulu refinery, selling it themselves under their own brands. In fact, the companies are directly connected to the Standard refinery by pipeline. (Standard's "competitors"—principally Texaco, Shell, Union and Phillips—reciprocate in other parts of the world where they have oil and Standard doesn't.)

Standard's Hawaiian refinery gets all of its crude oil under assigned quotas from foreign sources, namely, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Indonesia, where Standard produces crude oil in operations that Standard owns in common with several other major oil companies. Oil extracted from the Persian Gulf area and Indonesia is the cheapest in the world. The true cost of crude oil refined in Honolulu is about two-thirds that of domestic crude oil refined in California, despite the high costs of transporting it from its source. But consumers in Hawaii pay about three-and-a-half cents more per gallon for gasoline than their counterparts in Los Angeles.

Standard imports oil to Hawaii under its assigned quotas and produces almost exactly as much gasoline as is sold in the state. It could meet all of Hawaii's needs for gasoline, and at reasonable prices. But there is no competition and Standard manipulates upward the price of gas. Between 20 and 37 percent of the gas refined in Honolulu is shipped to the West Coast—2,400 miles away—at the same time that one of Standard's major Hawaiian "competitors" brings in a portion of its gas from the West Coast.

Despite the fact that Hawaii's gas and oil comes from foreign sources, it is priced as if it all comes from California. Retail dealers in Honolulu are charged the list or "posted" price Standard sets in California (17.4 cents a gallon) plus a penny per gallon for transporting it across the Pacific. California dealers themselves pay considerably less than the posted price. Thus, to use 1967 as an example, Standard's price in Honolulu was 24 percent higher than its average price in Los Angeles. Honolulu dealers paid 3.5 cents more per gallon. Standard might claim that the pricing has something to do with shipping costs, but it clearly does not. Standard sends all of the oil from its Hawaiian refinery that is not sold in Hawaii to Seattle, where, despite transport costs, it is sold at an average of three cents a gallon less than to dealers in Hawaii.

At the retail level, estimates of over charges to customers vary from \$13 to \$23 million a year—\$39 to \$69 for every motor vehicle in Hawaii.

Hawaii is without hydroelectric energy, atomic energy. Oil is required to generate electricity, for transportation, industry. One way for Hawaii to escape the Standard Oil Company juggernaut would be to attract a second refinery to provide true competition. But Hawaii would require a foreign trade subzone designation, accompanied by quotas permitting importation of foreign crude oil.

Imposing quotas on Hawaii is meaningless, as William Summers Johnson, Honolulu's Finance Director, pointed out to the Hart Subcommittee: "The main criticism of the oil import quota system, as it applies to Hawaii, is not that it keeps foreign oil and oil products out of the state. On the contrary, substantially all of the oil products used in the state are from foreign sources anyway. . . . The fault to be found with the oil import quota program in Hawaii is that it only has the effect of imposing arbitrarily high prices for foreign oil. The program has the practical effect of restricting the business of importing foreign oil—and most particularly the products of foreign oil—to a relative few favored companies." It would serve Hawaii's interests, and the country's to abolish the

entire quota system. Consumers, politicians, and businessmen in New England want Occidental Petroleum Corporation to build an oil refinery, at Machiasport, Maine, to process oil imported from Libya and Venezuela and sell a portion of it to New England oil-heating users. It is something the region needs. The right to import oil freely could save \$140 million a year in retail heating-oil purchases. But for New England to get it a much broader consensus is required. The federal government must either grant oil import quotas to Occidental for Machiasport or junk the Mandatory Oil Import Program altogether. The Machiasport matter has been pending at Interior for more than a year.

Eight million of New England's ten million people live in dwellings heated by light fuel oil supplied in the main by 3,800 independent dealers (many of them lately have been bought out by major oil companies). The Presidential order creating oil import quotas has had a drastic effect on the fuel-oil industry, resulting in shortages (in the past two winters oil supplies ran out), competitive advantage to natural gas (for which there are no quotas), and the need for temporary emergency import allocations.

New England, with five percent of the population, uses 21 percent of the country's heating oil—four billion gallons each year. Oil from the Caribbean area imported by Canada without quotas, costs, retail, three cents less than in the U.S. At current use rates each additional penny costs New England \$40 million.

Since 1959 New England's only oil refinery has been closed; no new refineries have been built. Because oil and its derivatives are not readily and economically available, New England has no petrochemical industry, which uses oil as a raw material for synthetic fibers, plastics and other products. The plight of New England is ludicrous if only because Maine is the most convenient port for oil imported from Africa and the Middle East. In fact oil is brought in to Portland, Maine from these sources and piped 230 miles to Montreal where it is sold for three cents less per gallon than domestic oil in Maine. Maine legally cannot touch the oil. Maine must buy oil shipped by tanker from domestic producers on the Gulf Coast.

Hawaii, New England (and the Southeast) say they want to reduce oil and gas prices for the consumer but their fervid interest in the quota system has also at its base the desire to attract new industry—primarily petrochemical companies—which need access to oil.

The petrochemical industry is opposed to oil import quotas for reasons of self interest, and finds itself in the embarrassing position of favoring tariff restrictions on certain chemicals but opposing quotas for crude oil. Kenneth Hannan, the vice chairman of the board of Union Carbide, testified before the Hart subcommittee as the representative of nine companies (Celanese, Dow, DuPont, Kodak, Monsanto, National Distillers, Olin Mathieson, Publicker Industries and Union Carbide). "We believe," he said somewhat sheepishly, "the U.S. petrochemical industry is an unintended victim" of the oil import program, which he went on to say increases the cost of the chemical industry's raw materials and impedes competition with foreign chemical producers who have ready access to cheap foreign oil. Protected by the import quotas in the market for their traditional products, the oil companies have been entering the chemical business, competing with Dow et al. Standard Oil of New Jersey, for instance, has a chemical division a third the size of DuPont.

The chemical industry can get its raw materials from two sources—natural gas or petroleum. The price of natural gas currently is low enough to allow competition with foreign chemical companies. But the industry is growing twice as fast as the production of natural gas, and prices are going up. By 1975, the industry line goes, the chemical

companies will no longer be competitive with foreign firms, unless, that is, they can get cheap foreign oil. The price of domestic crude oil is 60 percent higher than foreign crude. Eliminating restrictions would save the chemical companies an estimated \$240 million a year in 1975. And it would allow the companies to set up plants outside the Gulf Coast area where they now proliferate because of the availability of raw materials. The companies' suggestion that they would build plants in the Great Lakes, New England and the Southeast, the natural sites for such installations, is at least in part a ploy to attract support from politicians in those areas, and thus pit them against the oil producing states of the West and Southwest.

The petrochemical industry is saying in substance that if quotas are lifted it will spread its wealth in the South, Northeast and Great Lakes. If quotas aren't lifted, Dow, for one, will take its napalm and emigrate. The threat is not even subtle. "We could," said Hannan, "turn our back on the domestic situation and move ahead with plans for overseas plants—built with foreign equipment, manned by foreign employees and supplied with foreign oil free of import restrictions—and plan to supply the US market with their output. I don't believe the industry wants to do that. Frankly, I do not believe that would be in the national interest, and it is hard to see why our government would wish to continue a policy that would encourage this result."

The performance of the petrochemical companies at the Hart hearings was amusing to watch, if only because they are the natural allies of the oil industry and themselves support protectionist policies favorable to their industry. David J. Steinberg, secretary and chief economist of a group called Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., told Senator Hart he thought it "somewhat disconcerting to find that many of these same chemical companies, opposing government interference in the oil market, favor government interference in the chemical market. They have fought tooth and nail to keep the 'American selling price' method of valuation on benzenoid chemicals. It is an extraordinary import restriction which Congress has by legislation accorded to no other industry."

It is highly unusual for corporate giants to take one another on in public before committees of Congress. The oil industry and the chemical companies normally would work out their differences in private on some golf course somewhere. For DuPont to criticize Standard Oil is as unthinkable as for General Motors to bitch openly about the prices of US Steel. But recently both have. In the case of the chemical companies it has finally dawned upon them that the oil industry has uniquely used the government. While other industries hoped government would simply stop bothering them, oil lobbied for itself a gold mine in oil depletion allowances and oil import quotas.

The petrochemical industry, faced with declining profits and bleak projections of future business, decided after a great deal of handwringing (especially at DuPont) to joust with Oil, joining the fight with Hawaii, New England and others who oppose quotas. It is a good fight since an indirect and possibly unintended result of a victory would be a reduction in the prices all of us pay for gas and oil. Consumers thus in this case may benefit from the squaring off of two ugly giants.

Senator Hart, so far, has heard 60 witnesses—economists with abstruse testimony the gist of which is that the import quota system is arbitrary, unfair, and should be abandoned in favor of free market competition; oil company executives, much of whose testimony Dr. John Blair, chief economist of Hart's subcommittee characterizes as "seemingly addressed not to the subcommittee but to the internal officials of their own corpo-

rations, inoffensive, conveying no knowledge"; and the statements of businesses and state and local governments of areas that lose out to protectionist import policy.

The issues as discussed in committee seem beyond comprehension to most laymen, and perhaps that is one reason most of us don't know and therefore don't care that we are getting the shaft from the oil industry and its captives in the government, whose oil policies serve neither the national security nor the interests of the people.

AIR PIRACY MUST CEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling on the President to take whatever action is necessary, including economic sanctions, to protect civil aircraft of U.S. registry from illegal seizure. My resolution would also urge the President to work through the United Nations in an effort to seek ways and means of ending this irresponsible practice. These efforts should include, but should not be limited to, seeking broad adherence to the Tokyo Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft. Article 11 of this convention provides that a contracting state in which a hijacked aircraft lands "shall permit its passengers and crew to continue their journey as soon as practicable, and shall return the aircraft and its crew to persons lawfully entitled to possession." Unfortunately, it does not include provisions for the apprehension, extradition, when applicable, and punishment of those who seize aircraft in violation of the law.

Last week a TWA aircraft was hijacked and diverted to Damascus, Syria. It was only by the grace of God that the plane did not crash. According to the pilot, if he had been forced to circle the airfield even one more time the aircraft would have consumed all of the fuel. Then upon landing, a bomb which had been used to force the pilot to divert his aircraft, exploded causing extensive damage to the aircraft. Fortunately, no one was seriously injured or killed by the explosion.

To compound the crime, the Syrian Government has refused to release two Israeli passengers and is detaining them illegally. This sort of procedure can only encourage future hijackings.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one incident. There have been many others. Today air travel is like a game of chance. You buy a ticket to Rome or Paris and land in Havana or Damascus or in some other unexpected location.

We must do something to solve this problem. If these hijackings continue, the entire future of international travel could be imperiled. Already the International Federation of Airplane Pilots Association is threatening a 24-hour strike because of the illegal detention of the two Israeli passengers aboard the TWA plane.

Those pilots are responsible for the lives and safety of their passengers. Without worldwide governmental support and effective legal sanctions against

air piracy they cannot protect either the passengers or the aircraft. But in the final analysis, the protection of passengers and crew is the responsibility of the governments of the world. All nations must agree to treat hijackers as criminals and to return them to the country of legal jurisdiction for prosecution. If they are citizens of that country to which the aircraft has been illegally diverted, they should be tried for the crime of piracy and treated accordingly. A report of action taken should then be made to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Under no circumstances should hijackers be encouraged by the illegal detention of either plane or passengers by any country for any reason.

Mr. Speaker, it should be U.S. policy at the United Nations to urge all member states, who are themselves vulnerable to air piracy, to consider early ratification of the Tokyo Convention.

The United States should also propose a new convention, or a protocol to the Tokyo Convention, providing for the apprehension, extradition where applicable, and punishment of air pirates as a vital step toward solution of the problem of air piracy.

We must make some effort to end the illegal seizure of aircraft before a serious international crisis develops because a hijacked aircraft has crashed killing scores of innocent people.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 529

Whereas unlawful seizure of civil aircraft places in jeopardy the lives and safety of the passengers and crew; and

Whereas as long as those guilty of air piracy are permitted to escape unpunished such acts are likely to continue; and

Whereas broad international adherence to the Tokyo Convention on Offenses and Certain other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft would constitute an important first step toward the solution of the aircraft piracy problem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States take whatever action may be necessary, including the imposition of economic sanctions, in order to protect civil aircraft of United States registry from illegal seizure; and

Resolved further, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States instruct the Permanent United States Representative to the United Nations to request a special session of the Security Council to seek ways of bringing air piracy to an end. These efforts should include, but should not be limited to, seeking broad international adherence to the Convention on Offenses and Certain other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, and to the adoption of measures providing for the prompt and legal punishment of those guilty of illegal seizure of aircraft.

REUSS' MILWAUKEE STATE OF THE UNION HEARINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess I held a 3-day series of public hearings in Milwaukee covering the issues that so markedly divide our society today, the problems that separate rich from poor, young from old, black from white, and hawk from dove.

There were six hearings, one each on poverty and the welfare system, housing and relocation, consumer problems, taxes and tax reform, war and peace, and youth and the generation gap.

Testimony was taken both from scheduled witnesses and from any interested citizen who wished to express his views. Portions of each hearing were televised by a local station.

Reaction to these hearings has been most favorable, and I feel they served a valuable public function. Time and again witnesses expressed gratitude at being able to communicate directly with someone in government.

The hearings also provided me with first-hand information on the moods and attitudes of Milwaukee citizens, information that will aid me in my role as a legislator.

I feel that the views expressed in these hearings accurately reflect how many Americans feel about the great issues and challenges that face us as a Nation.

I commend the contents of these hearings to my colleagues. Portions of the hearing record follow:

POVERTY AND THE WELFARE SYSTEM, AUGUST 14 PANEL WITNESSES

Robert Lampman, University of Wisconsin, Poverty Institute

Joseph Baldwin, Milwaukee County Department of Public Welfare

Gary Evans, Social Policy and Action Committee, Southeast Wisconsin Chapter, National Association of Social Workers.

Monroe Swan, Director, Northside Concentrated Employment Program

Donald Sykes, Director, Community Relations, Milwaukee Social Development Commission

Ted Uribe, Chairman, Spanish Welfare Rights Organization

Lona Bielele, Chairman, State Welfare Rights Organization.

Supervisor William O'Donnell, Chairman, Milwaukee County Welfare Board

Mr. LAMPMAN. The question of priority is, I'm sure, very much in people's minds these days. One claim for priority or greater attention is the matter of poverty.

The poverty problem, which was called to our national attention by President Johnson, has been moved somewhat toward resolution in recent years. We have been seeing a smaller number of people in poverty year by year, particularly in recent years, and I would think it terribly important that we continue steps to accelerate that rather good movement toward a smaller number of our population being found below the poverty income line.

At present there are about 11% of the Nation's population found below the line. Another way of thinking of the size of the problem that remains, is that the amount of money in total that separates the poor from the poverty income line is about \$10 billion.

I would emphasize that the welfare system is only one of many ways we have for dealing with the poverty question. We also help people who are poor through other income maintenance. For example, social security and unemployment compensation do give some benefits to the very poor person. We also have, of course, the Veterans Administration and quite a number of other programs that do contribute income in one form or another to very poor persons.

Also, we're concerned with the poor in our educational systems and our health systems.

To return to the welfare system, there has been great agitation and great concern about the national welfare system which includes the federal government's participation, the state governments' participation,

and the local governments' participation. Both the administrators on the one hand, and the funders, as well as the recipients of welfare, have been very critical in recent years concerning what has been a pretty static system over the period since 1935 when the social security act was passed.

The numbers of beneficiaries have been increasing in recent years, and the questions of whether our state and local governments can finance their share of the welfare system have been very primary questions.

I would like to call attention to the effort that President Nixon suggests we make in revising the welfare system on the one hand, and introducing a new system of payments to poor persons in the form of a family assistance system.

My own view is that this is a constructive step, that it deserves very careful consideration, and that it should be viewed for what it is: a great innovation, a great pioneering step into a new kind of income maintenance system for this country.

Mr. BALDWIN. On July 1, 1969, the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, 15 to 30 percent of the nation's people have incomes below established poverty levels, and federal, state and local programs of public assistance have been unable to reduce these figures; and

"Whereas, these public assistance programs have developed unevenly as to coverage and benefits, primarily as a result of state and county limited taxing ability; now, therefore, "Be it resolved, That

"(1) The Federal government take over complete administration and financing of these public assistance programs;

"(2) Nationwide minimum standards for public assistance eligibility related to the cost of living in various regions of the country, be adopted."

Milwaukee County, like most of its fellow counties in the United States has never been remiss in helping the poor. Up until 1935, the county cared for the Aged and Disabled through its County Home and its Poor Relief program, but then the problems became too great and the federal government had to enter the picture with Old Age and Survivors Insurance.

Milwaukee County has not been remiss in coming to the aid of families and children, but again the load is getting too great and help from the federal government is again called for. The population of Milwaukee County ranks it among the first 15 in size in the United States, thus permitting its classification as an urban center with all the accompanying social upheavals.

Problems now confronting County Supervisors are not of the Supervisors' making. These problems come from in-migration, from both inside and outside the State of Wisconsin, from automation which dries up the number of unskilled labor needs, from the rise in the number of broken and incomplete families and from continually rising inflation.

These problems cannot be solved by Milwaukee County or any other county. Although the county has tried to do so by carrying on its property tax rolls more than 40% of the cost of welfare and income maintenance programs, it has now reached the limit of its taxing powers and cannot continue to carry this proportion of the burden.

The Milwaukee County Supervisors have therefore proposed that the federal government take over completely both the financing and the administration of the public assistance programs: Old Age, Blind and Disabled Assistance, together with Aid to Families of Dependent Children, and General Assistance.

There might be some who would consider such a transfer as weakening the role of county government. To them let me call attention to the fact that in at least 30 of the 54 tax spending jurisdictions in the United States, the state or its counterpart has

already relieved local communities of the responsibility for public assistance programs. Fully aware of the fiscal problems of state government, Milwaukee's position for itself and for the remaining states where counties are still bearing the burden is "Let's go the whole way this time."

Round table discussions taking place at the National Association of Counties Conference recently held in Portland, Oregon emphasized the role of counties in performing social services. Actually, the ability to perform these social services would be enhanced by the removal of the burden of financing and administering large scale income maintenance programs. Among the social services with which American Counties are now involved are housing, foster and institutional care, training and rehabilitation, transportation, health and the control of environment.

There may be some who will say that vesting the responsibility for public assistance with the federal government would make the programs impersonal and unresponsive. After many years of work in this field, I have come to the conclusion that these programs should be administered on an impersonal basis. As it is now, leeway exists among the states, leeway among the counties within the states and leeway exists within each of the counties with respect to the amount of assistance that a Caseworker may authorize for a given family. This phenomenon is responsible for a continuous battle between Caseworker and client with respect to the amount and kind of assistance that can be authorized.

Milwaukee County's resolution proposes a uniform payment throughout the United States, adjusted regionally perhaps to reflect difference in the cost of living, but promptly and impersonally administered by federal officials, probably those of the Social Security Administration.

The amounts involved should be just high enough so that individuals in need could rely on their own efforts to make up any deficits which their situations may require.

Such a program would put the burden of supporting an income maintenance program on the level of government which has the tax base which could finance it, provides for the impersonal administering of assistance payments in regular, clearly understood amounts, thus requiring a greater reliance upon the individual's own efforts if a deficit exists and finally permits the local county government which is nearest to the people and their problems to concentrate on educational, social and health services designed to bring about total community improvement.

Mr. EVANS. The present welfare system produces second, third, and fourth generations of welfare families. In most cases the real causes of this cycle of poverty are built into the system. Public welfare has many aspects which strip individuals of their dignity and pride. This is rarely the fault of the welfare administrators or the welfare workers. It is usually the structure within which we have to operate that is to blame.

Welfare recipients are constantly reminded that they are different from and inferior to other parents and children. Eventually many come to believe this. This is especially damaging to the children who receive aid under the present welfare system. It is practically impossible for the children not to feel different from their classmates. Children of welfare recipients stand in separate lines when renting their school books. Instead of paying for lunch in the cafeteria, they have a pass with which to pay for lunch. Other school fees are paid in the same manner, separating those on welfare from those who are not on welfare. These kinds of degrading and embarrassing experiences are probably the reason only 3% of ADC families throughout the state are receiving school fees.

Mr. REUSS. ADC being Aid for Dependent Children, the program which I believe Pres-

ident Nixon said was going to disappear into an across the board welfare program.

Mr. EVANS. Right.

Clothing is another sore spot for the children whose parents are receiving welfare. In a nation that is becoming more and more clothes conscious, most children who are receiving welfare have little more than one change of clothing. This again separates them from the others in their school system.

Most of the incidents mentioned thus far are embarrassing and degrading. There are other aspects of the present welfare system that are more damaging. One of these is the lack of an adequate food budget.

According to a study by the Department of Agriculture in 1967, a family of 4 needed at least \$100 a month as a minimum subsistence allowance.

In Wisconsin a family of 4 receives \$78 a month. It must also be kept in mind the cost of living has increased over 14% since that study was conducted. The \$78 has remained the same.

Some children are under-nourished to the point of suffering mental retardation as a result of this. Many others are working below their potential or experience more health problems than the rest of the population.

The present system is also very effective at destroying a youngster's incentive to work. For example, when a 16 year old boy, whose mother receives ADC, gets a job, he's allowed to keep only \$50 a month. Anything over that amount is deducted from his mother's welfare grant. In order for the family to maintain their present level of functioning, the boy must contribute the amount over \$50 to his mother. So regardless of how many hours a week he works, or what his hourly wage is, he receives approximately 31 cents an hour. This could hardly be incentive for him to continue working.

These are just some of the weaknesses that are built into our present welfare program.

Mr. SWAN. In speaking of poverty and our welfare system I think we all recognize that a good deal of time and energy has been put into the question of how to better the welfare system. I think the real problem is that too much thought, too much planning and too much program has been put into the system.

The system has always been directed at the symptoms of the problem. I think it is time now that we gave some thought to the causes rather than treating the symptoms.

I think consideration of a welfare system in some way could be compared to a system of war, or war program. I think that war is undesirable and that ways and means should be sought to eliminate a war or the causes that bring it about.

So I think when we think in terms of a welfare system, we should stop looking at the symptoms and start looking at the causes, trying to bring about solutions to the causes.

We look at problems of our society, we look at our economic system, we look at the discrimination that exists in this country—all of which causes people to be in poverty, people to suffer from unemployment, people to be denied decent housing. This causes people to be alienated from society, to be prohibited from entering the mainstream of American society.

And of course poverty has produced our welfare system, a system that only solves and salves a symptom of a problem.

I think that's putting too much emphasis and energy in the wrong direction.

I say we should look at our economic system and see what our interests are. Whether we will continue to have a good deal too much interest about property maintenance, about efficiency production, or whether we will in turn give some consideration to the human element of our society.

Mr. SYKES. At the risk of sounding like an amateur sociologist, I would just like to make a brief point and that is that deprivation is relative and that we must be very conscious of it. That means to me that when I look at

most changes in societies that have been a result of the way people have perceived their injustices and perceived their wrongs, I come to the conclusion that there are probably a number of reasons why people are poor. Two very simple classifications are the temporarily poor and others who may end up on welfare because the family is killed in an accident and they weren't properly insured. Due to accidents or death or something very often people are temporarily in poverty.

I think there is a large segment of this society that is systematically reduced to a state of poverty in a very systematic non-accidental way. Here I am not only talking about blacks and Latinos and other minority groups, but many whites as well. Primarily in the minority groups there is a systematic force operating that reduces them to poverty. When I think about the welfare system and the new scheme proposed by our present administration in Washington, I am amazed because I get the feeling that everybody thinks that this is going to be a panacea to deal with the issue.

My feeling is that these welfare systems and any other maintenance system provides a base, maybe beneficial to people who are temporarily poor, but it will not deal with the issue of those people who have been restricted to a level of poverty. I think that it is not a panacea and very often what I see happening is the concentration on these kinds of program as we eliminate those programs that I think are designed to help people who have been systematically exploited from participating in the mainstream of American society.

Mr. URBE. Man has the right to be clothed and educated. This is a modern truth in America in 1969. My group is an organization of Spanish speaking welfare recipients who are struggling to assert themselves as first class citizens. In our country the welfare recipients have the right to lead a more decent and civilized existence. The goal of my group is to label Spanish speaking welfare recipients, and to help deal with the apathy which often accompanies their condition.

Poor people, black people, Mexican-Americans, Puerto-Ricans, poor whites, people who are caught in a cycle of poor education, poor paying jobs, substandard housing find this condition transmitted from father to son.

There are many creative alternatives to give the poor a break. A definite legal requirement for civil service jobs, high skilled job training, high skill language training, for non-English speaking people, and asking the government and private industry to create new jobs are just a few. We need a reconsideration of priorities on national, state, county and city levels.

LONA BHIELE. I want to talk about the hypocrites in politics, the ones who are playing God over the poor people, people who go around cutting welfare, condemning mothers with children, pushing them to go to work instead of making stronger laws to bring back the deserting father. They are so happy sitting in the State Assembly making decisions. They are increasing their salaries and making decreases in our checks. Just recently, I think it was in the (State) Senate, they decided they couldn't live on \$15 a day away from home. This included \$7 a day for their room and restaurant meals. At one time they were paying \$5, I believe, for one man to eat supper while the welfare recipient, depending on the size of the family, had to make do with about two dollars a day for a family of four or five.

Also, they say they are helping the taxpayers by cutting away our checks by doing away with Aid for Dependent Children.

This sounds funny but really some of the welfare recipients are trying to help the taxpayer in the long run realize that these so-called politicians are really trying to cheat

them out of their money. When they take families off of welfare and put them in another category, taxes go up no matter how pretty they make it sound by getting people off welfare and making them go to work.

Many, I'm speaking for mothers now because that's where I'm most familiar, would be able to go to work. I don't know how this garnishment law is going to effect us, but I can tell you right now we'll be facing garnishment if we do go to work for bills our husbands left us with. Other mothers have many emotional and physical problems which are not seen by the public, who may think the mother is perfectly healthy or the children are perfectly healthy. Many children are suffering from emotional problems, too.

Many mothers have tried to go to work and found that their children were getting emotionally upset and getting into problems with the law. You have many children in poor families who are in trouble with the school and this is due to a lack of a proper diet. Children can't concentrate if their tummies aren't full with an adequate breakfast. Some families usually eat a lot of starches.

Try to remember that the so-called lush benefits you're being told you are paying for welfare recipients aren't all going to welfare recipients, no matter what category they are in. Much of it is going to the top man, the administration, the legislators. I feel that they shouldn't have the power to vote for their own increases in salaries. This should be left up to the people. If President Nixon was really concerned about the poor, he wouldn't take an entourage of cooks and people to make a full course American meal over in Rumania.

Figure how much of that came out of your pocket. It wasn't a recipient going over to Rumania to put on the dog.

Mr. O'DONNELL. There is no national purpose or goal on much of the legislation that has passed both nationally and in the states. Most of the legislation, if it is passed, is begrudgingly passed and its done on a basis that the poor here and we'll take care of it but we begrudge it.

We should take the same attitude toward welfare that the Congress and the American public have taken toward the commitment to the space program. This is a national commitment of billions of dollars and everybody is very enthusiastic about spending it and reaching the goal. Maybe it is good and maybe it's bad, that's hard to know. But if we could apply the same thing to our problems with the poor and poverty in the cities, then maybe we could accomplish something. I think this is what is needed.

There is need for public relations to tell why people get on general assistance or ADC. What do you do with a single man or single woman that unfortunately has turned to an alcoholic? These people are still human beings and you have to take care of them.

I don't think that any of the legislation that has passed in the area of the poverty program and public welfare is actually passed with any enthusiasm at all.

I think it is passed begrudgingly. I think people feel this. If we can go out and make our national purpose and our national goals to eradicate some of these problems, I think we could reach it in a period of a year. But we are never going to reach it with half of our society begrudging these people bread and butter.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON POVERTY AND THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Mrs. JAMES MILLS. This is just a reaction to the panel. I am here and to represent only myself. As an interested citizen, I think one of the things which concerns me most is that it seems to me that we're involved in being given double messages not only by the National government, but on all levels.

I think that it is accurate for the local and state governments to feel very bound in because of the financial situation. I think

this is a real problem and it cannot be ignored.

On the other hand it seems terrible anxiety provoking to me to have Congress on the one hand, as it did several years ago, say that "We're going to eliminate poverty," as though it can be done like that. So people assume we have done this.

We talk about eliminating poverty but we don't provide anywhere near the funds that we all honestly know would be necessary to make a serious dent in the problem. On the other hand we don't talk about wanting war, but we spend countless billions for the material of war, and to maintain military establishments throughout the world which are now being shown to be completely useless in terms of our actual defense needs. We get this kind of double message all the time.

I am wondering if a child born in this country has any rights simply because he is born and is a citizen of this country, or if his future depends upon whims and the political winds.

Cecil Brown, Jr.: I want to call the Congressman's attention to an area which I think tends to be overlooked. There is unfortunately a kind of philosophy that people are only poor because they want to be poor. I think this governs the approach of too many legislators in making appropriations around the poverty area and around the welfare area. Now there is a special segment of people that we try to work with in Jobs Now, a non-profit corporation I work for. We work with men and women who are released from the correction institutions in Milwaukee, the Milwaukee County Jail, and the Milwaukee House of Correction, trying to see that they get into educational training programs that will lead to better employment.

Some of the things that we've found, for example, are that a distressingly large number of them are under 25. This reflects the fact that the median age in this country is dropping rapidly. Also, a distressing fact has been uncovered. Approximately somewhere between 30 and 40 percent of black males, Spanish speaking males, Indian males that live in Milwaukee County have arrest and incarceration records.

We have too many employers, in fact the overwhelming majority of employers, who will not hire people who have arrest and incarceration records. And a relatively small segment, I would say from my experience less than fifty who have any kind of meaningful job, who will hire a man or a woman despite the fact that they have an arrest and incarceration record.

I was a little distressed to see that when our astronauts went to the moon that they left behind a million dollars worth of equipment there. I think about what a million dollars could do in a program like ours. We could operate for three years for a million dollars, work with 3,000 people, get half of them good jobs, the other half would have skills, and they would end up in five years time paying an equivalent of \$3,000,000 in income taxes.

I am distressed over that because our system of values is such that we put emphasis on the wrong things. In the federal prison system, the cost of keeping someone behind bars for one year ranges somewhere between 4 and 5 thousand dollars. That same individual can be given an opportunity to earn a decent living instead of costing the taxpayers 5 thousand dollars a year.

It's this unwillingness, I guess on our part, to deal with causes, and I think the panel pointed out very well that we're dealing with the symptoms rather than the causes, that must be corrected.

STATEMENT OF INTERLEAGUE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUES OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Mrs. FRANCIS L. PONDER. All of the members of the panel with their various viewpoints have given us much to think about.

The League of Women Voters has studied welfare services over the years and has the following support positions: Effective social welfare services through adequate financing, greater citizen participation, evaluation of programs and cooperative long range planning for family oriented services among the various levels of public and private services. We support equality of opportunity for education, employment, and housing.

We believe that the people must be able to communicate their wishes to their elected representatives and that these representatives must be responsive to the wishes of the governed. Hearings such as this are an effective means of bringing about real understanding.

HOUSING AND RELOCATION, AUGUST 14

PANEL WITNESSES

Lawrence Katz, Wisconsin State Director, Federal Housing Administration.

Richard W. E. Perrin, Director, City of Milwaukee, Redevelopment Authority.

Chuck Hill, Deputy Secretary, State of Wisconsin, Department of Local Affairs and Development.

Leonard S. Zubrensky, Expressway Commission, Milwaukee County.

Anna Hansen, Milwaukee Tenants Union—South.

Ted Slevier, Inner City Development Project.

George Pazik, Northtown Planning and Development Council.

Helen Barnhill, Coordinator of Housing and Public Accommodation, Equal Rights Division, State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Karz. In Milwaukee, there is no need for elaborate and detailed research to determine whether a housing shortage exists. It does. One need only drive through both the North and South Inner City to become aware of the need for housing replacement.

The causes of the housing shortage have been frequently enunciated by many, i.e., urban renewal; expressway construction; obsolescence of existing structures; increasing family formations and discrimination.

What is being done and what can be done to alleviate the current housing shortage in Milwaukee?

To properly respond to this question, it is necessary to observe the current housing trends in the Inner City. The oldest houses (50-60 years) exist in the southern half of the Negro ghetto and the northern portion of the Spanish-American ghetto on the south side. In the Northern Inner City, there has been rapid absorption of housing by Negro home buyers and renters on the north segment of this ghetto. This is due to panic selling by whites and the resulting availability of the properties they are yielding to black ownership and renters. In 1968, it appears there were approximately 2000 structures for sale and approximately 1500 purchasers for these 2000 units. FHA had, during this period of time, received applications at the rate of 100 per month for home ownership. This source of property is serving as a relocation resource. Some of these properties are occupied by those needing relocation. On the other hand, potential home owners not being forced to relocate choose to buy these properties and the units they are vacating are now available to those forced to relocate. Some of the 2000 units available during a year are in need of rehabilitation. Current rehabilitation efforts are being successfully carried out by both profit and nonprofit rehabilitators. This, of course, tends to preserve an existing inventory of housing units and does provide "instant housing". In addition, there is some new construction occurring in the Inner City and with the strong possibility of considerably more. With the release of Section 235 funds by Congress and the availability of mortgages with an interest rate as low as 1%, rehabilitators have requested and will

receive subsidy funds for the rehabilitation of 300 housing units under this program this year. This is in addition to the current efforts by the Northside Citizens Neighborhood Conservation Corporation in their rehabilitating approximately 100 units per year with a similar mortgage interest rate. In addition, this year is also seeing subsidies resulting in a 1% mortgage interest rate for an additional 150 existing housing units. During this month, this Agency will release Section 235 subsidy funds to the builders of 200 new homes in the Inner City. Most of these units will be on scattered sites—replacing homes that have been razed. 1969 will, therefore, see the availability of 750 individual homes available to low income buyers—550 being rehabilitated and existing units and 200 new.

It is interesting to note that in the 12-month period ending July 30, 350 home purchasers in both the North and South Inner City have been "welfare mothers" receiving ADC payments.

1969 has seen the completion of 519 housing units under Sections 236 and 221(d)(3) Rent Supplement. These units have been built on the northwest side, the southwest side and the central portion of the City of Milwaukee. 1970 will see the construction of 900 rental units consisting of one, two, three and four bedroom apartments and townhouses under these programs. They will be constructed in the central portion of the city under urban renewal land as well as locations outside of this area. It is further expected that, with the availability of additional Section 235 dollars, single family homes will be constructed and rehabilitated on scattered sites.

The interest that has been evidenced by sponsors in the sale of a parcel of land in the Kilbourn town No. 3 area by the City of Milwaukee evidences no lack of developers. There is definitely no shortage of sponsorship either profit or nonprofit motivated. On the other hand, there is a significant shortage of building sites for multifamily projects. Only one sponsor will be given the award of the parcel of land that will be sold by the City this month. At least five others—perfectly capable and able to build a multimillion dollar project will be disappointed. If we had five additional parcels of land, they would be happy to purchase and build. We would thus be able to see not merely 239 apartment units being constructed for the poor and the moderate income tenant but six times that number. *Only the shortage of land precludes this achievement.* Land in the city as well as outside of the city is necessary.

It is obvious that relocation efforts must be structured to a degree that will satisfactorily meet the demanding needs that have surfaced. The attempt to relocate people, as their needs are made known to a relocation staff is insufficient. Anticipated relocation needs must be foreseen years in advance and steps taken to insure the availability of housing so that the relocation is not the traumatic experience it is for the unfortunate resident who finds uprooting is his lot. It will be necessary that every housing unit, planned and under construction, must be known to the relocation staff. Knowledge of these units must be made available to the family needing them even if they are only blueprints at such time. Long range plans, then, must be made for the movement from the old into the new when the completion of the new occurs. Existing subsidized housing units must also be known to the relocation staff. Arrangements should be made between such staff and the owner of these projects for priority treatment of relocatees when vacancies occur.

If the relocation staff is unable to schedule the relocation because of the lack of availability of new construction until a later date, mobile homes should be available in the neighborhood for temporary housing. As example of this procedure can be the erection

of several hundred units in the Kilbourn town No. 3 area to temporarily house those who will need relocation housing in the Midtown Conservation area across the street. They will use these mobile homes while awaiting construction of new units in the same Midtown area.

The relocation staff must also have at its disposal all of the new and rehabilitated housing units under Section 235 subsidy funding. They must be aware of allocation of funds to specific builders and then arrange for the occupancy of these units in the future by relocatees.

In addition to the construction and rehabilitation of massive quantities of housing under subsidized programs, the successful response to the relocation problem presently confronting this community is a well-structured, well-staffed relocation service.

Mr. PERAIN. For the period 1960 through 1968, public programs at all levels of government caused a total loss in the city's housing supply roughly equal to one-half of the housing gain accomplished by new construction.

At present the total vacancy rate for the city is less than one per cent in sales housing and 3.3 per cent in rental housing. For the metropolitan area, the rate is 1.2 per cent in sales and 3.7 per cent in rental housing. There is general agreement that the total vacancy rate should be around 5 per cent to permit optimum mobility.

Except for the City of Milwaukee in which 1,557 public housing units were completed during these years, no public housing was built in any of the suburbs or, for that matter, in any of the four counties comprising the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

Against the stated background of housing loss, and notwithstanding the addition of some public housing for which the city alone can be credited, experience has made it abundantly clear that the major relocation housing resource, imperfect as it may be in some respects, has been and conceivably will remain to be the older existing supply as vacancies occur. Stated another way, and certainly without attempting to establish an absolute relationship between new housing construction and relocation needs generated by displacement activities, new housing, public or private, will play a comparatively minor role for direct relocation purposes except insofar as it increases the total supply which by a process of upgrading, turnover, and vacancy availability creates more housing opportunity. In some instances special efforts must be made to provide housing for particular needs such as exceptionally large or unusual families and for low income elderly. An example of this is the 100 unit scattered site public housing project to consist of 4-, 5-, and 6-bedroom units for certain families to be displaced in the Midtown Project and which is expected to be placed under construction in the current year. Additionally, proposals are being sought for 300 units of housing for elderly to be located on the south side of the city, with further units to be programmed subsequently in the 1,500 unit program reservation held by the Housing Authority.

It is also clear that unless new construction can be greatly stimulated at all levels, the current tight vacancy rate in the city as well as the entire metropolitan area will become even tighter. With this likelihood it becomes increasingly important that code enforcement, rehabilitation, and conservation programs must be stressed and extensive demolition be restrained until new construction activity can be more definitely anticipated.

Mr. HILL. The National Housing Act of 1949 committed our nation to a goal—"a decent, safe and sanitary home in a suitable living environment for every American family" (emphasis mine). If a similar goal for any major program, such as agriculture, space or

defense were enunciated, and then examined twenty years later with similar results, it would approach a national scandal.

The irony of it all is that the Watts riot, and rebellions all over the country in 1967, forced us to assess what we had done in housing; and it was much too little. The Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Commission) pointed out that in more than 20 years we had built only 600,000 units of housing for low-income families across the nation. We also managed, through federal, state and local government policy, to allow and even encourage racial and economic segregation through such devices as federally subsidized or guaranteed housing for middle class families not available to the poor or minorities, large lot zoning, restrictive building codes and federal loans and grants for public facilities in areas restricted to middle and upper class white families.

Needless to say, the greatest victims of our transportation policies and slum clearance policies have been the inner city residents, often poor, often black. In short, our commitment to meeting that 1949 stated goal of a decent, safe and sanitary home in a suitable living environment for every American family seems to have been abandoned.

The Kaiser Committee (*A Decent Home*) called for a ten year goal of 26 million more new and rehabilitated units of housing, six million of them for low-income families. The Douglas Commission (*Building the American City*) more modestly recommended 20 to 22.5 million new housing units with 5 million for low and moderate income families. As a person involved in housing and community development activities, I can predict with certainty that we will fall far short of these goals, unless drastic changes in our national priorities and our housing delivery program are made. I would like to highlight a few of the key impediments to filling this need for housing.

(1) *Insufficient Funding:* Present programs are so underfunded that last year's appropriation to provide housing for low-income families under the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act was used up months before the end of the fiscal year. Even with the complicated requirements, development cost limitations and inexperience of nonprofit sponsors in securing housing under various sections of the 1968 housing act, there is, and will continue to be, a dearth of available funds unless they are increased two or three times the present appropriation levels.

(2) *Lack of Technology:* If sufficient funding were secured, we would still face problems of technology on how to produce good housing quickly—through the use of mass production techniques. Let's compare HUD's 1966 research budget of \$1.4 million with Agriculture's \$230 million or the Department of Transportation's \$160 million. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) 1966 R&D budget of more than \$5 billion, once again, says something about our commitment to housing America's population. Unless we pioneer in housing development as we did in space, we will not even come close to our ten year commitment. Only substantial increases in R&D money will allow us to construct housing the way other manufacturers produce goods.

(3) *A Multiplicity and Inflexibility of Housing Programs:* We have a laundry list of federally assisted housing programs for low and moderate income families. We have public housing, with its own variations—Section 23 leased housing, rent supplement programs, 221(d)(3), Section 235, 221(h) and so on. Standards and specifications are often different for these programs, depending upon the kind of low-income people who live in them. This, in turn, requires expertise at all levels (federal, state and local), not in designing or constructing housing or undertaking the normal activities of development, but in knowing the variety of federally assisted housing programs and their requirements. This lends to additional overhead

which, given a cost limitation on each federally assisted program, will not add to the brick and mortar improvements. The 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act does provide greater flexibility than before, but much needs to be done in improving our housing programs further.

(4) There are, of course, numerous social barriers to housing, and I mentioned them earlier. Something must be done to break down those areas that exclude the lower class and lower middle class population through restrictive building and zoning measures and so forth.

Of course it is easier to say what is wrong than to offer some positive recommendations. I would like to make some positive suggestions that I think can help us meet this commitment.

(1) Adequate Funding: Congress' mandate to local communities in producing housing, especially for low-income families is like telling your wife to buy a new wardrobe with ten dollars. You just can't do it without enough money. And it must be provided, directly or indirectly, by the federal government through subsidies, tax incentives or whatever works best.

(2) Research and Development—More money must go to private enterprise to develop new technologies in providing new housing. This budget should be increased tenfold, if we are serious about producing good housing quickly.

(3) Move toward a simplification and consolidation of federally assisted housing programs, using the ones that work best, eliminating costly and time-consuming procedures, and most important, *doing this with a view toward making housing of low and moderate income families a function of occupancy not construction.*

(4) Encourage states to use their powers to eliminate arbitrary local resistance to the provision of housing for low-income families through incentive grants. Unfortunately, with few exceptions states have been unwilling to use their powers to eliminate local barriers to progress unless the stakes were high. A good case in point 's the federal highway act, which saw states constructing U.S. interstate highways cutting through and across local boundaries. Perhaps it is time to award large grants to states that develop an urban growth policy that includes, among other things:

(a) Adoption of performance codes for construction and ultimate jurisdiction in any appeals where more restrictive codes are alleged to be arbitrary or exclusionary.

(b) Adoption of a state land use plan which includes a requirement for distribution of residential land in local areas (on a percentage basis) that does not inhibit or exclude the access of low-income persons.

(c) Adoption of an open occupancy statute with no exemptions to assure access to housing regardless of race, color, creed or national origin.

(d) Adoption of regional development districts with designated growth centers.

(e) Creation of a state development corporation that can assemble land and construct housing and other community facilities for low and moderate income families.

If major incentives are given to states in the form of block grants to stimulate such development, they may be equal to the task.

I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before you, and will be happy to provide any assistance you may wish.

Mr. ZUBRENSKY (reading):

"I weep for you," the Walrus said:
"I deeply sympathize."

With sobs and tears he sorted out

Those of the largest size,

Holding his pocket-handkerchief

Before his streaming eyes.

The housing and relocation program in Milwaukee County has been the object of sobs and tears for many years.

I have never heard anyone be other than extremely sympathetic to the problem.

Somehow, America's expressway program has been like the stony-hearted step-mother of English literature who "listeneth to the sighs of orphans, and drinkest the tears of children."

Unfortunately, in many cities where expressways have been commenced, there had been a housing shortage to begin with. Certainly there has been in Milwaukee a shortage of housing suitable for displaced persons who generally are poor and disproportionately minority group members. Add in the large families and you have a fair picture of the housing problem in most urban areas in general, and Milwaukee in particular.

Keeping in mind that there are almost no homes being built in Milwaukee for less than \$20,000.00; interest rates having gone as high as the moon; we have built 254 public housing units in Milwaukee, exclusive of housing for the elderly, since 1954, and we have displaced and will displace through 1970 approximately 8,166 families by free-ways alone, it does not take an Einstein to conclude that we have neglected a segment of our population to a point where the word scandalous would be a gross understatement.

However, as Mort Sahl once said: "The future lies ahead" and rather than persist in the indictment of the past, we should chart the future and point out whatever shoals may exist.

1. Even in a city with an adequate amount of housing and a high vacancy rate (which is not the case in Milwaukee) the combination of racial discrimination and high rentals for available housing, may mean that unless subsidized housing is built, there will be no place to send the displaced. In such a situation, the statutory requirement of a feasible relocation plan should bar demolition without prior construction of low-cost replacement housing.

As a practical matter, insistence that relocatees be adequately housed as a condition of governmental displacement, would provide an incentive for subsidized housing which otherwise would not exist.

2. Since proper relocation could halt an expressway project for years, there is a conflict of interest between the site residents and all others. For this reason, Federal agency employees should make the determination as to whether adequate relocation housing exists rather than State, County or Local employees.

3. Because of the low political and legal visibility of site residents in general, their interests should be protected by a federally funded agency such as the Tenants Union which could fight for the rights of site residents, as they have not been able to do so for themselves.

ANNA HANSEN. For a long time now, the Homebuyers' Guild and other organizations and agencies have been trying to deal with the housing crisis in Milwaukee County that has been caused by the uprooting of families by urban renewal, expressways, and other governmental action. Yet, as residents and organizations have approached elected officials at all levels, the city, the county, the state, and federal, the buck has been passed. Even while residents of Milwaukee County are caught in this political meatgrinder, the uprooting goes on. Elected officials claim they are powerless to supply housing, yet plan new expressways and new urban renewal projects. Something has gone seriously wrong in the establishment of priorities and the interaction between levels of government.

On November 8, 1966, in a referendum, the voters of Milwaukee County voted 74 percent in favor of a central relocation agency and so far nothing has been done. The Federal Highway Act of 1968 requires adequate relocation for people displaced by highways and provides federal funds for this. State action is required to implement it, and this still hasn't been done. For two years resolutions for the County to take some responsibility in hous-

ing has been lying dormant in committees, and we're still waiting for something to be done. The Federal Housing Act of 1968 has many provisions to provide different kinds of housing. County Executive Doyle said right after his re-election that he would take action. We're still waiting for some action. The City presented a workable program to HUD that incorrectly stated that adequate relocation was available, in order to get more funds to displace more people. At this point, Aldermen and resident groups pointed out the housing crisis, and still, they're tearing down homes and nothing's being done. I think FHA under 235, the homes that are repossessed and rehabilitated are not eligible for people to buy, under the 235 program. Present welfare rent allotments are inadequate. Decent housing cannot be found for families at welfare department standards. The County has done little or nothing to provide low income housing.

While Milwaukee expressway construction, under the joint auspices of the State and the County, has been one of the prime sources of demolition, neither the State nor the County has been involved in any substantial relocation programs. The effort of the Health and Building Code is ineffectual due to a lack of staff, an inadequate system of fines and the lack of receivership process. City action in the past years has destroyed over 1,500 units, while opening only 24 new units for low-income, large families. Projected new housing for low-income families by the city is 1,600 units, none of which are yet under construction. There has been no new public housing on the South side for over 20 years. The city's scattered site program, if continued at its present rate, will not finish the first 100 units before 1971, and I think the average low-income person that is hit by some of these expressways and other things are just getting to the end of the limit. They know that there's no place for them to go, and I think it's just about time that the people that are representing these low-income families should start facing up to their responsibilities and start doing something about it instead of passing the buck.

Mr. SIEVER. I will give a little bit of background on why there's this kind of need for more housing. Since 1960 there was a net increase in Wisconsin of 170,000 family units. Yet during that same period of time only 124,000 new units were added to the State housing supply. So you have a gap there of 54,000 houses that needed to be built. One third of the unsound housing in 1960 was located in Wisconsin's 19 largest cities. In Milwaukee itself, for example, due to all forms of governmental actions in 1957, they've wiped out 8,800 dwelling units between 1960 and 1967. This was for all purposes, urban renewal, freeways, street widenings, parks, houses that weren't sound and had to be removed. This is primarily in the two inner-core areas, on the North side and the South side.

In human terms, I remember when the Milwaukee Tenants Union was down at the State Legislature, begging to pass the Conta bill, begging to pass the receivership bill, begging to take advantage of the 100 percent federal money that was available to relocatees, and one of the legislators from Milwaukee brought up the point (it was largely a group of rural legislators that we were talking to) that what this means to some of them is the same as if they wipe out five of the rural towns that were there. This is what's been wiped out.

Now for Milwaukeeans to better appreciate this, 8,800 dwelling units very conservatively means about 18,000 people. Let's imagine for a moment that the village of Shorewood disappeared tomorrow. That's what has happened since 1960 in the city of Milwaukee. Now I imagine if the city of Shorewood were to disappear tomorrow because of an earthquake or a flood, or it slid into Lake Michigan, that there would be all kinds of

programs that would be developed to rehouse the people. The federal government would find some money, the state would find some money, the county could find some money, and some of these people would be rehoused because they are articulate, white, middle-class.

Now the people that are getting hit in Milwaukee. It's not just black people. 72 percent of the poor in the city are white, and there're large, low-income white families that are being hit as well as black families that are being hit. Somehow nobody seems to respond to that.

Take that even further into a more individual case, one of the 18,000 people that have had their housing taken away in this period, with no adequate relocation. An example of one woman no husband, she works, she had six children. The expressway came by and it took all the houses around her house, and her house.

While they were knocking down the houses around her house they managed to knock off the porch of her house. And she started looking, for four months she looked. Now her house became unlivable. All the windows were broken, no heating system in the house, plumbing was freezing because of the vacant unit upstairs. The Expressway Commission wanted to keep collecting rent from her, by the way.

She decided, well, why should she pay that rent, because they're not going to give her any moving expenses, she's living in a house that is in violation of City Health Codes, the City Health Codes say that the landlord is not allowed to rent out a place that has health code violations, but they exempt the Expressway Commission. The Expressway Commission is the biggest slumlord in Milwaukee at this point. So she stopped paying rent. They brought in action both to evict her, and to collect their back rent, their \$83 of rent. She finally found a place, she was being harassed so much by the Expressway Commission in having these suits brought about her, on the South side. This place itself had numerous code violations. She moved in there. Meanwhile, she had been missing work and her boss was getting a little bit upset. That place was so bad she finally moved up to another place, 320 East Ogden Street, which became rather famous as the building where the Tenants Union took over when the Expressway Commission said they weren't responsible for it anymore.

One day, shortly before she was going to go to an Expressway Commission meeting to testify about how the Expressway Commission had treated her, the Expressway Commission managed to get a trespassing order from the court and came and evicted her on one hour's notice with her six kids, all the clothing, the food that was in the house, the furniture, bundled them up into a moving van and took it away, put it in storage and then said later "well, it's going to cost you 300 bucks to get it out of storage."

With all this, she finally lost her job while she was out trying to find housing, and is now on welfare collecting money from the county. During the period of time she was moved out on this trespassing business, she had to put her children in the children's home because she had no adequate place for them. It costs the taxpayer \$500 a month to have the kids in those Children's Homes. She had to have 6 children in there for a period of about one month. She is now on welfare.

With the help of about 15 agencies all trying to deal with the lack of housing in this city, she finally found an adequate place and hopefully she'll be off welfare. If you begin to add up the cost to the taxpayer of this type of action, let's talk in hard economics, with all the high-priced legal talent that the Expressway got so they could get her out of the places, the cost of moving, the cost of welfare, the cost of having the children in the Children's Home, it probably cost the taxpayers a good \$4000. Possibly she might have to stay on welfare, unless she can find an-

other job, and it's kind of hard for a mother without adequate day care to get a job. This is what happens to individuals, and this is happening now. Of those 8,000 dwelling units that have been wiped out, that's happened to 8,800 families.

Mr. PAZIK. It seems to be almost impossible to get into a discussion of our housing crisis without people looking for someone to blame. Looking for someone to blame always ends up causing all sorts of people to take defensive positions instead of truthful positions. This stops and stymies discussion, and this stymies our facing reality.

I think the public is to blame. I'm sort of cynical I suppose about the sudden interest of the freeway people now in relocation, now that they're just about finished tearing up the central city, now that they have just about finished putting poor families out of their houses. Now we are going to have a relocation problem. Now we're going to have a relocation problem for the people in the suburbs, the suburbs in the North, for example, people who have a great deal more mobility than the low-income families or the poor families in the central city. Too bad about them.

Where was the public outcry when their homes were being torn down? Congressman, you know that we had a great public outcry that our expressway system was going to destroy the beauty of the lakefront. I'm for beauty for the lakefront. But how come we weren't concerned about when we were putting people out of their houses? And instead of attempting to blame officials, as we often do in these discussions but haven't yet, and I hope we don't today, we forget to put the blame right back there on the public who elected officials, who keeps them in office, and continues to vote for them, and who the officials are trying to please. We can't operate this way any longer. We can't play the game of racial containment any longer either.

In Milwaukee, we very politely, as in other cities across the country, insist this is not the case, but somehow it ends up that way because somehow in Milwaukee 98 percent of our black population ends up in one area and Ted, how much of the brown population lives in the other? Somehow we've played this game of gentlemen's agreement and keep them where they are. We cannot successfully solve the housing crisis unless we do something.

The suburbs can't point a finger at the city of Milwaukee and say that it's not doing it's part. And the city points a finger at the suburbs and says you're not zoning properly. As Ted Siever pointed out, the city of Milwaukee doesn't build public housing in its own south side where they don't have a zoning problem. It's really not in the best faith to complain about River Hills not putting in more public housing for the poor. We have to deal with these facts and lay them on the table, that's where we're going to solve the problems.

Congressman, we have to get some of the government red tape out of these programs. Have you had an opportunity, Congressman, to really sit down and examine the type of horrible things that Richard Perrin's planners have to conform to in order to get some kind of money for urban renewal projects? It's absolutely stupid.

The other day we were with some people in town who were surveying HUD programs, and they told me, as they told other members of the panel that. It took one person working 5 and a half full days of staff time doing absolutely nothing else to prepare an application for an open space grant of \$11,000. If the name of the game is to make it as difficult as possible, then that's a great game. But if the name of the game is to get something done, we ought to get the red tape out of government programs.

Congressman, when Congress passes a law, it maybe looks something like two or three pages. Hand it over to one of the agencies

and it ends up in some handbook. And that's what it is. 80, 90 or 100 pages. You have to be a master just to master the handbook. Never mind being able to master homebuilding, never mind being able to master urban renewal either, you have to be a master of the handbook first.

If Congress would like to attack some of these things and set some priorities, some of the agencies in Washington would have to listen. This handbook gets all through being written, with all the rules and regulations and do's and don'ts and no-no's and yes-yesses, then it's handed down to Lawrence Katz, who tries with intelligence and imagination and determination to try to make it work as well as possible. He has to work with those limitations.

Why is this?

Congressman, you have personal knowledge of the fact that with the NCNCC program, which you helped found and which you've worked mightily with, that without your help there would be no NCNCC program, NCNCC of course being the Northside Citizens' Neighborhood Conservation Corporation, which is by reputation the first or second best 221 rehab. corporation in the country.

Congressman, you yourself found that there were regulations in the handbook that were not in Milwaukee. And you had to go to HUD in Washington to protest and object. Without your help and your presence on the NCNCC Board, these things would have never happened. These are some of the things that hold up progress.

Mr. REUSS. I can give you one very current example of your criticism of Washington for its delays and endless red tape. A year ago, in August, Congress passed the Housing Act of 1968 which, as several witnesses have said, was really a good measure. Included in that act was a provision designed to make rehabilitation and conservation possible wherever it was needed in the city, not just in so-called urban renewal areas, which are few and far between. And Mr. Perrin and the people in City Hall are ready to go as soon as they get their guideposts from Washington.

For a year now, I have been after the Department of HUD to issue those guideposts on new rehabilitation programs. They're supposed to be issued this month. I haven't yet seen them. But there you have a year of wasted time in which nine-tenths of central Milwaukee continued to deteriorate because the local people with the best will in the world simply haven't been put in possession of the pieces of paper to enable them to go ahead.

HELEN BARNHILL. Being the last member of the panel, it's probably true that most of what I could say has been said already. I was sitting here wondering about the 8 of us, and the numbers of other people whom I've listened to from time to time on housing. There definitely is a national awareness of the housing problems. There is an awareness on the part of local government and everybody who should be informed. This has been pointed out.

I was thinking of myself, maybe, as a person who might be moved in the very near future, and I realize that anybody who is in that position might have to see at least 5 of the 8 of us before he could find someone who would begin trying to help him. And in this we're expecting the poor person who is being uprooted to be more of an expert than we are. I think we have to change our attitude toward new ideas, such as the mobile home park or the pre-fabricated units. These are bad words that we like to lash out at all the time, but I think temporary housing is a means toward an end. What good does it do, really, to take people out of housing and to tear it down, when they haven't been relocated properly?

What's happening is that they move into the periphery and double up. Why not use

a temporary kind of housing to prevent some of this overcrowding? It has been used in other cities, New York has done some, Chicago has done some, and I think we have to be creative. We just have to get away from the business of 'We can't do it'. Let's do it, and have somebody stop us. Our attitude has to change.

The new kind of housing that we read about in magazines can be permanent housing. There is nothing wrong with new ways of building things. We haven't stopped buying cars because they put them on an assembly line. So we shouldn't think in this way about housing.

I get concerned, too, when the question is raised, and it has been raised by this panel, that HUD requires that there be enough units to house the people who are going to be displaced. I think along with that there should be some insistence on those people, some insistence that the people being moved will get that housing, and that the housing that has been counted as available units is of the size that will accommodate these families. These are some of the discrepancies, I think, that we haven't really looked at.

It doesn't make any difference if you're moving a family who can pay \$70 a month rent if you decide, yes, they're four units out somewhere and they have 2 bedrooms and there's ten in the family and the rent is \$100 a month. The family can only pay \$70 and the house is too small for them. So just the counting of units, with the numbers of people, just does not get us anywhere at all. I think we have to be concerned about the total uprating of one's life. Housing is certainly a part of this.

As Mr. Pazik pointed out, we have to get more concerned about job opportunity and all of these things that go along with the upgrading of one's life. Mr. Sleever pointed out that because of a severe housing problem, one lady is no longer able to work, or she has to wait until she can get another job because of a housing situation. I don't suppose that if any of us had any suggestions that would really take care of the problems, there wouldn't have been a need for you to invite us to sit here and talk about it. But I'm hoping that this is one of the last times that we're going to be telling people what the problems are. We know. I think enough research has been done, and I'm not fighting research. I think research is necessary. But I think enough has been done now that we can begin to move toward providing housing. It doesn't do us any good anymore for someone to tell me that 3000 families were moved, the housing was torn down, and nothing has been built. We know that. Let's build housing.

Mr. Reuss. If you want to be pessimistic, you can certainly make a splendid indictment against the federal government and the Congress for its passing all sorts of grandiose housing laws and then badly underfunding them and inundating local officials with mountains of indigestible paperwork. You can certainly indict the State of Wisconsin for standing idly by while our cities deteriorate and for not taking action to provide land on which public and private people can build. You can certainly indict the suburbs for their selfish ways in not even beginning, with a few rare exceptions, to look at the metropolitan problem as a unitary problem and ask in what ways a serviceable community can be built. Just to complete the description, I would think that the city of Milwaukee could do a little better on reviewing some of its zoning ordinances and seeing if it can't cough up, all on its own, with a little more land, particularly in portions thereof and not represented by your presiding officer.

However, having said all this, there are these hopeful little breakthroughs. Larry Katz, in my judgment, is not talking through his hat when he says that he is pleased by

what's happening in several areas on the outer city and the inner city too. The presence here of two very energetic and public-spirited representatives of the State shows that maybe this message that we're wrapping up here may go back to those who can do something about it at the State level, despite the recalcitrance of the present Legislature.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON HOUSING AND RELOCATION, MRS. DAVID HILLS REPRESENTING MRS. THOMAS KOLSTER, PRESIDENT OF THE MILWAUKEE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

In a study of the problems of relocation in 1966 the Milwaukee League of Women Voters found that compensation in Milwaukee varies depending upon the program for which the dislocation takes place and the very nature of the problem and the people involved results in considerable hardship for those losing their shelter and/or livelihood.

This study followed by consensus from the members lead to our present support position: We support measures to establish equitable compensation and adequate relocation services for businesses and residents displaced by Milwaukee's public purpose programs. We also support a practical well planned program of urban renewal for Milwaukee with emphasis on adequate financing and expediting administration.

This can be accomplished by (a) coordination of the social services now available to relocatees; (b) responsibility by the City for administration of all relocation workloads being center in the city's central planning agency (the Dept. of City Development); and (c) availability of adequate alternative location housing before acquisition and demolition begins for any new programs.

CONSUMER PROBLEMS, AUGUST 15 PANEL WITNESSES

Mrs. Adrienne Davis, Chairman, Wisconsin Consumer League.

Attorney Thomas Jacobson, Consumer Specialist.

Philip G. Rozga, Manager, Financial and Solicitations Division, Milwaukee Better Business Bureau.

Attorney James Hemmer, Consumer Specialist.

John Jackson, State of Wisconsin, Department of Agriculture, Consumer Division.

Attorney Floyd Harris, Consumer Specialist.

Father John Maurice, Director, Spanish Center of Milwaukee.

Mrs. DAVIS. First, I'd like to say that I feel that consumer problems are equally important as all of our other urban problems, housing, unemployment, etc.; and I say this because it has just been very recent that this fact has been recognized. The Kerner's Report by the Governor's Commission played a significant role in bringing this factor to the public's attention; that consumer fraud and exploitation were among the major causes of riots in our cities. It reflected the kind of marketing system confronting low-income consumers, shoddy merchandise, high cost credit, over-priced merchandise and many merchants that exploit their ignorance and their poverty. In general, these are just a few of the abuses and inequities that exist in our society . . . there are many more. As we all know many of these abuses are also used to exploit the more affluent consumers. However, studies have shown that the ugliest manifestations of these abuses have been found in poverty-stricken areas. Therefore, I feel that special attention must be given to the consumer problems of the poor.

There must be more consumer education programs. The schools, I believe, need to become more active in this role . . . in addition to government and community agencies. There are many families who lose their jobs because of garnishments. Overextension of credit leads to such economic reversals such as lawsuits and repossessions and financial stress—in general affects the family stability, school attendance and employability. What I

am trying to illustrate here is that while many agencies are attempting to raise the family income and restrain persons so they can improve themselves much of this is being diverted by excessive finance charges, repossessions and garnishments. Consumer programs can assist in alleviating these situations. This will not be the panacea for all of our urban ills; however, when consumer education is coordinated with, and becomes a part of a concert of effort, it can greatly help families headed for but not yet involved in these situations.

In addition to consumer education more and more effective legislation is needed. I think it is a known fact that much of the deception and fraud that exists would not exist if the unscrupulous merchants were not aware of the fact that they could collect their debts through legal channels. Therefore, it is important to outlaw harsh collection practices. For example . . . the holder in due course—a procedure that allows a finance company or some lending institutions to purchase installment notes from a retailer without any responsibility to the consumer. In situations such as this the consumer has no recourse. If a finance company purchases a contract he should have some responsibility in seeing to it that the goods or services are properly furnished.

The use of deficiency judgments, which allows a retailer to repossess and also collect for his merchandise should also be outlawed. In a situation such as this, often the same items, automobiles especially, are often sold two or three times. I feel that this type of extortion is very detrimental to the consumer and should be eliminated. A law similar to that in California, which allows a creditor either to repossess or sue for the balance of his bill, should be enacted in Wisconsin. Judges and persons in authority in the legal area must begin to scrutinize cases carefully and as Judge Walstead stated "no longer allow the courts to act as collecting agencies for many of our unscrupulous retailers."

I feel that if the spiral of poverty is to be broken consumer problems are going to have to be studied and analyzed and more consumer oriented programs will have to be developed in order to make better use of the dollars currently available to low-income families. Not only is it going to be important to give equal employment opportunities to the black man and other minority groups but it is going to be necessary to guarantee him that his earnings are not stolen from him through the business practices of unethical merchants and outmoded laws.

Mr. JACOBSON. In Wisconsin I would say, based on the experience that I've had in the Attorney General's office as a Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs and working in a law practice that largely draws from the working clientele of this community, the state of the consumer in Wisconsin is very bad. We have to start out with the question in Wisconsin of where does the consumer go to have his problems taken care of?

The first problem that we have is that the department which regulates consumer protection at the State level, is a department which just doesn't sound like the place consumers would go. It's called the Department of Agriculture. I think the fact that we have a department which is called the Department of Agriculture is not the kind of thing that makes logical sense that if you're a consumer and you've got a consumer problem which deals with the market place.

I think we have to start right there to get the consumer protection activities in a logical place at the state level where the person that has consumer problems knows where to go. I take the position it is in the Attorney General's office where we ought to have an Assistant Attorney General that's an expert in consumer problems to be the person who takes care of the consumer at the state level.

Another comment I'd like to make briefly is the fact that our legal system is topsy-turvy in terms of priorities in this entire area of consumer problems. You've got a situation where the law largely only protects the creditors' interests and the debtors' interest are largely unprotected. I think an example of that is a recent case which I was fortunate enough to have a successful conclusion to, at the United States Supreme Court level. That was the Garnishment case. We had such a terrible situation in Wisconsin that we allowed working people to have their wages taken away from them before they even had a hearing as to whether they owed the money or not. There are some laws that are just as harmful as that kind of law.

Mr. REUSS. What was the Supreme Court decision on that garnishment matter?

Mr. JACOBSON. The decision indicated that you're entitled to a hearing, you're entitled to have the opportunity to defend yourself as to whether you owe the money or not before you can have your wages taken away. In other words, you have to have a judgment on the principal action, that is, the action wherein you owe the money. Then you say if you owe it or not, and that has to be litigated. After that's resolved, if in fact you owe the money and you won't pay it, then you can have your wages taken to satisfy the judgment. So that's garnishment after judgment as the result of that decision. The legislature has been inactive on that particular reform. For 10 years there were bills that were introduced to have that law changed and nothing was done. It's time that the citizens and Wisconsin began to get concerned about these problems, to get informed about them, and to begin lobbying legislators and, as the Congressman is doing here, having citizens' hearings so that people can become educated about the kinds of problems and what they can do about them in society today.

Mr. ROZGA. The business community has expressed its vital interest in this area by the formation and support the Better Business Bureau not only in Milwaukee but in 145 major marketing areas in the U.S., Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, Israel and Puerto Rico.

While each Better Business Bureau is an autonomous organization, deriving its financial support from its own local business community, each provides the same services and shares the same dedication to eliminate misrepresentation and deception in the market place for the benefit of the general consuming public and legitimate business.

What later became known as the Better Business Bureau of Greater Milwaukee was established as the Vigilance Committee of the Milwaukee Advertising Club in 1913—one of the first of its kind in America. Voluntarily checking advertising and discussing questionable claims with those who publish them, demonstrates an early local interest in consumer problems. The present non-profit corporate structure, as an independent organization, affiliated with a national network of similar offices took place in 1939.

Today the Better Business Bureau of Greater Milwaukee is a significant factor in the Milwaukee marketing area. It is asked to give information or assistance to more than 500 people each working day.

The services to the general public are provided without charge and are made possible by the financial support we receive from over 1600 local reputable businesses. The work of the Milwaukee Better Business Bureau has gained a reputation of impartiality in the eyes of business, the public and government.

The Better Business Bureau work falls into three main categories. The first is maintaining truth and accuracy in advertising. This is carried out by checking advertised offers for accuracy of description, availability of merchandise or service, violations of Federal, State laws and advertising standards.

When particular advertising problems arise in an industry, the Bureau works with the

industry to draw up standards to eliminate the causes of complaint. Such local standards are in effect for the advertising of appliances, automobile transmission repair, furs, home furnishings, home improvements, mattresses and springs, musical instruments, magazine selling, sewing machines, and tires. These voluntary standards raise the quality of advertising and selling in the industries involved and the believability of advertising generally.

The work of the Better Business Bureau would be much more difficult if it were not for the excellent cooperation we receive from the media. Many ads do not appear in local media because the publisher or broadcaster, after checking with the Better Business Bureau does not feel that carrying the offer would be in the best public interest. When Bureau shopping discloses that an advertisement was misleading, local media does not accept the advertising until the objectionable elements are eliminated.

The second major area of Bureau activity is the handling of complaints where there is evidence of misrepresentation or fraud. Actual instances which fit the classic definition of fraud are rather rare. Misrepresentation or misunderstanding business transactions are much more common.

The Better Business Bureau cannot handle every instance of customer dissatisfaction. In some cases, the facts do not warrant the adjustment which is requested by the complainant. It is our philosophy that when a purchase is made, the terms of the bargain obligate both parties. If the customer does not get what he paid for he has a legitimate complaint.

We realize that there are generally two sides to a story, so, to get all the facts we ask the complainant to give us a brief written outline of the problem. A copy of the complaint is sent to the company with a request for an explanation.

When the complaint is reasonable and the company is reputable, the area of disagreement is easily removed. Some companies make adjustments because they know that the way they handle the problem will be made a matter of record in our files and reported to those who inquire about the firm's reputation. Unfortunately there are some companies who choose to ignore the Better Business Bureau, accepted business principles, and public responsibility. This attitude is noted in Bureau files to warn others of possible problems in dealing with the firm. If the complaints involve violation of governmental regulations the proper authorities are notified. We work in close cooperation with various regulatory agencies. Within the last month we have had contact with the Milwaukee and suburban police departments, the Milwaukee County District Attorney, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, the Wisconsin Department of Justice, the Wisconsin Real Estate Examining Board, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Post Office Department.

The third function, and perhaps the most relevant to this hearing, is the Better Business Bureau's providing of factual information on a firm's reputation. Last year, our office had more than 100,000 contacts with the general public. Less than 10% of these were complaints, the balance were requests for reports on companies, offers, or solicitations.

The Better Business Bureau does not recommend or endorse any firm or organization. We provide factual information which the inquirer can use to help make intelligent purchasing decisions.

The type of information contained in a Bureau report generally includes: the date the company was founded, the name of the principal, the exact nature of the business, whether we have had complaints and whether they were adjusted. If the complaints are of a serious nature more detail concerning the problems are given. We frequently also provide general information regarding an indus-

try or offer when previous experience indicates the need.

Using this information saves Milwaukee consumers millions of dollars and annually directs the money into legitimate business channels.

As an adjunct to informing the public on specific companies it is our responsibility to help educate the public on sound customer practices. This program is implemented through consumer education pamphlets, posters for employers bulletin boards, talks to groups ranging from high school students to senior citizens, and warnings which appear in various media.

It is the belief of the Better Business Bureau of Greater Milwaukee and of our association, based on millions of contacts with the consuming public, that the most effective form of consumer protection is actually consumer education. There appears to be no end to the laws which have been proposed in the name of consumer protection. However, there is also no end to the number of ways an uninformed consumer can waste his money on unwise expenditures. Only a wise consumer can make the proper decision in choosing among the countless alternatives for his limited funds.

John F. Kennedy, our late President, said this about the BBB: By serving the public as a clearinghouse of factual information about business practices affecting the consumer, the Better Business Bureaus throughout the country effectively express the business community's sense of responsibility for high ethical standards and integrity in trade practices and business-consumer relations.

The work of the Bureau in the past is only a foundation for the work of the future.

Mr. HEMMER. There has been talk about too much credit and too little talk, I think, about too little responsibility in the buyer. Instead of using the word responsibility, those who have criticized this extension of credit heretofore have used naivete on the part of the buyer, and lack of education on the part of the buyer as a rationale. Young though I may be, I still feel the best school is the one born of experience.

It seems to me that we can train our young people in this matter of credit in our schools. Most of them will do as they do, unfortunately, in most other things. They'll memorize for the test and then forget the next day exactly what they did learn, if anything. I feel that experience is a most important thing in the matter of learning how to use credit. Like it or not, I feel that part of the learning process in this business of wise use of credit is that the buyer buy too much, in other words that he not meet his responsibility to himself, primarily to his family.

I spoke of this last night and I said: "Which is it? Too much credit being issued by the seller or too little responsibility on the part of the buyer?" My wife's comment, and rightly so, was: "I think it's a little bit of each."

But we're living in an age when we use euphemisms, pretty words to say other things. Now what do we mean when we talk about consumers?

We're not really talking about consumers, we're talking about people. And when we talk about people, we're talking about these people in their ability to control their own actions. It's their personal responsibility to themselves, to their families, to the citizens that they abide with, to control their actions so as to conform to the standards. We're also talking here, interestingly enough, but I must say this, about a third party force here, a committee force, either on the federal level or, as Mr. Thomas Jacobson just referred, on the state level perhaps through the Agriculture Department or preferably through another more aptly named agency. It is force which is being imposed upon this whole bit of conduct, and I submit that we're either going to end up with people who abide by

rules which are superimposed on them, or as I would prefer it, if possible, would abide the common sense dictates of their own experiences with their own families.

There's a cliché going about which has to be knocked down, and that is simply this business of an overextension of credit. An overextension of credit as it's used demands one of two things, one of two extremes, or maybe my wife would have me put this in the middle again.

It seems to me that it demands absolute innocence on the part of the consumer when he makes the purchases, or absolute stupidity in not being able to understand what he is doing to himself, his family, and, by the way, his community. If we can't expect intelligent buying of our citizenry, how in the name of heaven can we expect an intelligent vote? And I really feel that involved in this discussion innocently enough, certainly not deliberately, is the suggestion that the average John Q. American doesn't know how to buy. I don't agree with this. I think he does. I would submit that those people who buy in an unintelligent way must reckon with the consequences.

I would agree that if those consequences are harsh and cruel, as a legal matter before the court, that these things ought to be tempered, obviously. But the consequences of naivete, that might not even smack of innocence, but of deliberate overbuying, exists as much as deliberate overselling.

Mr. REUSS. I would give you one tentative answer, Mr. Hemmer, to the question you posed of how you expect voters to vote intelligently in a democracy and yet how some people think buyers, consumers, need some help. The media, the newspapers and the television, do an excellent job of zeroing in on politicians. The voters really know quite a bit about us. On the other hand, when it comes to commodities and selling practices, very little interest, very little information seems to me to be given to the public. Therefore, if we and the public are put in complete possession of the impartial facts by the newspapers and TV and radio, maybe we wouldn't need to be concerned about the consumer problem. I don't think, however, that we've reached that millennium yet.

Mr. JACKSON. I feel that education is a very, very important part that needs to be played in consumer affairs. As I said, education should start on consumer affairs in junior high school. If you start teaching your youngsters how to save and buy, how to control their money, by the time they get out of junior high school and out of high school, then you have a very responsible young individual.

I find that most of the people get caught up in a bind financially due to the fact that they've done quite a little buying simply because they didn't know how to purchase their merchandise. Most of the problems that the consumer confronts are really too small to take to court and he cannot really afford to go to court with these problems.

We don't in the Dept. of Agriculture, try to play the part of lawyers. When we have a case, we usually try to do a mediation job. If we find that there was a case of fraud, then we use our legal battery to counteract this sort of thing. If you don't deal with the consumer when he has his problem, he's not going to pursue it any further. I would think, too, that most of the people, merchants and consumers, are not really trying to beat anybody. You have people, merchants, who really want to be gyp merchants travelling from one state to another. They'll move out of Wisconsin and move over to another state. People in Wisconsin say "that's not my problem." But what happened to the other fellow in the other state who runs to Wisconsin? This makes it their problem.

I think that we're talking here today about what the federal government can do for consumer complaints or consumer problems. If this is the case, I think the federal

government should come up with some federal laws that are meaningful, that have enough teeth, to say that it will do a job for the consumer. Seemingly, each state has its own set of statutes that have to deal with merchants.

I further emphasize that you do have some honest merchants that are not trying to beat these people. They are not going to leave one state to the other. But your gyp merchants are running all over the country. And we are going to get our share of them. This means that we will have to deal with them.

The question is: "What is an intelligent consumer? What is a wise consumer?"

It seems to me that a wise consumer is one that can exercise good sound judgment, common sense. Now where do you acquire good judgment and common sense? I spent 7 years in college and I never saw them teaching it. I think I saw very few people who didn't have it, acquired it merely through the process of education. I don't think you can legislate it. I don't think you can teach common sense.

Congressman, you said that the newspapers don't devote enough lineage in their papers to consumer problems, and perhaps you are right.

I think we can make an analogy with a pigeon drop. Does a month go by that you don't pick up a newspaper and read at least one case of a pigeon drop? This type of situation gets a lot of publicity if the cycle continues. Why? Because people are gullible.

A wise consumer knows he doesn't get anything for nothing. He's lucky if he gets what he pays for. He's not getting more than that and he may get less.

As a practicing Attorney I represent both creditors and consumer, but basically I represent creditors. Obviously, over a number of years, I have been involved in situations that have resulted in misunderstandings between the users of credit and the dispensers of credit. Sometimes this misunderstanding has given rise to stress between these two groups.

Generally speaking, I feel these two groups seldom come together as equals. Most often the seller of merchandise or the grantor of credit is more sophisticated in the ways of credit transactions.

But from my viewpoint, this apparent disparity is really the seller's edge to protect himself against the one unknown factor that exists in every credit extension which is whether the buyer really intends to honor his contract? Does he intend to pay? The only one who knows this is the consumer.

In very recent months federal and state legislation has been enacted and more soon probably will be enacted to correct certain supposed evils in current credit practices. Some of this legislation seems to have originated from those who rightly or wrongly seek to protect those people who are believed unable to protect themselves.

I am not suggesting that this is inherently wrong but I do maintain that in attempting to attack certain abuses of credit that have been committed by an extremely small number of merchants and loan companies, laws that have served good and salutary purposes over many generations have suddenly been denied the responsible merchants without any corresponding new relief given to them. In other words, you've got to correct the abuses committed by a very few. Effective collection remedies that were available to all creditors have been taken away with nothing to replace them.

I suggest that if legislators want to rid the credit world of certain credit abuses and practices, then the federal approach in accomplishing such an aim would be to legislate against these practices, not to deny all classes of creditors their effective collection remedies.

Rev. MAURICE. The problem of the gyp merchant easy finance and high pressure door

to door salesman have long been documented in this state. It is obvious that even present legislation is not adequate to protect the consumer.

However I would like to speak to another aspect of the problem. The lack of alternatives. People who have been taken advantage of for a long time may well know the merchant or finance company is giving them a bad deal—but where else can they go? Who will extend credit? There is no bank in the neighborhood, the supermarkets are fast disappearing, the "reputable" stores no longer exist in the inner city.

It is easier to buy new merchandise on easy credit than to buy serviceable items at the Good Will or St. Vincent de Paul Stores. You do business with the merchant who welcomes you—even if you suspect he may be gouging you.

It seems to me that one of the real answers is self run cooperatives and expansion of Credit Unions to offer a real alternative. You can't do it through consumer education alone. Why tell a person the risks of high cost credit etc., if you don't offer him a place where he can do business.

What is needed are federal guarantees or direct funds to back up high risk loans made by community Credit Unions.

Second—a real thrust must be made to offer subsidies and expertise for the establishment of neighborhood consumer cooperatives. Consumer cooperatives in food, drugs, and appliances could easily be established if organizers were trained to do the initial organizing. Funds would be needed to help with initial capitalization.

These alternatives do work. El Centro Credit Union and the North Side Community Credit Union are proof positive. The rapid growth of the Thrift Coop on Milwaukee's south side, the first "direct charge consumer grocery coop in the U.S. is another positive proof that there are alternatives to the gyp merchant.

Coops and Credit Unions have one overwhelming advantage, they keep and develop economic power within the community of the people they serve. They become the practical training ground for economic responsibility and they directly involve the poor in planning for their own future.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON CONSUMER PROBLEMS

Mrs. WILLIAM S. MEYER. Mr. Congressman, I have had the experience of going into a food store, and I found that there was frozen meat, particularly pork chops, in with the fish. How long these chops are frozen I don't know. I was afraid to take them home.

Also I have taken lunch meat that looks fresh, got it home, put it in the refrigerator soon as I get in, and couple days later I take it out and can't eat it because of how long it's been around.

So I think if you package meat and put a stamp on which tells the price, poundage and date, I think they would help a lot of us pick out foods that are right for our family.

Mr. JACKSON. I am in perfect agreement with the young lady. I think that meat should be dated. All perishables should be dated so that the customer can realize what's going on. Stores do in fact date many things, but most mainly people don't know what the code date really means.

Mrs. FLORA SEEFELDT. Mr. Congressman, I guess my whole thing was when you were talking about how garnishment law works. I know five people who were garnished for things that weren't fair. One Christmas ago a family didn't get a check because the father was garnished. Later they found out that he wasn't the guy that was supposed to be garnished. He can sue but he has to pay the attorney and has to go through all those different things, and it didn't serve any purpose to go through all those channels. Still, his family has suffered because there is a law that says that they can garnish somebody

by that name without even knowing who the person is.

I think that's one reason why it would be good to have it so that people cannot just be garnished without knowing who is who or whether I am really guilty of the crime they are accusing me of.

Mrs. MAURICE LERNER. Mr. Congressman, I happen to have the opportunity to be in the back of meat department of the A&P, and it was interesting to me that they had great big blocks of frozen meats that came in and these great big blocks of frozen meat were run through the grinder. This is their ground beef. Now I was always under the impression that you couldn't refreeze meat.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it labeled ground beef or did you have any suspicion that it was not beef?

Mrs. LERNER. I take it for granted it was beef. It still shouldn't be frozen, it seems to me, and sold as ground beef. From now on I do not buy ground beef in any chain store.

Mr. JACKSON. The state tells you you can have 25% fat in ground beef.

Mrs. LERNER. 25% fat?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mrs. LERNER. Wow.

TAXES AND TAX REFORM, AUGUST 15

PANEL WITNESSES

Professor Richard Trestrail, Marquette University

Joseph Petska, Milwaukee County Property Owners Association

Richard Glaman, Fiscal Liaison Department, City of Milwaukee

Donald Buzar, First Wisconsin Trust Company

James Behling, President, Milwaukee Citizens for Tax Reform

Dr. Arthur Becker, Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

Professor TRESTRAIL. We are now in one of those infrequent periods in our history in which a reasonably wide-ranging revision of the federal income tax code is politically feasible. When the new code emerges from the Congressional battlefield, we will likely find that at least some modest tax reductions have been programmed for low and middle income taxpayers, some tax avoidance avenues eliminated or reduced in scope—and quite possibly some new tax avoidance avenues created.

Hopefully, the new code may on balance prove to be a significant improvement. It should better satisfy the sense of equity of most of the public, at least temporarily, and may also promote more efficient use of resources in the private sector. But the tax reform movement is primarily a political struggle to reapportion an overall tax burden which most of the public regards as excessive. Tax reform measures designed to both reduce taxes and also reduce the need for public expenditures would clearly be superior to most of the reform measures currently being proposed.

I would suggest that a tax reform measure which would be close to ideal would be one which would simultaneously encourage a socially desirable investment activity, reduce the need for public expenditures, and allow citizens to reduce their own tax bill by acting in a way which would also reduce their neighbor's tax bill. If such a measure would also tend to reduce the pressures for additional federal tax revenues for the purpose of revenue sharing with state and local governments, it would be even more desirable.

I propose that the Congress seriously consider a tax reform concept which would not only have the foregoing virtues, but would also serve to widen freedom of opportunity for our younger citizens, and to improve the overall quality of education in the United States. The concept concerned is an investment tax credit limited to investments in human capital. The specific concept is an investment tax credit for tuition payments made to accredited private schools for edu-

cation and training courses which are also offered in publicly supported schools at taxpayer expense. I do not propose any specific level of credit nor any specific limitation on amount, but only that the Congress give serious consideration to the concept.

Mr. PETSKA. I should like to confine myself to the discussion of reforms in local taxes only, since that is the field in which we are working.

We do know, however, that reform on the state and national level are also very much needed.

If the tax on any level is inequitable, it is at fault and due for a change.

I have been called a liberal and also a conservative at the same time. Actually, I am just that.

There are times, when we must be liberal and at times conservative, although the meaning of these words is quite vague.

When we are liberal, we should also be liberal with our own money and not only with the other fellow's money.

On the other hand, when we are conservative, we should also be conservative with the other fellow's and not only our own.

Some of our local officials are very anxious for tax reforms on the local level and we are quite happy over that. However, they are accused of making hay for themselves. The fact of the matter is, that those who are dragging their feet have for the past many years been making hay at the property owners' expense, and did nothing for the property owners, and wish to continue doing just that while the sun shines on their form of unfair and oppressive tax structure.

The policies of the Milwaukee County Property Owners' Association are:

1. Economy in Government.
2. A better tax structure. (Do away with the single tax plan.)

These two policies have served as the ground work in our association for the past twelve years.

Generally speaking, we have made gains in spreading the knowledge of a need for a better tax plan.

In the matter of holding down the property tax, we have also been effective to some degree by applying the brakes.

Our tax plan has taken on a national trend. 170 cities in the country have since 1960 moved into the non-property tax for local government.

Mr. GLAMAN. I consider the topic of taxes and tax reform to be the most single pressing domestic issue in our country today. I say this because taxes represent resources and we cannot solve any of the problems, particularly the urban problems of this country without the resources.

Certainly the question of resources is far and away the most pressing problem facing the City of Milwaukee government today. Without resources we cannot eliminate our slums. Without resources we cannot provide the necessary housing to give everyone a decent home in a decent environment. Without resources, we cannot improve the quality of our educational system. Without resources we cannot hire enough law enforcement personnel to make it safe to walk the streets of our city. To put it bluntly, we cannot solve any of our urban problems without resources.

Mayor Maiser has been engaged in a crusade for resources for several years now, but he has been fighting an uphill fight. His demands for fiscal justice have been frequently portrayed as an attack upon our suburban neighbors and upon state government. Yet, his fight has been the same fight that is being conducted in almost every central city in the country today. For practically every central city is facing the same problems as Milwaukee. The problems of the central cities have been aggravated by the flight of the more affluent citizens to the suburbs. Under our existing laws, particularly those in the State of Wisconsin, the central city finds itself at a disadvantage compared to its surrounding suburbs. I am speaking particularly

about the shared tax system in Wisconsin. Anyone who looks objectively at the shared tax system in Wisconsin cannot help but come to the conclusion that we need a revision of this system. I do not intend to go into the present inequities in our shared tax system at great length. I think most of you are familiar with these inequities; but let me cite just a few.

Probably the most definitive study ever done of the Milwaukee area is contained in a report to the Advisory Commission in Intergovernmental Relations. The report is entitled, "Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities." The section done on the disparities in the Milwaukee metropolitan area was by John Riew of Pennsylvania State University. I would like to quote a little from Professor Riew's report. "Milwaukee's revenue base is deteriorating and the urban fringe exhibits sharp differences between the industrial and the high and low income residential suburbs. Wisconsin localities derive 99.9% of their tax revenue from the property tax. This tax, high in cities and towns generally, rises abruptly inside the Milwaukee borders.

Wisconsin is known for sharing funds with local governments. Yet, this generosity is upside down from the standpoint of equalization. The rich industrial communities get \$314 per capita, the high income suburbs get \$161 and Milwaukee proper is low man with \$88. It would be hard to devise a more perverse effect on local government financing and the direct result is inter-local balkanization and ferocious fiscal zoning.

In another place, Professor Riew notes that the suburbs spend considerably more per capita on most municipal services, but their high per capita valuation and high share of state revenues together outweigh the differences in expenditures and thus permit low local tax rates. He particularly singled out the City of Oak Creek, with its exceptionally high state shared utility tax which permits it to finance all its local services and a large part of the county tax levy out of its cash fund. Oak Creek does not have to levy a property tax for municipal purposes. The same report cited the great disparity in state school aids between those received by the City of Milwaukee and its surrounding suburbs. Again I quote from the same report.

Surprisingly, however, school aid places the central city in the least favored class. The per pupil aid received by the central city was even lower than the mean per pupil aid for the high income residential suburbs. The disadvantage of the central city is more striking in terms of per capita aid. The per capita aid for the central city was barely one-fourth the amount received by the low income residential suburbs and approximately one-third for the medium income residential income suburbs. Why is it, one may wonder, that the central city with the lowest per capita valuation falls so poorly in school aid?"

One final quote from the report is, "Great fiscal disparities we have already noted exist among the municipalities of the Milwaukee metropolitan area. We now observe that the state's shared tax programs significantly aggravate the situation."

The report had some recommendations for state action. They were: (1) Improve distribution of tax money (2) Use ability to pay as the criterion for education aid (3) Coordinate state aid to localities, and (4) Give more aid for spill-over functions.

Under the last one, the report stated, "The central city needs a fairer deal from the state in shared taxes and aids. It needs more active state and federal help with those public functions whose benefits spill over city boundaries such as health and welfare, highway and education."

I could go on at great length to cite the inequities in the present state shared tax formula. However, I think this final example will suffice. The Wisconsin Electric Power Company is building a nuclear generating plant in the town of Two Creeks in Mani-

towoc County. This generating plant will cost in the neighborhood of \$122 million. The Town of Two Creeks has a population of about 458 and is mostly farm land. It raised about \$65,000 a year from local property taxes to pay for services provided by the town. Under the present state shared utility tax formula, the Town of Two Creeks would get about \$2 million a year in state shared utility taxes. This amounts to more than \$4,000 per person. The City of Milwaukee gets less than \$8 per person, per year in state shared utility taxes. What is the Town of Two Creeks going to do with all this money? Send out checks every year instead of tax bills?

Now I would like to call to your attention another report. This report was done by Tempo. Tempo is the General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies at Santa Barbara, California. The report is entitled, "Options for Meeting the Revenue Needs of City Governments." It was published in January, 1967 for the National League of Cities. The report stated that the cities of this country were facing a revenue gap of \$262 billion in the next ten years. This revenue gap is the difference between what city governments will be receiving in revenue from their normal tax sources and what they will need to continue their existing level of services.

In discussing funding sources, the report said that states show increasing potential over localities while the federal government has the greatest potential for raising revenues equitably and efficiently. It says that states with their broader tax bases can put together more acceptable tax packages than cities and because their revenue needs are rising less rapidly than those of the cities, state aid to cities could be increased by 50% in the next decade.

The report also finds "That in practice there has been little effort made by states to aid in solving problems unique to urban areas."

The Tempo report also has some comments about the local property tax. The report states that in actuality, there is no direct correspondence between property taxes paid and community services received. To the extent that revenues raised by increased property taxes are used to solve today's most pressing problems renewal of slums and improvement of the conditions and abilities of slum dwellers the net effect would be to impel out-movements of middle and upper income families and business enterprises and in-movements of low income groups with little capital or skills and a wide range of problems.

The report also says that assuming no major increase in defense budget requirements, it is feasible over the next ten years to increase federal appropriations to city governments by \$125 billion. This amount would be equal to 40% of the uncommitted estimated incremental federal tax revenues in this period. The Tempo report finds "That federal funding on this scale is absolutely essential for making real as opposed to token progress in solving urban problems."

The Tempo report also has a section on administering federal aid to cities. This section notes that tradition in this country assigns responsibility for the government of cities to the states. I would like to quote from a portion of this section.

"There are compelling reasons for not allowing the states to administer or even to decide how to allocate federal funds intended to aid localities. If given power to administer such funds as they see fit, it is naive to believe that the states would not divert some of the funds to other uses. Nor, is it enough that the states be given functional instructions in how to use these funds—that is, instructions on how much money is to be spent on community health programs, education, urban beautification and so on, but left complete freedom in allocating funds among the cities."

The report says that federal funds could be distributed by the states on a population basis, but says this procedure is defective because it makes no allowance for differences among cities in fiscal needs and capacities. As a result, the report says it would short change cities with relatively high per capita fiscal needs and relatively low fiscal capacities.

I think the Tempo report is significant at this time because of the obvious tendency of the present federal administration to channel federal funds through state governments. I think the mayors of the larger cities in the nation are justifiably fearful that their cities will be short changed if the federal money is administered through the states. I think the Congress should look very closely at President Nixon's revenue sharing proposal. I think safeguards should be built into the proposal to make sure that cities get their rightful share of this revenue.

In closing, I would like to say something that has been said many times, by many people recently. That is, that it is time this country gives as high a priority to the problems of our cities as it gives to reaching the moon or subsidizing agriculture.

Mr. BUZARD. I want to address my preliminary comments on a very narrow area which is covered by the reform bill of 1969 recently enacted by the House, and now before the Senate for consideration. I think certainly the House Ways and Means Committee and the House is to be complimented for the rather monumental tax reform that they have started. They have some excellent provisions but I'd like to be critical of two things.

I agree with what assistant Secretary Cohen called the bill when he called it the "Lawyers and Accountant Relief Act of 1969." It's very complex; but I don't know how it can be avoided.

Seriously, I would like to criticize what is being done to the charitable foundations and to charitable contributions by individuals. I think the Congress, the House, has over-reacted, perhaps dangerously, to some rather well publicized abuses by private foundations and the use of their funds. Perhaps they are overreacting to some of the publicity of very wealthy individuals who through giving money to charities avoid paying any taxes at all.

The existing laws provide an indirect subsidy to voluntary charities, to private charities, health and welfare and educational charities, such as United Fund, hospitals, colleges and universities, the fine arts, our music hall, conservation, and many other areas.

Now some of these services are so essential that if they are not covered by voluntary contributions, our tax dollars would have to cover instead. Others provide seed money for programs which if they prove to be attractive often are adopted by governmental units. Sometimes these private, voluntary, charitable organizations provide leadership in unpopular areas that serve a common good. By making it attractive from the tax standpoint to support these voluntary activities and to contribute to these charities, the charities are the ones who benefit.

Very often it's the wealthy individuals who are in a position to support them. The cost of collecting money is simple to understand. It's easier to get a \$3,000 gift than 30 \$100 gifts or 300 \$10 gifts. It is often that the persons best able to give are the ones who are giving. There is a tax benefit but the benefit in the last analysis goes on to the charity. In removing this tax subsidy you are punishing the charity.

The Wall Street Journal, analyzing the bill, quoted from the House report that the tax on the income of private foundations was raised \$75 to \$100,000,000 a year. That may not seem like much but I think that \$75 to \$100 million comes out from voluntary support for worthwhile charities. They also are

putting limitations on individuals' rights to give in the sense that appreciated property which has been a very special advantage to wealthy individuals is removed as a tax incentive charitable device, as are bargain sales and certain other devices.

I agree completely with the House that they should cure the abuses. The abuses of self dealing and the use of foundations, not for charitable purposes at all but for the private benefit of people who create them. Or to be punitive to foundations that don't distribute their income, but which are really engaged in business activities and have large business holdings. But on balance I think they have made a mistake, and are going to penalize a very important part of our whole national structure by what they have proposed.

I urge upon you and your Colleagues, when you have an opportunity, to consider amendments after the bill comes out of conference, to reconsider this.

Mr. REUSS. As you pointed out, I agree with you that the tax reform package put through the House is a great step forward, but only half a loaf in terms of what I would have liked to have seen. On foundations, I have to say that I don't think that foundations should quite go home completely tax free.

The House bill I believe put a tax of 7½ percent of their income. That doesn't really bother me perhaps as much as you would like to have it bother me, but I will now add that there were in the foundation package many provisions which I think are objectionable, including one which would impede the work of many very legitimate and bona fide foundations. That's the provision that says they may not engage in anything which effects economic or political or social affairs. That's just carrying things much too far. There have been some foundations that abused it, but I would hope, with you, that we can rationalize that and improve it before it finally gets through.

Mr. BEHLING. The tax bill has been described by Congressmen, the press and so forth as "the most far-reaching tax reform bill in decades," perhaps ever. The bill, it seems, would offer some substantial relief to the low income taxpayer. It does promise to close numerous loop-holes which wealthy individuals and corporations have exploited through the years.

However, there is one group that the bill slights. That is the largest tax-paying group of all, the middle income group.

When campaigning last summer and fall for the presidency, Richard Nixon talked of America's forgotten people. The silent majority, he said, "must at last be served." Mr. Nixon promised to serve that group, if elected. Of course every election has its own campaign rhetoric, but still there were the forgotten people. America's silent majority would receive some long over-due consideration in Washington.

If this summer's tax reform efforts are any example, it seems to me that President Nixon, as well as Republican and Democratic legislators, have again forgotten to remember America's forgotten people.

This isn't too surprising though is it?

It's easy for Washington to forget the middle income tax-payer, the man earning between \$7000 and \$25,000 a year.

Through our recent urban and educational turmoil the middle income people have generally remained law-abiding, perhaps afraid, certainly reluctant to make waves. Based on that good behavior history it was natural that Congress forgot to give real tax relief to the middle income taxpayer. After all, and unfortunately, our society rewards the loud squawker, not the quiet talker these days.

But what about those claims that the tax reform bill is in fact a bonanza for the middle income group?

Let's see what the bill really does.

It is written that the bill promises the middle income taxpayer a great reduction

over a period of a couple of years averaging somewhere around 5 percent. That same 5 percent reduction would also go to those in the 75 to 100,000 dollar bracket and somehow that doesn't seem quite equitable. Those in lower income areas will receive substantial rate reductions, between 60 and 12 percent for those earning between \$1,700, the official poverty level, and \$7,000 annually. This is fine. No arguments. Low income people should get substantial tax relief. And of course it's in from a political standpoint, push hard for the disadvantaged.

But other than that 5 percent rate reduction, what other relief does the bill really offer the middle income taxpayer, the guy who pays this nation's bills and doesn't complain perhaps loudly enough?

While others would cash in on the gold and the tax reform gold mine, the middle income taxpayer if you will allow the analogy, will be left with the shaft. But it's a tricky gold-plated shaft. This is the main point. The standard deduction according to the House bill would be raised from \$1,000 to \$2,000 annually. That sounds great until you remember that the majority of middle income taxpayers and a solid majority in our Milwaukee community own their own homes. That means they have soaring property taxes and that means also that they are paying interest payments on their mortgages. That, in turn, means they itemize their deductions and those who itemize are affected not at all by any increase in a standard deduction.

In reality the standard deduction reform is an empty bucket to homeowners.

Our group, Citizens for Tax Reform, has been striving for four basic reforms. They include plugging loop-holes and increasing the standard deduction. And these reforms, for the most part, are included in the House bill and for those favors we're appreciative. But the other two goals have been ignored: Tax relief for parents in paying for their children's higher education, and most important, an increase in the per dependent exemption allowance. The six hundred dollar exemption allowance, the figure enacted shortly after World War II, has not been changed for more than 20 years. But through the years inflation has eroded the value of that \$600, while the cost of living has doubled in the last 20 or so years. The taxpayer has been stuck with the same \$600 a year for dependents.

The injustice is painfully obvious and the reform is just as obvious and I don't see quite why the House has over-looked it. Raise the per-dependent exemption to \$1,200 and that's over a period of six years if necessary: \$700 in 1971, \$800 in 1972 and so forth to \$1,200 in 1976. Now wouldn't that be a nice birthday present on our 200th anniversary?

This reform would touch all the people but it would especially help medium and large size middle-income families.

In summary, the middle-income taxpayer, especially the home-owner, receives little significant relief from the proposed tax reform bill.

If the Federal government does not offer tax reforms giving significant relief to homeowners the financial crisis of our cities can become only more acute, and our urban quality of life will continue to deteriorate. Mr. Reuss, is Congress ready to accept that responsibility?

Mr. Reuss. I subscribe 100% to the criticism you make. Now if you think it's a little odd that I, as a Congressman, accept that criticism, if you'll reflect a minute on how the Congressional process works, I think you will see how it is possible.

You should bear in mind that two days before this so-called tax reform bill came to the floor, the Ways and Means Committee had not included in it any relief at all for the \$8,000 to \$15,000 a year income group. It was only when some of us dug in our heels

and said that we're going to vote against this bill that the Ways and Means Committee belatedly put in the very, very modest reduction in the rate bracket.

The moral is that the work you and your tax reform associates have started on has got to continue. This is simply a first installment. I wish you would feel encouraged that your first time at bat has produced what everybody said was impossible and what has not been accomplished in a quarter of a century, namely the beginnings of tax reform.

But you and I can agree completely that this first go at it is hopelessly inadequate and must be merely the first installment on a reformation of our entire tax system.

So I accept your criticism. I don't think it's in any way intemperate, and you encourage me to continue my efforts to secure really meaningful tax reform. I think everything you've said is a valid criticism. About all I can add is that we might have had nothing. We do have something and that is at least a start.

Dr. BECKER. The overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives last week in passing the Tax Reform Act of 1969 reflects the mood of the American taxpayer. It is hoped that the Senate will be equally sensitive to taxpayers' wishes when the bill is considered by that body this fall.

I applaud the efforts at tax reform embodied in H.R. 13270. There are very few provisions with which I disagree. Indeed, the bill represents a remarkably large package assembled in a very short time. I would hope that other tax reform measures will be forthcoming later. It is to this next step that I wish to address myself today. Because of time restrictions, I shall be able to do little more than to list some suggestions that I feel are of considerable importance for a second round of federal tax reform.

A. Suggestions for reforming the individual income tax:

1. *The income tax base should be broadened to include most if not all government transfer payments as well as many fringe benefits.* The inclusion of government transfer payments involves social security, unemployment insurance, veterans', and health and welfare benefits. This will add about \$30 billion to gross taxable income.

2. *Interest on all state and local bonds should be taxable.* The complete elimination of the exemption of such bonds would achieve uniform tax treatment and avoid complications and some probable unintended results.

3. *The additional exemptions allowed for the aged and blind should be eliminated.* With the present deduction allowed for medical expenses, the proposed increase in standard and minimum deductions, the lowering of tax rates, and considering the many other groups of handicapped taxpayers, these additional exemptions for the aged and blind are not justified. This would add more than \$2 billion to gross taxable income.

4. *Allow the deduction of interest paid only, (a) on loans to finance business or investment, and (b) up to the amount of property and business income reported.* This provision would broaden the tax base and increase equity between renters and homeowners, cash and credit consumers, as well as low income and high income (who benefit most with the interest deduction) consumers.

5. *Restrict deductions for philanthropic contributions by: (a) tightening upon the very liberal variety of organizations for which contributions may be eligible for deductions, and (b) allowing itemized deductions for contributions only if in excess of 3% of adjusted gross income (the average for middle bracket taxpayers) with total deduction limited to perhaps 30% of adjusted gross income.*

6. *Limit the depreciation of all eligible income producing property to only a single*

depreciation life. This will lower the rentals of older housing for low income families, take the profit out of slums, and stimulate private renewal. This restriction should apply to the corporation income tax as well.

7. *Allow the homeowner to have his property taxes withheld from his wages or salary.* This will help the homeowner avoid the financial hardship and inconvenience that he now faces in trying to pay his property tax when it falls due. The property tax is the only major tax which must be paid deliberately in one or at most twelve large payments. The burden and difficulties in paying his property tax is thus greater than that of paying his income tax, which is withheld from his wages or salary, even though his income tax obligation may be several times as large.

B. Suggestions for reforming the tax treatment of tax-exempt organizations.

1. *Tighten up on the definition of tax-exempt organizations.* Many of them give unfair competition to tax-paying organizations and by encouraging the growth of these tax-exempt organizations, the federal, state and local tax bases are further seriously eroded. This applies particularly to some charitable, fraternal and educational organizations. Many of those do not primarily serve the poor and tax-exempt status for them will not increase welfare burdens significantly.

2. *Business income not directly related to the primary purpose of exempt organizations, including churches, should be subject to corporation income tax rates.* This should apply as well on business property and firms owned by tax exempt organizations and leased-back to the former owners or leased to new owners.

C. *Capital gains should be taxed at death on the increased value of assets left by the deceased.* His capital gains tax liability should be based on the assumption that he sold his assets at the time of his death. This provision will eliminate the tax advantage of the estate whose capital gains are never realized compared with those whose capital gains are realized as the estate is built up.

D. Suggestions for reforming estate and gift taxes:

1. *Integrate gift taxes with estate taxes into a single tax on the (non-sale) transfer of property. An alternative is to include gifts along with other transfer payments in the individual income tax base.*

2. *Trust transfers of property should be taxable as is the case with outright transfers.*

3. *Increase the present estate tax rates moderately and distribute a percentage of the tax yield to those states that repeal their own inheritance, gift, and estate taxes.* The percentage should be large enough to return to states amounts that exceed, by perhaps 25 percent, the average yield of present state transfer taxes. Present state efforts at taxing estates, inheritances and gifts has led to gross administrative difficulties and serious inequities, including that in which several states as well as the federal government may tax the same base several times over depending upon the nature of the estate and its geographical distribution.

The above suggestions are designed to resolve in a more satisfactory way many problems of the tax structure which are inequitable, unduly burdensome, promote slums and interfere with incentive to work and invest. Action to meet these problems is long overdue. I hope these suggestions will be helpful in directing such action.

Mr. REUSS. Let me pull together what's been said. I think the valuable thing about this panel is we've had a variety of different interests represented, Mr. Pettska, whose first love is the home-owner, the real-estate taxpayer. I don't blame him for his concern there. Mr. Glamon, who represents the harassed central city which is trying to keep its

nose above water. Mr. Behling and Professor Becker who are interested in an equitable federal tax system, of which the first step is plugging-loopholes so that you can get the revenue where you must. Professor Trestrail and Mr. Buzard who testified about various specialized aspects of this.

I think we can all agree that we're going to need in this country a federal-state and local government system. We aren't going to change that system. We can also agree that government ought to do at various levels those things for its people which need to be done and that it ought to do it with economy and efficiency, not wasting one penny but doing the job that has to be done. I commend for instance Mr. Petska because he does not come here and say "Let the city of Milwaukee stop collecting trash." Sure you could save a few dollars by doing that, but that doesn't solve the problem of the people of Milwaukee who need those services.

So our problem is largely taking a look at the total federal, state and local tax and governmental systems and see how we can come to grips with some of these problems like saving the central city, saving the overburdened home-owners before he loses his home and gives up in despair, and saving the middle-income taxpayer who has had to bear too large a portion of the total.

Here again I would like to commend Mr. Behling for his statement that when a tax break was given, as it was in this Congressional bill, to the lowest income taxpayer, that didn't bother him in the least. Those people are not necessarily his clients, but he recognizes the justice of taking care of them. What he objects to is the fact that others, mainly in the \$8,000 to \$15,000 bracket, have not been adequately taken care of.

Putting all of these things together, and throwing in revenue-sharing by the federal government with state and local governments which President Nixon tentatively proposed recently. Where are we? Obviously, nowhere if all the federal government is going to do is to pass out money to the states, saying "All right, here is some money for you to distribute."

There is going to be no incentives for the states, including the State of Wisconsin, to improve the equity of the structure. The State of Wisconsin returns a very important income tax return to a wealthy suburb like River Hills, whereas a poor city or town doesn't come in for that. Equally, the State of Wisconsin, as the Tarr report shows, gives to its small communities which happen to have big public utilities like Cassville in Grant County, very large returns, whereas the rest of the state goes hungry.

Unless the State of Wisconsin and the other 49 states are going to reform themselves and their relations with their local governments, it seems to me we're never going to get the fair systems of taxation and expenditure policy that we all need.

Therefore I'll put to the panel this proposition. I would hope that in Federal revenue-sharing, which we are probably going to get in the years to come, revenue-sharing would be conducted in such a way as to induce the states to reform their relations with their local governments and to permit their local governments to survive and to take some of the burden off of the more regressive forms of taxation of which the local property tax is perhaps the worst. Conversely it would be a mistake simply to give states an oxygen tent, a crutch to enable them to continue the same old inequitable taxing and expenditure practices. Let's perhaps have some reaction to that proposition from members of the panel.

Mr. PETSKA. It makes sense, but I think that principally more reapportionments for state legislatures should come following the 1970 census.

Mr. GLAMAN. I think that while there will be substantially more revenue available once defense spending is cut; there probably won't

be as much money available as many would like to see because a lot of people are trying to get their hands on that money.

If there is federal revenue sharing I think that, if it doesn't go through the state, I think that it certainly should be a requirement that a large proportion, and I'm thinking in terms of maybe 90% of it, should be required to pass to local government and pass it on on a basis that takes it in to consideration local tax effort.

Mr. REUSS. In addition to that, should not the states be required, as a condition of receiving these revenue sharing funds, at least to begin the reform of their internal structure with respect to governments in metropolitan areas and rural communities, too, so that our 19th century, very wasteful form of local government has at least a chance of being modernized.

Mr. BUZARD. Many of the inequities that are obvious come about by these artificial boundaries of municipalities, little tax havens that have been carved out that really are part of a major area. Even carving out the schools as separate tax districts or sewers or anything else really doesn't make much sense these days. Perhaps we ought to have one school district for the entire state or maybe a single school district for a region, but many of the tax problems are caused by artificial and today meaningless boundary lines which carry with them very different tax treatment.

Mr. REUSS. Very good point. Would you agree Mr. Buzard that maybe we ought to put governmental functions into two baskets. You have suggested that really all of the people of the metropolitan area, let's say Milwaukee, ought to support local schools on an approximately equal financial basis. Having said that, however, would you also agree that the detailed government of local schools in a vast metropolitan area like Milwaukee, ought not to be handled on a separate basis but could well be devolved upon neighborhoods, perhaps even to a greater extent than is the case today? You would have overall area-wide fiscal responsibility for paying the taxes, but decentralized governmental powers so that the neighbors, the parents, the teachers, the taxpayers, of the neighborhood or smaller area had a great deal to say about this system. I recognize that this is not the governmental allocation that we now have, but is it not something that we could work for?

Mr. BUZARD. Yes, I think so.

Mr. PETSKA. Mr. Reuss, how would this work? Accept this idea of federal grants for federal aid for all areas of local government or just for certain areas, like say welfare or the schools. I was wondering if we could limit that to certain areas only?

Mr. REUSS. An interesting point. There is certainly something to be said for federal responsibility for the two areas you mentioned: welfare and education. Take education. In Wisconsin, particularly at the higher education level, we educate at the taxpayer's expense at a great University, hundreds and hundreds of Ph-D's and graduate students, who then high tail it to California where they benefit the people of California for the rest of their lives. In welfare, we have to face facts. We of Wisconsin are paying the welfare, and to some extent the education costs, of children very frequently black children, who started life in Mississippi and who were very badly shortchanged there and who now as a straight, cold-blooded dollar and cents matter require extended costs. Therefore, it seems to be that you're on the right track, that it would make sense for the federal government to pay all or a very substantial part of the costs of welfare and education.

If this were done it might well be that we could then leave to the locality much greater freedom and flexibility and not load it up with hundreds of specific federal aid programs that drive Mr. Glaman's associates out of their minds at city hall. Is this what you are talking about?

Mr. PETSKA. There are many families today migrating from one state to another looking for a state where there is better picking by way of welfare. That has been proven many times right here in Milwaukee. And many times they may stay here and again they go right back where they came from.

Mr. REUSS. Whether that is so or not, whether there is this welfare shopping that you are talking about in any large sense, it certainly is true that some states are now shirking their welfare burden and other states thereby have an inordinately large welfare burden. Wisconsin happens to be in one of the latter categories. Federal responsibility would eliminate this interstate competition to see who can most short-change the welfare program to pass the burden off on somebody else. I think you've made this clear.

Mr. PETSKA. On the other hand if we cut our federal aids in all these areas I think we're moving away from states' rights too much. Don't you think so?

Mr. REUSS. I would favor the devolution down to the lowest possible level of government of every function which could best be performed there. I also have never been enchanted with the idea of five or six hundred separate federal programs on each little aspect of city life. For example, we've got two federal programs now which affect what the city of Milwaukee Health Department does about measles. That doesn't really make too much sense. We have a good federal program for rat control in our cities, but I would much prefer to see an overall block program which lets the city of Milwaukee find its own priorities on what it thinks is most important.

Philosophically I do not disagree at all with you. I do think that the one unit of government which has most shockingly evaded its responsibilities has been state government. I think either we're going to have to give up state governments, which I don't favor because valid and viable state governments have a function, or we're going to get our state governments to be more responsible.

Mr. PETSKA. State governments have a hand at withholding from the local communities certain rights and privileges which they should have because they are common to that particular community.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON TAXES AND TAX REFORM

RICHARD MARKEY. Mr. Congressman, the evil system that robs the elderly of their happiness in their golden years by ignoring their needs for an escalating income taxes even as the cost of living surges upward. Are our senior citizens so easily forgotten? I would like to go on the record, Mr. Reuss, as supporting immediately legislation to prevent the further robbery of these fixed income citizens.

Mrs. FLORA SEEFELDT. Mr. Congressman, people who put their children in private schools find their taxes are not eliminated. They pay double to educate their children. Some people who wish to put their children in private schools really can't afford it.

We started out paying \$129 a month on a house. Now, mind you, the house costs \$13,000. We have to pay this for 30 years. Can you imagine what we are paying for that home. With the interest and all that? It amounts to a \$30,000 home, really.

That's not my gripe as much as it is now that the taxes have gone up so we pay \$145 a month for the house. Now other families are paying \$150, when they started out paying \$130. The Federal Government has just washed its hands from the whole thing and has gone on about its business. They don't care about us.

Mr. REUSS. I think Mrs. Seefeldt makes a very good point, certainly familiar to Mr. Petska and his group. In this system of gov-

ernment of Federal, State, and local government, one level acts as if he had no responsibility to the others. I'm a Congressman, therefore some say it isn't my concern what happens to city hall. As a result of this, people of modest income, including yourself, suffer.

Mr. PETSKE. A few years back I conducted a little research just to the number of tax exempt properties in Milwaukee. At that time 29% of the property in Milwaukee was tax exempt. That is before the day of urban renewal and the expressways. Today it must be somewhere around 40 percent. Therefore, only 60 percent of our property is being taxed by local government, one of the main reasons why taxes have been going up.

Orro KATT. I want to speak on the retired people and their living. I was born and raised here. I raised five children. My wife died two years ago. I tried to sell my home. But could only sell it to the FHA appraisers for half what I paid for it in 1956. During that time my taxes have more than doubled and the value of the property depreciated to half although its in A-1 shape.

Social Security and a pension is what I have to live off of. I have lived all my life here and had a good trade. I was forced to retire. I belonged to several retired groups, and people of all ages have the same problem and nobody does anything for us. You can't go any place. Nobody will listen to you. What are they electing people for? What do we have our local and state government for if no one will listen to you? Who can you turn to? What can you do? I am 76 years old. I have schooled and educated 5 children. They all live in the city of Milwaukee and in the suburbs. They have their own families.

Instead of getting better everytime you go to the store you get less for your dollar. My country, what will it do for me? I almost tried to sell, I couldn't sell. What can I do in any case? Who can I turn to. Nobody.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Katt, we'll all try to help you. Do you still live in the house at 4127 N. 24th Street?

Mr. KATT. Yes, I do.

Mr. REUSS. Is that a duplex or a single family.

Mr. KATT. That's a duplex. I bought it in 1956, in 12 years time the taxes have more than doubled. I paid \$514 in 1956 and I have to pay \$1,071 today.

Mr. REUSS. You deserve some help. And I know that my colleagues on the panel will want to help too.

WAR AND PEACE, AUGUST 16

PANEL WITNESSES

Les Aspin, Economist, Marquette University.

Robert Bee, Vice-President, First Wisconsin National Bank.

Dr. Carol Baumann, Director, Institute of World Affairs, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

Arthur Heitzer, past President, Marquette University student body.

Mr. ASPIN. The real place to look, if we are going to change our foreign policy, to improve foreign policy, is not at the policy itself, but rather at the system by which the policy is devolved. I think that there is a new mood in the country today. It's a post Viet Nam mood. It's a mood in which people are very unhappy with the kind of methods by which our foreign policy decisions are being made today, decisions primarily by the executive branch.

I think that really the evidence for it is quite substantial. There's a total breakdown in bipartisan foreign policy. In the 1950's we always used to be able to rally the whole Congress behind the President on the grounds that we must stand together in the face of the enemy. But now we can't even get unity within the party, never mind across party lines. Secondly, I think there is a real suspicion these days of Presidential powers.

This, no doubt, is an outgrowth of the fiasco of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution.

There is a real realization on the part of people that seemingly innocuous decisions have really very long range effects. Thirdly, I think that there is a desire on the part of citizens to become involved in foreign policy decisions. The mystique of the foreign service or the foreign policy expert is somehow tarnished in the way that the mystique of the military generals and officers expertise has been tarnished.

All of this adds up to a very new mood in the country. In fact, I think that really the cry for public or civilian control over foreign policy is potentially as strong or stronger than the present cry for civilian control over military expenditures.

What does this mean for conducting foreign policy?

It means its very, very difficult for President Nixon. He is faced with trying to alter our policies in some areas and he's got this new kind of situation politically at home. What has happened is that what we previously used to regard as policy has now got to be changed. We always tried to thread a line between total nuclear war and capitulation in the case of a foreign aggression against a small country. Our policy was that real danger to peace is not confrontation with the super powers but rather between a couple of small countries. And in that case we had to avoid nuclear war on the one hand, and capitulation on the other.

So we developed a policy of flexible response, meeting challenge with appropriate response.

Since Vietnam that has been changed. We have found that small wars can be found to be very, very unpopular politically. And so we are faced with three alternatives which are equally unpalatable. They are: nuclear war, capitulation or do nothing. And Vietnam type wars. Now what does the President do under those cases?

Something will have to be worked out, but in the short run the kind of logical solution is what was suggested by President Nixon in Guam. He said that we will be very selective about our commitments, and that our decisions as to whether to intervene or not to intervene will be decided on a case by case basis and not by general policy. That means we will become perhaps less involved in Thailand or Korea and more involved in Indonesia. But when you try and conduct that kind of a policy against the kind of a mood of suspicion at home, you've got very difficult problems.

On the one hand you've got this policy of selective response, which I guess is what you'd call it. If the President is going to embark on it, or probably will embark on it, coupled with this new mood at home, what do we do then?

It's quite clear that we have a whole new series of institutions and procedures that have to be worked out whereby people can have their own input into foreign policy decisions. The President must have a political mandate to conduct foreign policy. What this means ultimately is that Congress must become more involved with foreign policy.

That raises a whole host of constitutional and practical problems. But it seems right now that's the only way that we're going to be able to conduct foreign policy without political backfire. I think that that's the thing that we ought to be worried about. That's the thing that Congress ought to be studying, that's the thing that academics should be studying, and that's the thing that we ought to be holding hearings on. That is, how can we get the people more involved in foreign policy decision?

Mr. REUSS. I was interested, Mr. Aspin, in your listing of what you thought the alternatives were in a situation like Vietnam. As I jotted them down, you listed nuclear war, doing what we've done, and capitulation.

I'd like to quarrel in a friendly way a bit with that list. I don't really think that you've exhausted the alternatives. It seems to me that there is a non-military alternative which in most of these cases is the better alternative. It involves all sorts of economic, political and psychological measures, but doesn't involve the use of American troops. I wonder if in many cases that non-military alternatives while not perfect, may work, and are about the best thing we can do.

Mr. ASPIN. Certainly, when I listed those three alternatives, there are certainly lots of possible modifications. The one that you suggest is somewhere in between capitulation and committing U.S. forces. The problem is when you come up against the problem; if that doesn't work, then what do you do?

We were involved in Vietnam to that extent at one time. The policy was failing and the trouble was that we then escalated instead of deciding not to go to war. The trouble is that, once you make a slight investment, the tendency or momentum is always to throw good money after bad in foreign policy, and if you've got a commitment of economic and technical assistance and the country is still shaky and not holding up, there is a strong tendency to follow it up. That's the danger of it.

Mr. REUSS. It's said, you know, that the orientals are always afraid of losing face. It seems to me the Americans do pretty good in that area as well.

Mr. ASPIN. The orientals have nothing on the political government or politician. Saving face is very important.

Mr. BEE. I would like to develop the theme that trade and investment contribute to world peace in two ways: (1) by de-emphasizing nationalism, and (2) by increasing economic interdependence between nations. People, ideas, ways of doing things tend to travel with goods and, in the process, tend to break down specifically national approaches to life. At the same time, the growing volume of trade between nations tends to build a structure in which each nation becomes more dependent on its trading partners.

When speaking of trade and investment, I refer only to private operations. State trading frequently seeks to achieve non-economic goals, such as political subversion and military advantage and, as such, does little to enhance world peace. Private trading, on the other hand, seeks mutual gain. The dominant considerations are quality and price, and both exporter and importer feel better off once the transaction is consummated. Investment, in a broad sense, is a kind of extension of trade since the major purpose is to develop additional sales by operating in markets heretofore not exploited or by greater penetration of existing markets through lower cost production facilities. Thus, my proposition is that private enterprise, by trading and investing in circumstances where market forces are allowed to operate reasonably well, contributes effectively to world peace.

Private trade cuts against nationalism in many and varied ways. The movement of goods from one country to another can indeed have a very profound effect on the pattern of life of one society. This might seem obvious if we consider, for example, the relatively recent, widespread distribution of transistor radios throughout the world. Today, in countless villages of Asia and Africa, even those which do not yet have road connections with the outside world, a visitor would almost certainly find at least one transistor radio. As a result of this single acquisition, the villagers are vastly better informed about what is going on in the world than they were before the arrival of the radio. Today, most primitive villages also enjoy some refrigeration, have access to penicillin

and a jeep or two. It does not take too much imagination to visualize the enormous impact on the pattern of village life that has taken place from the mere introduction of a radio, a refrigerator, a jeep and some modern medicine. There is not only a substantial improvement in well being, but there is also a new awareness of the outside world and the beginning of some understanding of it. While this change in perspective is dramatic for the villager, it is even more dramatic for citizens of the major cities of Asia and Africa. In the cities virtually all of the products of our outside world are available and visible, and there are even examples of modern European or North American suburban life to be seen.

An awareness, and an elemental understanding, of the outside world certainly do not imply a rounded or intelligent opinion or that people of a developing society are no longer subject to emotional, nationalistic appeals. Certainly not. However, I am suggesting that more understanding, when heretofore there was virtually none, is a very healthy movement in the direction of peace.

It is true that wide differences between rich and poor can sometimes cause tension that could lead to hostility and war, and that trade can sometimes make people of a poor country more conscious of these differences. However, the differences are not caused by trade and, indeed, I believe that in most instances private trade and investment help to bridge the gap between rich and poor nations rather than make it worse.

While bringing modern products to the cities and villages of a poor, developing country produces a fairly clear and dramatic impact, trade and investment between developed countries has a very similar effect, although perhaps less dramatic. France, for example, with its expressways, motels, super markets, TV and cluster of new automobile-based suburban communities outside of Paris, has witnessed a vast change in the pattern of everyday life during the past 20 years. This change must be attributed largely to trade and investment since, in most cases, the product or the technology was introduced from abroad. In Japan, the 20 year contrast is even more striking. In two highly productive decades Japan has become a modern, automobile-based industrial society and, to the casual observer, downtown Tokyo differs very little from downtown Detroit or downtown Milan. The important point, however, is not that the average citizen of Tokyo, Paris and Frankfurt has a much different life today compared to his counterpart 20 years ago, but the new pattern of life in each city has become very similar to that in other major cities of the world. This movement toward standardization tends to break down national ways of doing things and supplant them by more universal approaches to life. By so doing, people of other nations become less "foreign". The sameness of man is emphasized and this, I believe, contributes to world peace.

This tendency toward a standardization of life pattern has, of course, encountered resistance. The standardization is viewed by some as a kind of unwanted Americanization of the world. General De Gaulle has articulated this theme with perhaps the greatest eloquence and success. But even in France, at the height of Gaullist power, free economic choices by French citizens were giving added momentum to this process of standardization and now, at the end of the Gaullist period, the arguments of the General appear more and more as an unwanted vestige of a nationalistic past. Thus, in a very real sense, the movement toward standardization of life demonstrated its strength, despite the nationalistic appeals of De Gaulle in France.

International investment has very much the same effect as trade when viewed in terms of the product reaching the consumer. In a real sense, investment is an added dimension of marketing and facilitates a more effective distribution of a particular product

throughout the world. The major instrumentality of international investment is the multi-national corporation.

De Gaulle and others have tended to act as if the multi-national corporation is a uniquely American phenomenon. While it is true that about 2/3 of the major multi-national corporations have their headquarters in the U.S., a very significant number are European-based and owned (such as SKF, Unilever, Electrolux, Shell and Bata Shoes). Moreover, it misses the point to focus attention on the country of headquarters when discussing multi-national corporations. These organizations endeavor to apply modern management techniques to rationalize production and distribution on a global scale. In the process of building a global organization, national boundaries become a relatively minor consideration and people are shifted from country to country on the basis of corporate need, not nationality. Differences in language, custom, accounting, personnel procedure and many other aspects of corporate life tend to be harmonized primarily on the basis of efficiency. In time, company loyalties develop which, in some important respects, tend to transcend national loyalties.

The trend toward multi-nationalization of corporations, whether based in America, Germany or Japan, is going forward at a rapid pace and in itself makes a significant contribution to world peace. Not only is the product standardized, but new methods and procedures are introduced, many of which contribute, I believe, toward breaking down national approaches. For example, a Frenchman working for IBM is most likely to be a very different man after five or more years exposure to IBM methods and personnel. This is also true of the American working for Volkswagen and the Brazilian working for British Petroleum.

Private international trade and investment, when allowed to develop and flourish, do more than augment prosperity and emphasize sameness of man. They both help build a structure of interdependence which, by its very nature, makes it physically more difficult for one nation to go to war against another. Supplies, fuel, parts and components of many kinds must be obtained from a multiplicity of sources abroad in order for the industry of one country to continue to function. This dependence becomes, in practice, a growing disincentive to war. The existence and expansion of multi-national corporation further strengthens the structure of interdependence of national economies. It is getting so that "American" economic interests are becoming very difficult to define. It is certainly no longer clear cut for us to retaliate against "foreign" corporations, and it is no longer realistic to assume that everything within our national borders is "American" and everything outside is "foreign". The difficulty of imposing national controls or regulations on multi-national corporations has become increasingly obvious. Indeed, the existence and growth of these global corporations will require national governments to work more closely together in order to achieve a minimum of control or regulation.

All of what we have said heretofore about trade and investment contributing to peace has referred primarily to the non-Soviet world, whereas the greater threats to world peace involve potential conflicts between the Soviet World and the Free World. The practical possibility in present circumstances for private trade and investment to make a contribution to peace in our relations with Soviet bloc countries is, of course, limited. Nevertheless, in principle, additional trade could make a contribution to narrowing East-West differences. East-West trade has increased rapidly during the 60s and it seems probable that this trade will grow more rapidly during the 70s. Further growth is bound to have a beneficial effect in bringing the two patterns of life closer together. Investment is more difficult, but even here

it is possible to imagine circumstances under which a private Western firm might find an effective basis for collaboration with a Soviet State enterprise. The recent agreement with Fiat to build a new automobile plant in the Soviet Union may well provide a formula for new investment collaboration arrangements. In any case, the basic role of trade and investment as a peacemaker can in principle be extended to dealings with the Soviet bloc countries.

Given our human frailties, peace is an exceedingly difficult objective to achieve. However, private trade and investment in the non-Soviet world can make a very substantial contribution to improving the conditions of world peace. As trade expands with the Soviet bloc, and even some forms of investment become possible, attitudes can be expected to change so that, in time, the risk of misunderstanding and miscalculation would be substantially reduced. In summary, private trade and investment, because they bind men more closely together, strengthen the prospects for world peace and development.

Dr. BAUMANN. Our human concern for the issues of war and peace is not unique to this generation, nor to this country, nor to these hearings. But the current problems of war and peace are unique—for their solution may be vital to the continued existence of mankind itself. A statement such as this is neither alarmist nor over-dramatic—it is based on the dangers of the arms race and the possibilities of thermonuclear devastation and on the conflicts of interest and ideology between the great powers. Both of these realities contribute to the growing insecurity of our age—an age which has known and fears the horrors of war, and which longs for peace.

What can and should the United States do to prevent and avoid war, and to preserve and strengthen peace? This is the basic question of these hearings. It is not an easy one to answer.

The fact that a nuclear "balance of terror" has existed between the United States and the Soviet Union ever since the Soviet development of missile power in the mid-50's has been accepted by scholars and laymen alike. What is less generally understood is the delicate nature of that balance and its importance. It is delicate because it is particularly susceptible both to technological innovation and to human miscalculation. It is important because it is the last guarantee against a foolhardy attack by either side which may think it has that momentary margin of power necessary for victory. In a situation in which both sides possess the ability to retaliate, mutual destruction is the logical result of nuclear attack—and victory itself becomes an empty slogan.

It is this element of restraint contributed by the nuclear balance which has lent such significance to the recent Senate debate on the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile system and its deployment by the United States. Unfortunately, in the opinion of many of us who are anxiously concerned about maintaining a nuclear balance and increasing its stability, the deployment of the ABM can only destabilize that balance, increase the suspicions and hostilities between East and West, and contribute to the dangerous escalation of the arms race.

To counter-act this step backward it is even more imperative than before for this country to enter the nuclear arms-control negotiations with the Soviet Union with renewed vigor, imaginative proposals, and good faith. Equally important is continued support for the further extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to non-signatory states and its early ratification by others. In the light of the frequent and sporadic non-nuclear fighting in the Middle East and Latin America (to say nothing at this point about South-East Asia), it would also be appro-

prate to review more stringently our policies of overseas weapons and armaments sales and to explore more actively the possibilities of a general non-nuclear arms-control and reduction agreement. Finally, to avoid even greater involvement in overseas military conflagrations, the United States should increasingly support the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations and its attempts to develop and strengthen its international police and para-military forces.

The second problem concerning the conflicting interests and ideologies between the great powers is not only equal in importance to that of the nuclear arms race but, in fact, precedes it. It is precisely because the states of the world do have differing and conflicting interests that they sometimes resort to arms in order to protect them. As Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau has written: "Men do not fight because they have arms. They have arms because they deem it necessary to fight." A recognition of this fact is essential to an understanding that disarmament or arms-control alone is not the final solution to the prevention of war in our time.

Therefore, along with attempts to de-escalate the arms race through any or all of the policies mentioned before, the United States must carefully determine what its real national interests are as opposed to the interests of its "world image." These interests—the interests of international trade and commerce, of the security of our state and the welfare of our people, of political and cultural contacts with foreign states and peoples, and of a peaceful international climate in which only they can flourish—these interests it must protect. But whether these limited and legitimate interests are so threatened everywhere by other states as to necessitate an American world-wide police force for their protection is a dubious contention at best. Rather, not our withdrawal from world-wide political and economic affairs, but our retrenchment from world-wide military encampments appears to be in the better self-enlightened interests of this country at this time.

Finally, in assessing the international issues of war and peace as they face contemporary U.S. foreign policy, it would be manifestly short-sighted to ignore the equally important domestic issues of war and peace as they challenge our policies here at home. The two are inextricably interwoven and interdependent. Only if we cease to squander billions of dollars on a virtually counterproductive and potentially self-destructive arms race, can we apply those resources imaginatively and fruitfully to improve the quality of urban life in these United States. Conversely, only if we learn to bridge the glaring gaps between black and white, rich and poor, young and old in our own country, can we hope to learn how to understand the problems of other nations and other cultures and perhaps take that first earthbound "giant step" toward bridging the gap between East and West, North and South.

Mr. HEITZER. What I would like to do is go into the types of struggles we see in Vietnam and relate this to what I expect may develop from the more serious conflicts in other parts of the world, especially in Latin America. There are, in many countries of Latin America, primitive stages of guerrilla movements not entirely unlike that in Vietnam developing. U.S. Green Berets are being used in about four or five of these countries. We have military missions in 19 Latin American countries.

I think that we are getting ourselves involved in a very dangerous situation just as we did in Vietnam, and I think its because the world is largely, especially in many underdeveloped countries, going to be going through a continuing stage of revolution, much like what we've seen in Vietnam.

I don't really know if the people of Latin America will be capable fighters or as determined as the Vietnamese are. I suspect that

our policies may be dangerously similar to the ones we pursued there.

I think the trouble is that America is, at this point, wedded to a policy which is basically reactionary and counter-revolutionary. This is against, and very contrary to, our traditions and the ideals we've expressed. For instance, I'd just like to quote Congressman Abraham Lincoln before he was president in 1848. What he said, I think, was very relevant to today. He said: "Many people anywhere being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off existing government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable and sacred right, and the right we hope and believe is to liberate the world."

Mr. REUSS. If I could interrupt you for just a moment, at that interesting historical point, Lincoln was speaking the truth back there in 1848 and for his pains, as you remember, he was defeated in the next election. Still, it was a good idea.

Mr. HEITZER. At that point the Mexican war was popular, just as the Vietnamese war was several years ago. Well, what happened is that we had invaded Mexico and Lincoln felt that was an unjust thing. As a result of that invasion we ended up gaining a great deal of land from Mexico. But it was unjustified. And I think it is very fitting today, as we look at Vietnam as perhaps we do Latin America.

I'd like to quote another person, another American who is expressing current U.S. policy, Robert McNamara. He was testifying before the House and he deals with a lot of Latin American policy. He readily concedes from the beginning that there are grave injustices in Latin America and there is a great deal of social tension and social inequality, but his solution is somewhat different than what Lincoln said was justifiable.

I quote: Social tensions, unequal distribution of land, unstable economies, and the lack of broadly based political structures paved the prospects of continuing instability in many parts of Latin America. The objection to these and other associated problems if one is to be found, lies in the alliance of Progress to which we and our Latin American friends are devoting large resources. But the goals of the alliance can be achieved only within a framework of law and order. Our military assistance program for Latin America must continue to be directed to the support of internal security and civic action measures.

Very briefly what he said is this, yes, there may be injustices, but just as many people in this country are saying they can only be solved through the framework of law and order. But what law and order means in Latin America I think is worth looking at. For instance, one classic example of U.S. policy in Latin America and a key one was in regards to Brazil. In 1964, the democratically elected government, which was very socially reform minded and led by Goulart was overthrown by a right-wing military coup which took over the country. There was no mandate from the people and no elections were held.

In 1962, Brazil received \$81,000,000 from AID. In 1963, it was cut in half to \$38,000,000. That was when Goulart was still in power. In 1964 it was again halved to only \$15,000,000. Then he was overthrown by a non-Democratic repressive bunch of generals. The following year, 1965, AID money shot up from \$15,000,000 to \$122,000,000. The year after that it increased by \$229,000,000. Whoever was running the foreign aid policy in making those decisions thought it was beneficial to the U.S. to encourage that type of regime. There is a strong feeling on the part of the U.S. that it is necessary to stop revolutionary movements, and if you stop it by reluctant regimes—fine. If you stop it by right wing, non-elected regimes, then that's fine, too, and in the case of Brazil its much better than to have an elected regime that is interested in a socialist government. I think we have a very serious situation. You can ask:

"Is it true that revolution is justified in Latin America? Is it true that the conditions are ripe according to what Lincoln said according to the American tradition?" I think, we should just take a look at our own Declaration of Independence, which said that there were three inalienable God-given rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Heitzer and thank everyone of the witnesses for throwing the major issues on the table here. There seems to be a general agreement, and I certainly agree that there is going to be a lot of trouble in the world in the next generation. New countries in Africa, older countries in Latin America, countries in Asia, for example, are going to undergo turmoil, and a lot of it will be violent.

I think there's agreement among members of the panel that it's not either necessary or proper for the United States to get involved in all of these disputes. What should be a set of guidelines for the United States with respect to the use of power, and that means military power, throughout the world? I think we all would agree from our testimony that economics, trade investment, cultural exchange, political and psychological factors are tremendously important. Dr. Baumann and I would say they are the most important, and I think every member of the panel would agree that they are basic.

Over and beyond that, when you get into power, what should our national stance and posture be? When do we use our power?

If I may throw something on the table, I suggest that the United States ought not to be militarily involved beyond its borders except when three conditions concur. One, it has to be a vital interest to the United States that is affected. That, cited that way alone, perhaps begs the question, but certainly it means that in remote areas we can't attempt to right every wrong. Let's say, secondly, that the country to whose aid we are considering going must be, if we are going to consider it seriously, a country with at least a moderately progressive and humane government. It need not be a Wisconsin-style democracy but neither should it be such an unedifying dictatorship that we have to be cynical and ashamed in going to its rescue.

Thirdly, it seems to me it has to be a country which has sufficiently engaged the love and devotion of its people so that they are willing to fight for it. We can't forever be fighting other people's battles.

Mr. BEE. I think they are all good. But I would like to add one if I might, one that has come up recently in some of the remarks of President Nixon. I think this is a theme that has been articulated by our former Ambassador to Tokyo, Professor Reischauer. That is that even if these three conditions are satisfied, that we should exhibit a certain amount of restraint before moving, and in particular we should wait, in effect, to be encouraged and asked by some of the larger countries in that area. Reischauer always gives the example of Japan.

Japan, because of our quickness and our almost over eagerness of response in Vietnam kind of looks on this as an American show and yet it's an error, if you will, in their area of influence. It's an American show which they don't like.

I would argue that with more restraint, with more cool, the Japanese themselves might have seen their vital interests and then they would come to the United States and solicit our cooperation and our strength behind a much broader cause.

Mr. REUSS. I think that's a welcome fourth point which I will certainly add to my thinking. Let the fourth one read something like this: Go slow, take it easy and above all don't act unless your help is sought by the relevant important and hopefully democratic leading countries of the area. A fifth point: Before you do anything go to the United Nations and see if you can't get the U.N. to

act, and if the U.N. can't be induced to act, think four or five or six times about acting unilaterally.

Dr. BAUMANN. That was just exactly my point. But I do have two others. Coming back to your first point, Congressman Reuss, which I think is really the difficult one, what really is a vital interest?

You seem to indicate it has to be a country of some standing or a country with which we have had long and lasting relations or an important country. This is very true.

What bothers me is the phrase of Chamberlain prior to World War I about Czechoslovakia, a remote little country, with the people about whom we know nothing . . . and why should we get involved.

Those people whom we know nothing about might ultimately be very important to our own security.

Mr. REUSS. Chamberlain was, of course, wrong about Czechoslovakia, but not necessarily for the reasons that the Czechs are marvelous and democratically inclined people, which they are.

Dr. BAUMANN. The other point is the question which can arise. Say that extended involvement is entered into with a democratic government and then that government is overthrown by a military dictatorship. Under this dictatorship policies of fairly liberal reform are under taken. In other words, by force land is seized and redistributed, land reform takes place. What do we do?

Mr. REUSS. I would answer that by what I said before. You should have a local government which, while it may not be democratic, is at least reasonably progressive and humane.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON WAR AND PEACE

Mrs. BABETTE ZUBLATSKY. Congressman Reuss, why did the Navy ask for \$700 million for an air-craft carrier when this money could be used for poverty areas? They said building this carrier was for a 'long range program'. Carriers were once used so planes could refuel. Today they can fly half-way around the world without stopping. Couldn't this money be used for more far-reaching goals?

Mr. REUSS. This hearing was to enable me to ask citizens questions, but you have cornered me. I'll try to answer. Why did the Navy ask for it?

The Navy asked for the \$700 million for new carriers because the military services always ask for everything they can think of. The other part of your question was would not the money or part of it be much better spent on the problems of our cities, on air and water pollution, on the quality of life. The answer to that question, in my judgment, is yes, it would be. We need, in my judgment, a strong defense. We have a strong defense, but I think each new weapon system that is proposed has to be scrutinized much more carefully by the Congress than we have scrutinized requests in the past.

Mr. HERBERT F. BLAESING. Do you get this Washington Observer? I think they've been sent you people, to all the Congressmen and the Senators. I'm quoting Washington Observer: First the Pueblo: With \$100 million worth of scientific instruments aboard, three Russian jets ready to load it on and take it to Russia. Number one. Number two, from the Washington Observer Newsletter asking Congress what they are going to do about the Pueblo: Number three, the Scorpion—what do you know about it? "Torpedoed by a Russian sub," Washington Observer. And last but not least, you all heard about the airplane that was shot down by Korea: no survivors. For your information, there are ten survivors. Held there. Who knows what we will have to pay for them?

I'm a veteran of the Mexican border and World War I. Wars are fought to be won. If we're in Vietnam for some other reason, let's get out. In the Korean War if we'd have bombed four bridges over the Yalu River we'd have had the Russians, Chinese,

and the Russian Communists out of our hair. If we'd have left General MacArthur there, we still would have had 'em out of our hair.

That's all I have to say.

Mr. ROBERT HICKS. The way this government's going, elected officers are insulated from the common people and it's extremely difficult to get to talk to them. This is the first time I've ever had a chance to look you in the eye.

I'm eligible for a pension. The monetary policies and the wars of the last 20 years have robbed me of that pension. Two hundred and fifty dollars a month a few years ago was a princely sum. It won't even buy housing today. The wars, plus Congress' lack, and I say responsibility, in paying for them when they occur, has robbed me and other people of their pensions.

An \$18 war bond in 1944 would buy a pretty good suit, but that \$25 war bond that I still have won't buy this suit I'm wearing.

I have been protesting to the State Department of this country for about 15 years. I don't trust them. It was a mistake that we're not fighting in Cuba, that we're fighting in Vietnam.

And I'd like to say something about limited wars. I happen to have a son in Vietnam. We're sweating out the last 30 days. Two friends of ours, one kid came home in a basket, couldn't even open the casket, the other one's crippled for life. Now that war is not limited for those boys. Your pro athletes on your football teams are everyone of them in the Reserves. They're not serving. That's not equal basis. Those are things that need fixing.

Mr. CARL SCHUSTER. I have had an unfortunate experience with my family in the last year that prompted me to come up here. I haven't heard much sympathy from anyone. I learned my patriotism at \$11.25 a month in World War II. Patriotism. My wife gave birth to a son that was lost in Vietnam last year, so she knows pretty well what war means. I come from a family of six brothers who served in World War II. All honorably discharged. Okay. What has this cost me in addition to my son? I think many times no one realizes what the after effects are. My son was married, never saw his son either. I have spent considerable amount of money as far as funeral costs, in addition to the garments that they give the widow, which is the way it works. I might add, our country can go to the moon, and spend billions for everything, but I think if my daughter-in-law and my grandson were to exist on what the government pays them, they'd starve to death. She works certain hours more than what the law allows, it's reduced. Okay.

Part of the reason, more than anything, why I came here, was this. Now I'm going to read a letter, I probably should give it to someone else to read. But this is what it says. Mrs. Schuster wrote the Adjutant General, Kenneth G. Wickham. It says:

"This is in response to your letter to General Kenneth G. Wickham, the Adjutant General, requesting an American flag to display in honor of your son, who died in the service of our country. The Institute of Heraldry is a Class II activity under the jurisdiction of the Adjutant General. Under the provisions of Title 38 of the United States Code, a flag is furnished the next of kin of the deceased veteran. Your daughter-in-law received an American flag under this statute. The Code further provides that if a flag is given to the next-of-kin, no flag shall be given to any other person on account of the death of such veteran."

You wouldn't think that in the correspondence that the government had on the day that my son died that he ever had a father or mother, that he ever had a 27 year old sister, that he had another 21 year old brother, or that he had another 15 year old sister, or an 11 year old sister. "Now," the

letter continues, "the Adjutant General receives a great number of requests from patriotic individuals who would like to receive an American flag. However, inasmuch as Congress appropriates funds only for the purpose of purchasing necessary flags for official use within the many government organizations, such requests must necessarily be denied. Although American flags are available commercially for a nominal sum, the Adjutant General cannot use federal funds to purchase them for unofficial purposes. Your reasons for wanting an American flag are fully understood, and I regret that your request must be denied."

Mr. REUSS. May I say, Mr. Schuster, that I'm going to see that you and Mrs. Schuster get an American flag which has flown over the Capitol of the United States, and I'll see that that flag is flown within the next few weeks. I'm very sorry about anybody getting a letter like that.

Mr. EDSON SAWER. Mr. Reuss, I'm not going to say very much about the war, what it means to our country. I think we all know how foolish it is when we have some 100 percent over-kill of the Russians, as the quotas now stand, and they have 10 percent over-kill of us. Either side could completely destroy our civilization as it exists.

I would like to spend my time dreaming a little bit. I would like to see the United States unilaterally, by 1971, say to the world, "we will cut our military expenditures 10 percent this year. Not only in manpower, not only in wealth, but across-the-board, 10 percent. We will use this 10 percent for the economic development of our world. We will send our best agriculturists, our best engineers, our best farmers, anywhere in the world where we are asked to go." Along with this, I would like to see the United States say, "we will have absolutely no strings to these people." Nehru, in his famous book, *Truths of World History*, said he knew what the political imperialism was, he'd lived under that, but he said he didn't know what economic imperialism really meant to a country. He had a sneaking idea that it was far more devastating to the economic welfare and development of the country where it was being carried on than political imperialism was.

He was speaking at that time mostly of American relations to South America and explained the role which our economic imperialism has had on the nations of South America. The two famous books written by the Paddock brothers, one of them *Starvation, 1970*. The other one, I believe the title or subtitle, *Who Must Starve?* These two brothers, one was in the State Department, one was an agriculturist, gave us a pretty good indication of the type of world that we will be facing within the next 10-15 years. If there was ever a place where a nation that had the courage to stick its neck out, to say to the rest of the world that we no longer are going to depend on guns but we're going to depend on good will, we will furnish our best agriculturists, our best engineers to help you develop your economic resources, there will be no strings. This is it. It seems to me that through these ideas, or ideas like these, that America will have a place in the world.

Mr. JOHN SNYDER. Mr. Aspin, in your opening comments, and Mr. Reuss, in your reply, suggested four solutions to Vietnamese type situations. It's curious, seems curious to me, that they all include some form of American intervention. All four solutions call for American intervention in South East Asian affairs. All solutions seem based on some desire to intervene in Vietnamese affairs.

Now it seems to me what you're looking for is an American solution to a Vietnamese problem. What is the vital American interest in a formerly minor Asian civil war. What is the vital U.S. interest?

Mr. Aspin, you said there are three solutions, one you mentioned is capitulation. To whom or to what do we capitulate; if we do

not sacrifice several thousand lives in Southeast Asia. To what? Some monolith?

I wonder if you could devote some time to answering those questions. Don't direct them just to me, direct them to the man who was just here, and the girl who came up before and asked you about the carriers. These are the questions that concern the people of America now, especially my generation, because we're not going to stand for it any more. We've had enough.

Mr. REUSS. I think you misunderstood at least what I said. I said that there was a fourth solution which didn't involve military intervention but involved the use of economic measures.

Mr. SNYDER. American economic aid. We've been giving aid to Vietnam for years. This is just exactly how our Vietnam war began. We do it in South America, Southeast Asia. We do it all over the world. President Nixon went to Thailand on his Southeast Asian tour, and he gave them the same damn pledge that we gave South Vietnam. Are the people in this country, my generation, going to be fighting in Thailand?

Mr. REUSS. You're talking about a military commitment which I suggested is what we should not make.

Mr. SNYDER. I'm suggesting that your economic commitment leads eventually to his military commitment.

Mr. ASPIN. Can I say a few words? The three alternatives that I was discussing whenever there are problems in this kind of situation are: Number one, it does nothing. Number two, it involves itself in some kind of military way which involves a small war. Thirdly, involves really nuclear war.

Mr. SNYDER. The word you used was capitulation.

Mr. ASPIN. Right. Okay. Capitulation or ducking the issue or something else. The point is the United States in any condition like that is making a decision which affects the outcome of the struggle. If it gets into it, it can influence it one way or the other. If it doesn't, if it ducks out of it, it also influences the decision.

Mr. SNYDER. Why should we want to influence the situation?

Mr. ASPIN. What I'm saying is that there is a reappraisal going on within the United States government at this time, and I think that this is right. If what we have had is that in trying to thread this line between nothing and a nuclear war, we have been invariably led to the conclusion that small wars are somehow a good thing. I think that's changing now. I think the attitude you express is widespread in the country. I don't think you're saying anything that millions of people in this country don't argue and don't feel including many Congressmen. Two years ago it was very different. Right now, it's a whole different world.

Mr. RALPH HABERMEHL. As of July, two members of our family are now in service, both under 21. So, we're concerned. One of the things that I like to ask is how come, under our present trade agreements, we are trading strategic war materials and copper with Russia. Of course we know, they're one of the biggest suppliers of North Vietnam, getting through Haiphong harbor unmolested. Is there any explanation for this?

Mr. REUSS. We are not trading strategic war materials with the Soviet Union. We have a very tight embargo on them. Some of our allies are trading.

Mr. KENNETH KAYE. What I would like to see happen in this country is for some of the best minds in our universities and in our government to use their talents to creatively seek peace, possibly through the Cabinet level set-up. I think that we need to not just react to situations as they occur. We need not to just fight when we have to, but we need to look ahead. Perhaps this can be done through the U.N. Perhaps the World Federalists have some ideas that can be explored and made a little more practical. But I think we need to devote at least some

of our time and some of our energy and some of our money to thinking about peace ahead of time.

Mr. MIKE CULLEN. Congressman Reuss, panelists, I'd just like to say that it is a joy to stand before you and to say that it is a blow for freedom in a sense we strike today to open hearings like these to the public. Hearings like these have been needed for a long time, especially during the last four years. The country has gone through much suffering and much strain and much pain. In a sense the light of freedom, the light of the hope and the genius of America has almost been put out. The freedom that was born here 250 years ago for many who have come to its shores have looked for that light, that freedom, and have seen it missing. I feel that in the last four years we have been betrayed as a people, we have lost more than 43,000 sons in Vietnam. We have dropped more than 3 million tons of bombs on a nation that is mostly agrarian. I have traveled in the last year to 22 States, had the opportunity of speaking to the public, because, of course, of an action that most people would consider to be unpatriotic. (Note: Mike Cullen is a member of "The Milwaukee Fourteen", who burned Selective Service files.)

We have done what good men have tried to do within the law and failed, saw that nothing was changing, that the war was getting worse, that people continued to die in unacceptable numbers. I have traveled to more than 22 states in the last year. One thing that's come very clear to me is that the average American, so often doesn't read and he doesn't know his history. It's a tremendous kind of ignorance. There is a beautiful love here of the soil, a love of this land, this land of America, this land that was supposed to be and hopefully would be the hope of this world. Not because of our economic power, but because we are a nation of many peoples, of many races and many ethnic groups who are trying to find a path to one way of life, a path that would, in the sense of our Constitution, give men liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the right to freedom.

I would like to say something about the draft. If we are a nation, and we are given the power we have, given the fact that we've built the greatest military machine the world has ever had in its history. That we are to enter into conflicts, whether it be in Latin America or Asia or Africa, we're asking for a retaliation by another power which may be just as great as ours. I think that most of us recognize the smallness of this planet that we live on now. The greatest technological advances of the last couple of years, with our ventures to the moon, have enabled us to travel this little planet in 2½ hours. It would be just as easy and just as possible to annihilate every man, woman, and child on the planet. It doesn't matter what nation it would be from.

I feel that the draft is not just illegal, but it's almost silly for us to think we can solve the international problems, social problems, domestic problems, by military means in the future.

Also, I would say, for those who are moving in the direction of revolution and violence, that violence is a direct means to social change for anybody. It'll be used, I know, and I'm not so naive to not recognize that it won't be used in the next four or five years. But everytime violence is used, whether it's in small bush wars in Latin America or Africa or Asia, or in our streets here in the cities of this country, we're asking for annihilation, we're asking for the use of greater weapons. The many who worked with Martin Luther King know that new means have to be found to social change. New means have to be found to solve international problems. Perhaps they will come along the lines of an international way of developing some kind of mutual agreement

between large nations in terms of their economy. Perhaps this is one way. This will be putting more power in the United Nations and they becoming a peace making team with the enforcement. I'm afraid that, given the fact of how the United Nations is structured, it's sort of impossible at this time for the United Nations to have any kind of power, any kind of influence in the world, where real conflict with two great nations is involved.

The draft system as such is illegal for me. It's become immoral. I cannot give, as a member of just not a faith; but a man who believes that, if I believe in freedom that much, I am not afraid to die on behalf of freedom. There's a genius in America that strikes me, as I said, as I crossed the nation. An American will fight for freedom and it would be very hard for freedom to be annihilated. If anybody enters our shores, it would be a response on behalf of the people to move, to defend the nation as best they know how. The draft system is coming up maybe now, though it ought to be changed, I would say an end to the draft.

Mr. CECIL BROWN, JR. I think it's interesting to note that while we had conversations about war and peace that almost all of the conversation has dealt with war. I suppose that's not too strange. They say that for every ten years that the world knows that there's war some place in the world for every nine and that there's only one year when there's not any war. I would like to suggest that this country is in a bag, and it's been in a bag since 1947, because no matter whether the Democrats or the Republicans are in control of the national administration, our foreign policy seems to be the same. Only the outside packaging changes. Ever since the end of World War II, we have found ourselves in the position of supporting conservative, and in some cases, ultra conservative governments, because we were more concerned with the ability within that area than we were with freedom. It has therefore been a policy of reaction, instead of a policy of positive creatism. The last example I think we can point to as any kind of creativeness was the Marshall Plan, and the Point Four Program, which died a rather strange death. Too often our foreign policy is determined by what Russia or Red China might do, is doing, will do, or could do. And so then we find ourselves in a confrontation trying to deal with the minds of people when they are hungry and we are talking about democracy. And we lose.

I'm often reminded of the statement that Pogo made: We have met the enemy, and they are us. I look at the foreign policy in South America and the Middle East and I am distressed almost to the point of tears. In the Middle East our foreign policy is controlled not by the State Department, but by the great oil companies. What's good for the great oil companies, that's supposed to be good for the United States of America. Look how long United Fruit determined the policy with Cuba.

The young man before mentioned the fact that we were so happy to provide Batista's regime with his mortars, machine guns, tanks, rifles, military experts. For what? Who was going to threaten Cuba? In Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in many of the South American countries, we have a distorted view of what's going on there.

But I want to say something that I think has perhaps been overlooked. That 90 percent of the people in Cuba are black, like I am. That they were without land. They did not control the wealth. Some of them never knew what it was like to own a piece of soil. The same thing is true in the Dominican Republic. And too often the foreign policy of this country has been tied in with racism. This points out the last problem here.

I suggested when I started that we were too preoccupied with war and not with peace. We are in a strange position in this country, because at the same time we are in a state

of peace we are also in a state of war. We are fighting in Vietnam, where 30 percent of the combat troops are black, where 20 percent of the troops in Vietnam are black, where they are fighting for something they can't have at home, and they do not know why they are there. Therefore they are black mercenaries, and they ought not be there.

In this country we have an Administration that went into office with the slogan of law and order, when there can be no law unless there is justice, and there can be no order unless there is reason. And I don't hear very many people talking about justice and reason.

Mr. Gerald S. Glazer. If there is one institution in our society that is exploitative, unfair, and inconsistent with American ideals of freedom, that institution is compulsory military service, euphemistically known as the "draft." The draft can be abolished and replaced with voluntary service without endangering our national security; to do so would be to remedy a gross injustice to young American men.

The draft threatens every young man in this country like the sword of Damocles. He never knows when it will fall, or if indeed it will fall at all. If he is among the chosen and the called, he faces three choices: join the military, go to jail, or emigrate. It is a sad irony that the ancestors of many Americans came to this country during the 19th century primarily to escape forced service in European armies . . . they now take refuge from our compulsory militarism. Much of the alienation of today's youth from society and our form of government can be traced to the prospect of compulsory military service . . . particularly service in Vietnam. There would be far less turmoil on campus if it were not the refuge of men seeking to avoid the draft. Anti-draft sentiment among young Americans has driven thousands of them into the open arms of extremists on the left who exploit the dilemma of the young man who loathes the prospect of compulsory service.

The existence of the draft makes it possible to exploit servicemen in ways that would not be possible if service were voluntary. Soldiers are paid slave wages (less than \$100 per month starting), serve 13 hours a day or more, live in dismal barracks, and have few rights. No other federal employees are paid or treated this way . . . perhaps because no other federal employees can be imprisoned for refusing a job! Without the threat of prison, it would not be possible to get anyone to accept employment on terms now offered by the U.S. military. Thus, the draft is no more than a form of temporary slavery.

The draft is also unfair in every sense. For example, women are exempt from service, although there are women's branches of each military service. Moreover, students get deferments, clergymen are exempt, some conscientious objectors get alternative service, and others are rejected for various mental and physical defects. The one who is ordered to report for induction is in a sad minority indeed. The only fair draft would be one in which all Americans are forced to serve: men, women, fathers, ministers, students, teachers, etc. Obviously the cost of making the draft fair in this sense is far greater than the cost of abolishing it.

The draft is not an efficient way of procuring an effective army. We now force men to serve for two years, after which we must train an entirely new group of recruits to take their place. There is little re-enlistment. Roughly half of all draftees at any one time are in training; thus we get only 50% active service from them. The draft is a dragnet that pulls in men that are often ill-suited to military life; some are discharged early, others fulfill their term without performing useful service. The selective service system is an expensive operation, especially if the cost of prosecuting and imprisoning draft-resisters is included.

Two reforms have been suggested for the draft: the lottery and alternative non-military service. The lottery method, boosted by Senator Kennedy primarily, still relies on compulsion to get the unlucky men into the army. The lottery would be a method of redistributing the burden of military service: from those unlucky in getting deferments (as now) to those unlucky with numbers (with the lottery). There would still be no incentive to improve the pay or working conditions of our citizens in uniform.

The other reform would give the draftee the option of performing some non-military chore which meets government approval, as is now permitted for conscientious objectors. This is clearly unconstitutional, since the 13th amendment prohibits involuntary servitude. The courts now recognize that the right of Congress to raise armies is an exception to this principle, but there is certainly no legal basis for compelling Americans to engage in other forms of forced labor.

Like slavery, the draft cannot be reformed while it retains its compulsory aspect. Accordingly we must move to replace the draft with voluntary service. Of course, this replacement must be accompanied by certain reforms of military life, since few would join the present military unless forced to. I would propose the following significant changes:

1. *Pay.* Soldiers should receive no less than \$100 per week at the outset, and twice that after re-enlistment.

2. *Representation.* Soldiers should be entitled to representation by an employee organization just as postmen and other federal employees. There should be legitimate channels for redress of grievances.

3. *Justice.* In peacetime conditions, serious military crimes should be tried by civilian federal judges and juries. Now commanders act as prosecutor, judge, and jury, and often decree excessive sentences.

I submit that if the military service of this country adopts the reforms cited it will be possible for us to provide for our defense without resort to compulsory conscription. We must take note of several objections that have been made in the past few years to the concept of purely voluntary military service. These objections are primarily the following:

1. *There will not be enough volunteers to meet defense needs.* Under the present system we have 3,000,000 volunteers in the U.S. armed forces. This figure includes officers, reenlistees, air-corpsmen, and others not drafted into service. Some of these may have been spurred to enlist by the draft, but benefits proposed above might spur even more. In any event, our defense needs could be met by a smaller force of better trained and more dedicated soldiers. The draft could always be re-instated later if emergency conditions required it.

2. *Voluntary service would be too expensive.* Although better pay is necessary for a voluntary army, the increased pay would be offset by lower training costs since there would be more re-enlistment. Moreover, the entire cost of maintaining the huge selective-service machinery would be eliminated as well as the cost of prosecuting and imprisoning draft resisters. (In 1969 10% of all federal criminal trials involved draft resistance.) Even if the cost of voluntary service would be higher anyways, it would be better to pay more than to rely on conscription to preserve low wages.

3. *A voluntary army would consist mainly of the poor.* The conscript army we have now consists mainly of the poor, since the rich young men go to college, graduate school, and into deferred occupations. The difference would be that a poor man entering voluntary service would have some money left when he completes his service, while now he is just as poor as when he was drafted.

4. *A professional army is undemocratic . . . may even threaten our freedoms.* This is the

most specious argument of all! When we had voluntary service in this country—between the Civil War and World War I and again between the world wars—the military played a less important role in setting policy than it does now with conscription! Moreover, in countries, like India, Canada, Britain, and Sweden which have voluntary service there is less militarism than in countries like Syria, the Soviet Union, both Chinas, and Greece which have compulsory service.

President Richard Nixon, the late Adlai Stevenson, Senator Barry Goldwater, Senator Nelson, and other prominent Americans have urged the establishment of voluntary military service. Congress should take their advice and end the draft this session.

YOUTH AND THE GENERATION GAP PANEL WITNESSES

Gerald Behling, Director of Special Projects, Milwaukee Boys Club.

Reverend Gerald Cross, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Campus Minister.

Pat McCabe, President, Milwaukee Youth Committee.

Steve Driver, Northcott Neighborhood House.

Marge Kroger, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee student.

Dave Michalski, Milwaukee Boys Club.
Paul Drevlin.

Mr. BEHLING. There is nothing wrong with our youth of today. They are the same as they were in my day, in my father's day and even in the ancient days of Socrates, who said of the youth of early Greece: "Our youth now loves luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority, and disrespect for their elders. Children nowadays are tyrants." I'm not trying to say that we have no problem, however, I am saying that we should look where the source of the problem lies.

The National Crime Commission in its 1967 report to the President, declared that a major factor in the rapid rise in crime, particularly among persons under 21, is the failure of parents to train and discipline children in the home. Proper discipline is one of the two basic requirements which a child needs from his parents in order to become a mature adult. The second is sufficient love and attention. Too often in today's world, we find love and attention replaced by indifference and discipline replaced by permissiveness. Permissiveness in the last several decades has changed from a willingness to tolerate a situation to a granting of full liberty to do as one pleases.

This change has come about due to a gradual transition in society as people have become less concerned about their fellow man. People rarely have time to sit down and listen to one another. Parents do not have time to listen to or to play with their children in a relaxed, fun-filled setting. An individual and especially a child has to have attention. He has to be recognized. He has to be respected and to feel that he is loved. This will enable him to find his identity and to become a special part of his world.

Mutual recognition, respect and love will establish excellent communication, which is essential to bridge the Generation Gap. Without a thorough understanding between parent and child, it becomes impossible for them to later communicate effectively with one another. Respect and love bring forth a willingness to mutually accept responsibility. However the degree to which one acknowledges this responsibility must be taught from childhood.

We as parents abdicated to the schools our role of teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic a long time ago, however the fourth "R," responsibility, continues to rest firmly on the shoulders of parents. If we as adults are willing to be accountable for our actions, to show full consideration for others and their property, to be willing to take on more

than our load and not complain; then we will find youth willing to do so, too.

However, society in its dehumanization process has left many of our youth insecure and lacking in an adequate self-image. These youth may become the school dropouts, the hippies, the delinquents, the mental health problems—or—maybe just a normal young adult in tomorrow's Generation Gap.

Rev. GERALD CROSS. Let's say the generation gap exists today and will continue to exist in the future society. I'd better use the term life-style gap rather than generation gap, because I believe that its more descriptive of what has actually taken place. I'd like to give a little bit of background of why I believe the life-style gap exists today, and why I think it will continue to exist and will not be overcome in the sense that we will learn to live with it.

There are several reasons for the life-style gap that are prevalent. One of them is that this has become a scientific and technological society. Where at one time young men were needed as an important part of our labor force, today there are fewer and fewer jobs open to our younger people. At one time hardly enough men, young or old, could be found to till the soil, cut trees for lumber needs, erect telegraph poles, lay railroad tracks, and so forth. What was needed was manpower and every willing man was accepted into America's working force.

Today we are a technological society. The kind of labor needed for today's industry needs skills that require years of training and education. Young people are not accepted into the working force. They must spend their time in schools to learn the skills needed to make a living in this scientific-technological era.

The consequences for this new society have brought on many complications in becoming an adult. For one thing, the adult world is much more difficult to identify with. Children, both boys and girls, have difficulty understanding what it means to be an adult person. Father's work is so technical that even other adults cannot understand it, let alone the children at home. Mother is out of the house and children have difficulty identifying a clear-cut role for Mother.

Therefore the role identification of what it means to be an adult is much more complicated than it once was. For another thing, the amount of time necessary to be accepted into the adult world is greatly increased. I have already said that once a young man could go immediately from grammar school to work and was quickly accepted into the adult world. A young girl would marry early and begin her family and her marriage. This took her into that adult world regardless of her age.

But today young people are not accepted into the adult world until they can make their way in it economically. And since more and more training is needed before this can happen, more and more time exists between youth and adulthood.

Therefore, the age of adolescence which was once approximately between the age of about 12 to 16 or 17, now stretches to the ages of about 22 or even 25. Young men in graduate school who are 25 years old or older who neither married nor gainfully employed are really considered adolescents by the working world.

Consequently with more time between youth and adulthood, we have another complication in terms of becoming an adult.

The final factor in all of this is the decreasing average age of our society. Over half of our nation is now under 25 years of age. In the past this was not true. We have more young people under 25 than ever before and their entry into adulthood is delayed much more than it was a 100 years ago.

The symbols for entry into adulthood are

much more confused than in the past decades. Out of all this has come a youth subculture which has its own life-style, its own symbols, and its own moral code. Its life-style is that of freedom. The symbols are such things as music and automobiles. The moral code is one of individual responsibility.

Those who identify with this youth subculture are often put into conflict with the adult world and so we have what is popularly known as the generation gap.

These are the things that the older generation cannot understand and it is because of this lack of understanding that we have so much conflict in our society.

Miss McCABE. First of all, I'd like to talk about the Youth Committee that I belong to. It's known as the Milwaukee Youth Committee, and there are some 50 active kids in the group from the inner-city and the suburbs. We have been able to work on different projects ranging from education, employment, race relations, to others. We've been able to work together and so I definitely feel that it is not right to say that all youth can't work together for a common cause.

There are many separatist movements going on right now among the blacks, among Puerto-Ricans, Mexi-Americans, but I think the only way to solve all the problems is to work together.

So far our committee has proved that this can be done. Our main purpose for forming the group was to give youth a voice in the community. That seems to be one of the hardest things to do because presently we are working with the center for civic initiative on establishing a community school which would give the student freedom to take a course of study that he would like. We've run into many problems with the youth opportunity board in trying to set up this school. They keep telling us we should worry about the organizational aspects of it. We're trying to get across to them that we are not worried about the organizational aspects such as fire regulations. We are worried about giving the kids an education that would really benefit them.

We've run into trouble with the Milwaukee school board. They won't give us any leeway in any of the projects that we undertake. We can't even have literature on this project distributed in the schools. For some reason, all these different big bodies just don't want to give youth a chance to really voice their beliefs.

What we're asking from them is simply to have the adults listen to us and also experiment with our ideas. You may find, I am sure, that our older panel members here would listen to our ideas and say, "Fine that's great. Good luck on your work." But what we really need is a commitment to try these ideas out, because we can't pull them off by ourselves. We can't worry about the fire regulations because we're not qualified to worry about that stuff. We need the adult help and we need them to back us in experimenting with our ideas.

Mr. REUSS. Pat, is the school proposal the main activity of your youth community?

Miss McCABE. Right now, it is. We're also working toward a youth referendum on November 1. This is where we've had trouble with the school board. We're trying to have referendum voting on different issues that effect youth and effect the adults too. We want to find out what the youth of Milwaukee thinks so that we can better represent them. We're asking the school board to let us use the schools as polling places. Right now it's been under study for something like two or three weeks and we haven't heard much from them. But we're hoping that they'll listen. But it's just like running into a brick wall when you're trying to talk to them.

Mr. DRIVER. At Northcott we deal with kids from 5 to 18 and we have a beautiful rela-

tionship. However, I don't like to use the term generation gap. I just say that we do our own thing, that's all, and we can get a common interest together and can work with it. It just depends.

I think that our economic status has changed. We really don't deal with a whole lot of cares like our parents did. . . . The main thing is money. . . .

Well, we started dealing more or less with individuals, with people of different races and creeds and it's a gas being in between (like myself) I just reached 21 and now I'm getting older and I still want to be back with the fellas. Grown-ups never really try to take time out to understand us. It's just like . . . well the whole government doesn't seem relevant to us. It's built around much older people and the restrictions which they put on us.

I'd like to see a lot of things change but, the main thing is this: I wish the young people and their parents could get together and do their thing together. This way a whole lot of things will change in the country.

At Northcott we're starting a crash diet, you know, we control the kids very well. They need moral support.

Miss KROGER. I don't have a set of prepared comments to make, but I would like to make some sidelines to what other people have said here today. I think at the onset I should tell you that my framework is primarily political. I have worked for the past three years on a number and wide range of political groups from young Americans for Freedom and Young Republicans to SDS.

I have been able to observe both older and younger people, in what has been called the social consciousness or political activism realm of the campus.

So once again, most things I say have to be put in that context.

I recently saw a sign which might convey something about this generation, one of the sides of the so-called generation gap. It was on a rather unusual looking bus carrying about 5 or 6 students with long hair and beards. The sign said: Change America or lose it.

That sign is obviously an answer to the America love it or leave it signs, currently on many automobiles.

I think that that phrase in itself can characterize very accurately the generation of which I am a part. I am not saying that particular syndrome is peculiar to our generation, but I am saying that it is certainly more intense in this one. I think the reasons for that can be enumerated in three basic realms, some of which have political overtones but not all.

I think one of the basic problems is complete turn-off and alienation from the materialistic society in which we grew up. Many of our teachers throughout secondary education transmitted a kind of feeling of basic unawareness which, if you were aware of you just sort of accepted. Our generation isn't really in a position to do that, at least that's the way most of us feel.

At this time in our existence, the United States possesses the power to kill 2 to 3 times the population we now have. That's already on stockpile you know. Max Werner has come to call this concept over-kill. Many of us are concerned about a world where nations measure their success in atomic power, a world whose nations are concerned much more about prestige than about humane concerns. Most of us at one time or another have undergone the so-called disillusionment, not only during the McCarthy campaign, but in smaller endeavors.

So many times what Rev. Cross has called a life-style gap is nothing more than an embodiment of disillusion and complete alienation from another kind of society in which we grew up.

It may be because of political considerations which could have initiated the aliena-

tion feeling, or perhaps the social alienation came before the political awareness, the order isn't really very important.

I think that's one of the underlying problems that complacency and materialistic orientation brews. Of course it's very easy for us to be materialistic because most of us have it, most of us grew up with it. I am talking about the middle-class college generation. And you'll find most of the activists statistically come from very good homes. That in itself says something. I think about where we're moving as far as social life-style is concerned.

I think one of the other very big problems is the complexity of this society. The world has always been complex and there have never been any easy solutions. But when you confront the questions of deaths or peace particularly within the context of nuclear power, things become a lot more complicated now than when they were say 10 to 20 years ago. With all that sophistication in technology, we haven't accompanied sophistication in awareness and education.

The college sophomore of today is considerably more sophisticated than the college sophomore of 1940. He may not be any more mature, but he is considerably more aware, more intensely aware and increasingly more perceptive of the things going on around him. You can kid him a lot less. You really can't wave the flag at him as nearly as much. He isn't willing to accept many of the old answers.

So along with this increased sophistication and complexity, then, we have a society where absolutes and absolute truths are very difficult to identify. One of those absolute truths that become a little clouded in this kind of context is a word like democracy. We look for new interpretations for those words, new meanings, because the old ones haven't fit.

We're still having wars, famine, 2/3rds of our world population is still suffering from hunger while the United States spends 10 to 13 billion dollars to go to the moon. Those kinds of paradoxes remain unexplainable to us. And these are the kinds of questions we're raising. In the process of raising those questions maybe a life-style gap or a generation gap has emerged.

Mr. MICHALSKI. I am going to try to do one thing and that is not to run around the issue but to try to "tell it like it is." "Tell it like it is" seems to me to be a very important phrase. It stems from my generation, my friends and myself. We of today will run the world tomorrow. But if we are not trained properly, if we do not fully understand one another's differences, the world of tomorrow might be a very sad story. I am not saying that we all must have the same ideas, because difference of opinion is the spice of life. Rather, we must solve problems by finding a mutual understanding between all parties concerned.

Many people today say youth is wreckless and it has no sense of responsibility. I say this is wrong.

We live in an accelerated world, and in order to fit into place we must accelerate also. Some people think we are moving too fast but I think they are wrong. We care about many things but, we tend to care about ourselves a little bit more.

I think we all know this is something we must grow out of, or else we won't fit into society. What I'm trying to say is if people would just look at each individual before passing judgment and if the minority who gave you the bad name would be spotted out and brought to justice, we would have a much better world now and a better world tomorrow.

As far as the generation gap goes, I have only one thing to say, it's a real problem, and it must be dealt with right away. This gap is caused by misunderstandings between young and old. These generations drift slowly apart, and the real solution for this problem is for these parties to get together and dis-

cover a way to understand each other. Only then will this gap be lessened.

If the world of tomorrow will have a better life for its young, it must be set up by the generations existing at this time. Only if the older and younger generations work together to find closeness and understanding will this generation exist.

The older generation today must take time to train the young now for future jobs. Then we will be able to say we understand our elders' point of view.

If prejudice and discrimination are destroyed and buried, then a new generation will start to spring forth. This new generation, if brought up in this life, will have no generation gap but complete understanding of one another. And this I think is the goal of all mankind.

Mr. DREVLIN. I think the difference between the youth of today and tomorrow is that we may be considered pioneers. In past years the older people were concerned about achieving a job. This was their main goal in life. Now we are in the land of plenty. I must say I'm not suffering any. I have just about everything I want, except an occupation, and I'm not really sure of what I want. I could attain various jobs. But any job has to satisfy me personally, not necessarily in dollar value. It's a personal thing, and sometimes it gets a little rough to do this because you may be considered a bum or drifter. Most people nowadays will change their jobs several times over when 40 years ago a person went into a vocation and stayed with that job for the rest of his life. I think that's the main difference between now and then.

AUDIENCE TESTIMONY ON YOUTH AND THE GENERATION GAP

KENNETH MILTON. It seems, first of all, in order to solve the generation gap, people have to listen. I heard stated earlier that in order to solve the gap people have to sit down and talk. If nobody listens, you don't solve anything. It seems that when adults tend to act superior over you, when a kid wants to sit down and talk with an adult, the adult has a tendency to shut off the youth figuring "Well, I've had more experience and I know what I'm talking about." "I want to talk but I won't listen." Something has to be done there.

People won't listen, and won't recognize you as a person. If they don't, there won't and can't be any mutual understanding. There has to be some giving and some taking. There can't be a one-sided thing or someone just takes and someone continually gives.

I've witnessed more than once that adults have a tendency to shut out youth because they feel superior.

I'm not saying that they aren't superior, but kids do have some ideas of their own that aren't continuously wrong. Adults do have this tendency to shut youth off and criticize what they say. Kids nowadays are becoming more aware of social problems and realizing that there are some things wrong, for instance, the United States government . . . and peoples' sense of values.

When you were younger, everything was fed to you, like "This is right because the United States is perfect." "It's God itself". That sort of thing. There are some things wrong with it, and you can't continually say that everything is right with it. There is a false sense of values. When you spend billions upon billions of dollars for a military program, and maybe spend \$5 million to educate social workers, there does seem to be a false sense of values somewhere. Maybe that's why there happens to be so many demonstrations. Maybe they're not all full of baloney.

As far as the voting age goes, the argument is always brought up that if you're old enough to fight and die for your country you're old enough to vote. Certain other responsibilities should be given to the person who is old enough to be drafted, for in-

stance, owning a house. If a person's old enough to die for his country, he should be old enough to vote for the person that might put him in Vietnam. The older people vote to put the people in office, and the younger kids go out and die. The kids themselves have no social responsibilities, because adults say "Well, they aren't responsible enough." The only time they're responsible is when they can carry an M-1 and walk through some marshes.

I just can't see that.

That again brings up the point of the generation gap. I don't understand why a person of 18 is old enough to die yet isn't old enough to accept social responsibilities and reap some of the benefits from society.

LOIS JONAS. I've been in Madison three times this year, every time the 18 year old voting age came up before a committee. I was there against it because I happen to live with a 20 year old son. The panel members are sitting there looking real sweet, but the way they talk at home is different from the way you talk here.

However, I do think that to be given the privilege of voting, one should be given the obligation to work on a campaign. Then, they would more appreciate what a privilege they have in being able to cast their vote. Don't you think that's a good idea, that everyone should go out and work on a campaign?

MISS KROGER. It's good experience, ma'am, for those who wish to take part in it, but I don't think we'd accomplish very much by instituting it as a mandatory practice for those who wish to exercise the franchise. I don't think that's very realistic.

Mrs. JONAS. Don't you think you learn anything?

MISS KROGER. It's one of the most important things to me that I've ever participated in, but that happens to be my bag. It's not everybody's bag to go out and knock on doors. I don't think you have to have that experience to be able to intelligently exercise the right to vote.

VALERIE MALHOTA. The reason I'm up here is I'm wondering why Congress hasn't done anything at all about the Kerner Commission report that came out last year. I think it raises one of the biggest issues affecting youth today, as well as everyone. I think I have an answer to why Congress hasn't done anything. I hope my answer is wrong.

I think the answer is that in effect, Congress and the Senate are not really representing the people, they're representing the big corporate owners, the businessmen and those in power. As long as people are fighting each other, as long as all oppressed people, white and black, and this includes the middle class with two and three cars and a suburban home, they're oppressed just as the poor down in midtown where I work as a social worker. I think the Congress and the corporate owners feel that as long as these people are fighting each other because some are white and some are black that they only solve the problem of these people getting wise to the fact that they're not really representing them, that they are the sect continuing to oppress them.

For example, we've been working at Midtown Social Services for about two months now to try and get (under a HUD grant, by the way) white and black and Puerto Rican and Indian youth working together at a common goal. Just two nights ago we had a dance, the second of two. The first was very successful in having these kids have a great time together and begin to sit down and work out common objectives.

At the dance the other night an adult said inflammatory things which caused the whole situation to polarize, the black kids against the white kids. A fight, almost a riot, broke out.

As a result of this, property was damaged, which of course turns the middle class off, and the police came after about 40 minutes. It's lucky no one was killed.

When the police did come, they arrested the black youths without consideration to what actually started the thing. The police reinforced the racism that caused the whole incident by making comments like "They all ought to be shot," etc., and all of the white people went home feeling very self-righteous, thinking "Well it was true what we thought all along, you just can't work together."

I hope what I think about Congress and the Senate isn't true. I hope they are doing nothing about the Kerner Report not because they want this to continue. I hope this is wrong, but unless you have any other reasons for it I'll have to continue to believe this.

Mr. Reuss. I don't think that your explanation is the whole explanation. I think that there is no excuse, let me be very clear, for Congress' failure to do much of anything about the Kerner Commission recommendations which are in the main excellent, and long-past-due. Just for the sake of accuracy, one would have to say that the landmark housing act of 1968, which was a good law, was passed largely as a result of the Kerner Commission recommendations, so that something was accomplished.

The basic reason why not more than that has been done in response to the Kerner Commission recommendations is in part another evidence of the lag in Congress behind public sentiment, what people really want in this country. I don't think, although I'll leave everyone to his own conclusions and his own psychoanalysis of Congress, it's quite as sinister necessarily as you suggest, but lag there is and the result is equally bad.

WILLIAM SANSFIELD. Congressman, first I'd like to thank you for being here. Talking about the generation gap, I think maybe it would be more accurate to describe it as kind of a political controversy. For example, all the panelists here are pretty close together. But there is a discrepancy in the ages. You're not a teenager yourself, but my feelings on things and your feelings on things aren't really that far apart. It's more of a political thing, and I can see how it came about with my own parents. They were both brought up modestly, and they had to work very hard. Through my whole life, I've always seen automobiles, television, radio, and it's just hard for me to imagine that neither one of my parents ever saw a radio until they were 17 years old.

What we've got to do is return to the old reasons for our country. 200 years ago a bunch of guys, Sam Adams, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and some of the boys got together in a tavern one night and they said "Well look, these British are really harassing us, they're really crowding in on all of our rights". It was the same kind of harassment that is crowding in on a lot of people today.

So a lot of people came to America, and they said "We're going to do things the way we want to do it. We're going to worship in our own manner and we're not going to fight any wars because they don't make any sense." And that's the same thing a lot of the kids today are saying.

The kids are saying, "I've got my own beliefs and it's a free country." They're just trying to exercise these rights.

The Constitution guarantees that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist in the land. We're confronted with the draft. It says that all men are equal. All men are not equal, we know that. They're not treated equally. We have to go back to these guys that founded our country. They really had some great ideas. If you read the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and all the other amendments, there're really some groovy things in there. If we could just abide by what these people said everything would be a lot better.

As far as surviving, getting along, we've had a lot of talk about government appropriations spending so much money in this

area, but just a little money over here. I think the best point was made by Steve when he said that if we'd all get together and work together, that would be the best protection we could have. Then we're not going to let anybody take freedom away from us. Until we get to the point where we can say "We've got a great thing going here," then we've got a lot to worry about.

JAMES E. MILLS. I am the services supervisor for the Division of Family Services, Department of Health and Social Services. My comments today are in no way related to any official policy or belief by any state agency or any other state body. They are my views as a citizen and a parent, and as a social worker.

We talk of a generation gap, and often it's talked about in very nebulous terms and very difficult-to-define terms. Too often very little attention, I think, is paid to what is really underlying causes. I think meetings such as this try to get away from the theoretical discussions and try to get down to some way of handling matters. There is very little attention paid to what really causes the feeling of alienation which occurs between youth and adults. I would like to direct a few comments today, to an aspect I feel is very definable, and very remediable if we, as adults, are concerned about seeking a meaningful reconciliation between the two different viewpoints with which we are faced today.

The remedy, however, must come from some very diligent and heart-searching exercise of the responsibilities that our society has delegated to the older generation, which I think we can find now is anyone over 21.

Let's take a look at what the rights of children are, and by children I mean everyone below 21, though I think that's a very inept term, but this is the way society treats anyone under 21.

What are the rights of children? In this respect, I'm not relating to what's often been referred to when you get in a discussion like this, like who gets the car, what to wear, what time to get home. Rather, what are basic rights in our whole system of government.

We've exposed our youth now, and I'm a product of this for over a generation, we've expanded education at all levels, the generation has grown up with mass media, which has brought every aspect of the world to their attention as a viewer or as a reader. We've exposed people to the ideals, good ideals as the last gentlemen has stated, things like constitutional right, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, equal rights, and we've turned around and we've also exposed them to ghettos, to racial injustice, to hunger, to feather-bedding, the income tax evasion. Those are things which don't really square with the related ideal, and I think the confusion is understandable. People, and young people in turn, just as any person does, looks at their own experience. The question, whether stated or unstated, conscious or unconscious, is what rights do I have as a kid? I'd like to look at some of these rights, not the way the scholarly legal journals look at them, in terms of legal rights or a jurist, but what rights does a child really have.

He has the right to be beaten to death by a parent. Except in the most blatant of situations, there are no witnesses to the event. Many times a child has a right to go to a hospital several times before being mercifully murdered. Parents have the right to raise their children, and if sick enough and slick enough, beat them until death. Children also have the right to go to prison, for years in some cases, and there's no mistake about it, reform school, no matter what you call it, is a prison, and has all the negative things a prison has. I simply refer to the statements about the penal system earlier. They could go to prison for an offense which would not necessarily be an offense if the child were across the magic age of 21. Or if he were, it would only be a short jail sentence, or a fine. A child has the right to protection by the court or social agencies, but whether

through indifference or ineptness or insufficient funding, resources, staff or insufficient public concern protection means little. We have an adult decision which gives children certain rights in the juvenile court. Why should the child have a right to an attorney when he feels he's innocent? Or to know who his accuser really is. Or a variety of other rights that were established by this ruling. Yet one hesitates to seriously look at how this ruling has affected the practice of law in juvenile courts across our country. Many courts have ignored this, or only grudgingly accepted the provisions set forth in the Gelf decision.

Other laws insure the rights of adopted parents and foster parents. After all, whatever rights a child may have are obviously secondary to the rights of adults to take children into their homes and the terms that they feel they want to make at the time that they want to make them.

Look at the field of education. A child has the right to a free education. But he does have to pay a few class fees and costs here and there to get into class. Or he can attend school, though a dress code embarrasses him so much that he'd rather forego his right to an education than be embarrassed in front of his peers. A child has a right to have his heritage ridiculed and ignored by teachers and his textbooks. He has the right to see rich kids go to better schools and see a state-federal government pay these schools more and more money so they can have better and better education while in the inner city and in the less prosperous areas children continue to get mediocre or less than mediocre education.

Then we all wonder why we can't compete equally.

He has the right to participate in expensive and expansive remedial reading programs, because the schools haven't taught him how to read in the first place. You see how much value government places on our schools, and you look and find that the school board which set policies for the school gets paid \$600 a year and we support the Fourth of July Commission, which is half again as large and they get paid \$1200 for their efforts. I think the question exists: "Does a child truly have a right to a free education comparable to the education of other children?"

Does a child have a right to adequate housing? We destroy a good part of our inner city in Milwaukee and build little else. We zone children out in the suburbs. Our real estate industry does little or nothing to promote the choice of the city as a place for people who are interested and concerned to move into and become a part of this community and lend their abilities to solving these problems.

Does a child have a right to an adequate income? Evidently not, for in the state of Wisconsin we currently are proposing an approximately 10 percent cut in the public assistance payments to Aid to Families with Dependent Children. This in the face of a hitherto unknown inflationary spiral. What better way to punish an adult for sins real or imagined than to ill-house and starve a poor child. If the present system is not bad enough, we now have proposed a new program which has within it both promise and the seeds of further violation of whatever rights a child may have, to even have his own family.

At this point it is unclear just how much latitude, and I might add, at what cost, a mother might have in deciding whether or not she should stay home and devote full time to trying to be two parents to her children.

The ironies involved in this situation are ironies which I am sure will not escape the eyes of our very knowledgeable and intelligent youth of today. For example, the very people who support this measure will, on the one hand, encourage what may very well prove to be some forcing of parents out of the home as a straight step forward. On the

other hand, there will be cries of juvenile delinquency as one of the main results of the parents not staying home and being parents to their children. Or for those to whom present public assistance is such an anathema and so un-American the supporting of state-owned, directly or indirectly, nurseries, at which the attendance of children may be required, or certainly somewhat less than voluntary. Doesn't that have a familiar ring of the former government of the largest nation of the world.

Secretary of HEW states his belief in the efficacy of this approach, and the willingness of men to work, when most of the adults in the ADC program are women whose status as underpaid and exploited members of the labor force has been continuously documented by agencies public and private.

To go on, I think quite extensively, in the area giving examples of how youth are encouraged to become citizens, encouraged to practice good citizenship, yet really have no rights of citizenship. I would postulate that the gap between generations in no small part is a reflection of the gap between our national ideals of what a citizen's rights are and our national attitudes and accomplishments in defining protecting these rights. We have the tools to reduce these inconsistencies if we were only to choose to use them.

I have great faith in youth, and would respond to those who state that youth will not or cannot understand the realities of political expediencies, the problems of implementing programs that would define the rights of citizenship for all people, including our children.

I would respond in the following way. Make a sincere effort to close the gap between the ideal and the reality. Make a sincere effort to put aside prejudices and time-worn responses to main problems. Utilize earnestly the legislative tools at hand, and involve meaningfully the human resources, adults and children, of the nation in this task. I believe that one would find not only surprise at the reaction and competency of youth, but also their willingness to contribute to the accomplishment of the goal which is so vital to continued national survival. I think the legislative branch has a particularly heavy responsibility in providing for leadership for the nation for the solution of American national problems.

GAILYA OSBORNE. I'm a member of the Youth Committee that Pat McCabe is chairman of, and I'd like to say a few things about it. The kids that we have on our committee are representative of the way most of the kids in Milwaukee feel. We don't have a lot of hippies on our committee, we don't have kids who are cutting up, burning places down, or anything like that. The majority of kids on our committee are just middle-class kids, and kids who live in ghetto neighborhoods. A lot of the concerns of our committee weren't mentioned by Pat. We have been writing letters to the state legislature about lowering the voting age to 18.

Now I feel this is a valid request because the 18 year olds are concerned about what's going on in his community. The kids now are more aware of what's happening.

I don't know if the woman who said that her son is 20 years old and she doesn't feel he should have the right to vote, is still here. I feel that the reason that he may be like that is that he hasn't been brought up in the environment to give him the chance to develop responsibility. She just hasn't brought her son up right. All the kids from 18 to 21 aren't necessarily in college, and even those who are aren't necessarily on the protest scene marching and full of long hair.

There are kids who are 18 and 21 and are straight, who aren't acid heads or pot heads or anything like that. They're just decent kids who want a chance to voice their concern about what's going on. About the Milwaukee Committee . . . We are trying to get to the public schools and arrange a meeting

of citizens because as a representative board of youth in the Milwaukee area we have to be able to get youth throughout the area and we have to be able to publicize this through the schools, who obviously have the greatest contact with youth. The school board doesn't seem to want us to have any contact with them, but I feel I'm working for a responsible organization and it's worthwhile and it's something that kids should be interested in.

Mr. REUSS. Maybe the newspaper accounts and the public presentation of this will somehow reach the members of the school board and maybe they'll do something about it. Certainly they ought to give a hearing to your group, and tell you why they won't cooperate, if that's their decision.

Mr. BEHLING. I'd just like to comment on the statement that Mrs. Jonas has not brought up her son right. I'm sure there are hundreds of thousands of parents who are in the same bag, and I think that this is one of the problems that is creating our generation gap right now.

It's something that I hope I brought out earlier in my testimony, that parents are not close enough to their children and they have not taken the time to sit down and talk to them, to be with them, to play with them, as was mentioned, and to get to know their children so that later on there will be communication between parent and child. There would then be an opportunity for the child to come to his parents when he has a problem, and to want to talk to him or her. Judgment is something that's taught. As Mrs. Jonas said, her son did not have adequate judgment at this time to vote.

Well, he comes back: "At what age will I gain this judgment?"

I don't know. Unless you are taught to make proper judgments from your young years on, you're not ever going to be able to make proper judgments.

Therefore, I have to agree with the young lady here, and Pat McCabe, and with many others, that 18 can and undoubtedly is, a proper age for youth to be voting.

The Congressman has said there were many of his constituents for it in the past. Currently it seems there is a minority opinion in favor of this.

But I certainly believe that we can again regain a majority if we can only get youth to portray the image that is really there. Here I think is the comment that was made about the newspapers, and press and television, showing all the negative aspects of our youth.

It's not the good, it's not the young man or the young lady who is doing something for his or her community, it's not the youth committees that we now have that are functioning on a very productive basis and can do something for the adult community that gets publicized. It's all the negatives that we see. Therefore, again, it comes back to the parents. What are the parents, what is society doing, to make youth more productive to put them at a point where they're capable of judging.

Miss OSBORNE. I wanted to say something on the generation gap. I think that one of the causes of it is inflation, keeping up with the Jones', so the parents are out working like my parents. Both of them have always worked, and I hardly ever saw my father. So parents don't have time to sit down and talk with their children, although they'd like to. They are working just to keep their heads above water. It's difficult.

Inflation, and sending rockets to the moon. I know there are a lot of people employed in it, but these technicians employed on the space project don't necessarily need that employment. In the field of technology there are a lot of job openings. They could be employed in another program without sending all this money off to space.

Mrs. M. E. GELINE. Congressman Reuss, panel, I didn't have any intention of saying

anything. I came to listen. I came to listen because youth is my love, youth is my interest.

I'm only a mother, with an interest in horticulture, and I often compare raising children to raising flowers or raising any horticulture material. That's the way I personally look at them. You plant the seed . . . it may be the best seed, but without care it will grow wild. You can seed a mediocre seed, but with good care it will turn into something very beautiful and very productive.

I consider myself a member of the lost generation, because my parents belonged to a generation that was very strict, and when we became parents, we decided to raise our children differently. That brought on permissiveness, the progressive system of schools, which I was a member of, and I grew up with it. My children grew up in that period.

Now that my children are grown, I cannot help but make comparisons with this attitude of the parents who are going to be different than their parents were. They were going to provide their children with the comforts that they didn't have. They were going to give their children conveniences they were deprived of. As a result, it created an overabundance of material things for the children, an overabundance of leisure time, and it was not constructive. It was like watering a rose with too much water until you drown it.

Now this generation which has been given too much, because the parents had so little, grew up without enough sense of values, without any or enough responsibility, without being able to make their own decisions, because everything was given to them much too freely and much too much.

As a result, they found themselves with a lot of idle time. True, they went to school, but who gave them tuition and who supplied the necessities while they were in school? It was all given to them. They found themselves with a lot of time, and suddenly they graduate and they begin rebelling.

What are they rebelling against is my question? They are rebelling against the comforts that their forefathers had built up for them. They are criticizing constantly. Everything is no good, and everything should be torn down, everything should be changed.

My question to you here is why are they criticizing? I would like to hear a constructive program that they have to offer to replace the present program that has been built up for them. Whatever I read, whatever I hear, they always disagree. They always oppose, but I would like to see youth engaged a little bit more in constructive plans rather than criticize.

It's very easy to criticize your mother and dad, but the generation gap has existed since time immemorial. At no time did one generation see eye to eye, because of the differences in ages. It is absolutely normal.

But we do look forward to the young people to take over where we leave off, and I would like to see a more constructive attitude on the part of the young people. Come up with suggestions, but don't just call your parents old fogies, old-fashioned. Give them respect for the wisdom they have acquired through the experience they've had, the work they've put in. Give them a little credit, give them the respect, but if you have a better program to offer, speak up.

It is your world to take over, by all means, but do enter the world prepared for the knowledge of what has happened prior to your entrance into the world. That is my opinion to the young people. Don't just criticize, prepare yourselves to take over, develop good judgment, see the right and wrong.

MARTY SCHWARTZ. One factor in the generation gap is that my parents' parents and those of many kids were not from this country originally, being refugees from Europe or other repressed countries. They came here

with almost nothing, they had to work hard, and they instilled this effort in their children. There was the Depression, and the Depression is one thing that we always get thrown back in our faces. "Well, you haven't lived through the Depression, you don't know what it's like", and they, my parents had to work very hard, my grandfather died during the Depression and my father had to quit school, after three years of college. He didn't get the job that he wanted, but he worked hard anyway to get where he was. They always try to drive this fact into us.

My parents were instilled with the idea that America is the best country. That's true to a certain extent.

Since we have experienced things like this, we've been given everything and so now we want to go on because we see other injustices like our parents did. We see poverty, racism in the society today, and we're trying to strike out against that. Sometimes our parents don't understand what we're trying to do.

We were given supposedly everything that they could possibly give us, and they just sometimes do not understand us.

SOVIET MINORITIES PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many members of minority groups have been incited to unrest and discontent by the beckoning of utopian propaganda guided by the international Bolshevik movement.

Any such disaffected minorities should first examine the record of deception and persecution of the various ethnic groups inside Russia under Soviet Socialism.

The Caucasus region on the southern border of Russia is probably the most diversified ethnic area in the world. Many of these Asiatic peoples once occupied larger territories. But during the 18th and 19th centuries, the tsars conducted a series of military campaigns to bring the area under Russian domination. Other than among the ethnic groups in question, there was little opposition to the policy. The average Russian looked upon the objective as a "manifest destiny." In the imagination of 19th century Russian poets and novelists, the Caucasus region of Russia was a wild romantic setting where Russian gentility confronted exotic tribes. Here Byronic military officers advanced their careers in exploits against recalcitrant Asiatics. Elegant ladies of Russian nobility "took the waters" at exclusive Circassian spas. This literary theme reflected a larger political program. For example, Pushkin treated the subject of the Caucasian nationalities as a historical necessity. In his poem "Caucasian Prisoner," he describes Russian General Yermolov, who commanded the military campaign to conquer the Caucasus, as "the scourge of the Caucasus—your way, like a black plague, destroyed and annihilated tribes." Nevertheless, Pushkin praises the conquest and bids the Caucasus "tremble, for Yermolov comes." In spite of Russian efforts, the Romanov dynasty fell in 1917 with the Caucasus still unsubdued.

Eager to win the favor of the non-Russian nationalities, the early Bolshe-

viks deplored czarist policies. In his Thesis on the National Question, Lenin charges that:

These 10,000,000 individuals, Kirghiz, Bashkirs, Chechens, Ossetians, Ingush, were right up till recently, methodically dispossessed of their best lands by Russian colonists. Driven gradually into sterile deserts these people were devoted to certain death.

The first edition (1937) of the large Soviet Encyclopedia condemns the deportation policy of Nicholas II:

As a culmination the most vital elements of the population were deported to Turkey to the number of 20,000, and were in fact destined in their majority to dying out . . . The risings drew on themselves cruel executions and masses of victims, the annihilation of auls and the destruction of crops.

Such statements were part of the Bolshevik scheme of granting autonomy to nationalities persecuted by the czars in order to win their support.

After the consolidation of power, Soviet policy changed toward the non-Russian nationalities. It began to reflect the deep Bolshevik distrust of minority nationalism as expressed in a composition by Lenin:

The Ukraine is an independent republic. That is very good, but in party matters it sometimes—what is the politest way of saying it?—takes a roundabout course, and we have to get at them somehow, because the people there are sly, and I will not say deceive the Central Committee, but somehow or other edge away from us.¹

In spite of the Bolshevik propaganda offensive, many minorities attempted to reassert their national identity. They had discovered that the real Bolshevik attitude toward nationalism was not so generous as implied in official rhetoric. They resented Bolshevik methods of nationalization, centralization, and political rule. The Bolsheviks now began to deal with minority nationalism as an obstacle to the expansion of the Soviet empire. But, by adopting more forceful methods of control, they insured the continuity of Tsarist policies.

During the 1930's and 1940's, the Soviets adopted Nicholas II's relocation method, but on a grander scale than that undertaken by the Tsars. Three major nationality groups were affected. Among them are the Volga Germans, who were introduced to the Caucasus as favored immigrants by Catherine the Great; the Kalmyks, inhabiting the steppe of southwest Astrakhan; and a group of Islamic nations of the Crimea and North Caucasus.

The Volga Germans were the first sizable nationality to suffer deportation during World War II. They had entered Russia in large numbers as a result of two decrees issued by Catherine the Great in 1762 and 1763 inviting foreign settlement in lands from which the Russians had recently driven the Khans. The Germans were extremely successful farmers. As free peasants in a country of serfs, they scattered throughout the area from the Ukraine to the Urals. They took part in the Pugachev Revolt of 1773 and in the revolution of 1905. Nicholas II tried to curb Volga German recalcitrance in

the decree of 1916 against "German dominance," by ordering their expulsion from the Volga area beginning in April 1917.

The overthrow of the monarchy prevented the execution of the order. As part of a program to cultivate the region, the Bolsheviks created the Volga German Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1924. The production targets of the collectivization campaign of the early 1930's were so successfully met that the Volga Republic was treated as a showplace. During this period there was little tension between the government and the German population.

In spite of this record the Soviets evidently questioned the loyalty of the Volga Germans after the Nazi invasion of Soviet Russia. The decree for their deportation was issued August 21, 1941, exactly 5 weeks after the German advance:

According to trustworthy information received by military authorities, among the German population living in the Volga there are thousands and tens of thousands of diversionists and spies who on a signal being given from Germany are to carry out sabotage in the area inhabited by the Germans of the Volga.²

The ukase cited such vague destinations for the uprooted Germans as the Novosibirsk, Omsk, and Altai region. Of the roughly 480,000 Germans settled in the Ukraine, the Soviets evacuated about 200,000 while the Nazis deported the rest to Germany. The early relocation of this group was probably more a precaution against collaboration and irredentist claims than a punishment for uncommitted treason. Nevertheless, the Volga Germans have disappeared from all statistics of the ethnic composition of the U.S.S.R.

Once a precedent had been set, other minorities of "questionable allegiance" were exiled. The Kalmyks are Buddhists of the Lamaist rite who left Chinese Turkestan with 50,000 Kibitki—carts used as nomad tents—and arrived in the Volga region in 1630. The Tsars cultivated the Kalmyks as a tool for Russia's eastward expansion. The Kalmyk warriors, homeless, but still blindly obedient to their chiefs, were an instrument for keeping in check the rebellious peoples of the Urals. Peter the Great used them as border guards.

But the Kalmyks remained an alien and hostile element in European Russia. The Tsars' 19th century "Kalmyk policy" consisted of ousting them from economically viable areas and curtailing their fishing rights in the Caspian Sea and the Volga River. The source of their livelihood discontinued, the plight of the impoverished Kalmyks steadily worsened.

At first the Kalmyks benefited from Bolshevik rule. The Kalmyk Autonomous Province was created in 1920. During the interwar period literacy among the Kalmyks rose from 4 to 90 percent.³ But the foundations of a Kalmyk culture were not laid by Moscow.

¹ Robert Conquest. *The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1960, p. 49.

² Walter Kolarz. *Russia and Her Colonies*. New York, Archon Books, 1953, p. 85.

³ V. I. Lenin. *Sochineniia*. Moscow, 1922, vol. 33, p. 267.

This comfortable relationship ended when the Kalmyks resisted the harsh Soviet collectivization measures. In October 1929 Stalin reacted by ordering the expulsion of "kulaks and feudalists," a decree affecting about 20,000 Kalmyks disenchanted with Stalinization. The Kalmyks were relocated in desert areas. It is not known how many died of starvation while in exile.

The German occupation of Kalmykia during World War II gave what remained of this nation a chance to express its identity and resentment of Soviet policies. When the Germans were routed in 1943, the vanguard of the Kalmyks retreated with the German armies and formed an emigre organization in the West of about 13,000.⁴ After the Red army had liberated the area, the deportation order was announced December 27, 1943. "The liquidation of the Kalmyks as an organized community was carried out informally."⁵ Although many were sent to the Krasnoyarsk area of Siberia, the majority disappeared without trace. The Kalmyk A.S.S.R. was absorbed by the province of Astrakhan, the Kalmyk capital Elitsa assumed a Russified name Stepnovy, and the leading fishing settlement Lagan' became Kaspiiskoye. Lenin's reference to Kalmyk history as an "uninterrupted chain of suffering,"⁶ had assumed a prophetic quality.

Another Caucasian people whom the Soviets deported as a group are the Karachai. The Tsarist precedent for this measure occurred in the early 19th century when the Karachai were driven out of the Caucasus foothills by the advancing Cossacks. Confined to the rocky mountain area, they lived in the poverty of nomadic cattle breeding.

The Bolsheviks restored the Karachai to their native area in the plain. Prior to World War II the Soviets considered the resettlement of the Karachai a landmark in their Caucasus policy. According to Walter Kolarz's study of non-Russian nationalities:

It was just that resettlement which in 1942 offered to the Karachai the opportunity of getting in touch with the German armies and rendering service to them.⁷

Upon liberation of the area at the end of 1943, the Soviets ordered the abolition of the Karachai Province and the evacuation of its population. The winter journey of the deportees in cattle trucks took a heavy toll among the migrant Karachai. During the several weeks of the journey, deaths of up to 50 percent were reported. These were concentrated among the elderly, but typhus victims were of all ages.⁸

Like the Karachai, the exodus of the Crimean Tatars takes precedent in czarist policy. Between 1784 and 1790, 300,000 Tatars had left the Crimean Peninsula out of a total of 1 million. Some of these were sent to Turkey. Others were settled in less strategic positions where the Russians could more easily control them.

While there was minor population dis-

placement since 1800, the second large wave of Tatar emigration followed the Crimean War. From 1859 to 1863, legal deportation involved about 150,000 Crimean Tatars. Thousands more were exiled illegally during the same period. After 1875 Russian authorities recognized the great economic disadvantage caused by Tatars leaving the country and curtailed the issue of passports. But this measure did not prevent another 18,000 from leaving the Crimea. The emigration of the Tatars did not stop until after the October revolution.

The Crimean A.S.S.R. was established in October 1921. Tension developed in relations with Moscow during the 1920's when pan-Turkism fanned Crimean Tatar nationalism. Bela Kun, leader of the violent Hungarian Communist revolt of 1919, was named head of the Crimean Revolutionary Committee and dispatched to subdue the Crimea. The arrest of Veli Ibragimov in 1927, the main protagonist of nationalist tendencies, was followed by a purge of Crimean cultural ministries. During the late 1920's, 30,000 to 40,000 Crimean Tatars were exiled for "bourgeois nationalism" and opposition to collectivization.

The Crimea was relatively stable during the 1930's in spite of exhaustive purges. The German invasion of 1941 usurped Soviet control and let the Tatars express their nationalism. The Red Army fully liberated the area in April 1944. In June the order was given for the removal of the Tatar population for these reasons: First joining German volunteer detachments to combat Red Army units; second, organizing an anti-Soviet underground; third, popular sanctions of such treason.⁹ Of the 250,000 Tatars in the Crimea when the war broke out, 100,000 died during the exodus to Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Kirghizia.¹⁰

The Chechen and Ingushi tribes of the Caucasus have challenged the Russian Empire since the time of Peter the Great. The final conquest of the Chechens in 1840 was followed by the transfer of the population of 44 auls—mountain villages—to the plains, where they could be more easily controlled, or to Turkey. Another 34,000 left Russia in 1865.¹¹ But a Russian monograph on Chechnia published in 1894 concluded that the group could not be considered "fully pacified."

The Chechens reacted to the Bolshevik Revolution with a national-religious revival. Although the Soviets eliminated the leader of the religious movement, Imam Hadji, they could not cope with Chechen nationalism. During the 1920's, and 1930's, the Soviets used violent methods of suppressing the Islamic Chechens and Ingushi. During this period, the Tsarist fortress of Grozny, meaning "menacing," grew into an important oil city. Although it was the capital of the Chechen A.S.S.R., the influx of Russian oil workers inflated the population of the city on an "American scale." Because of the growing Russian population, the province was becoming

more a Soviet colony than an autonomous republic.

During World War II, the Germans exploited Chechen oil and nationalism. The strategic-economic value of the city of Grozny in part motivated the Soviets to charge the Chechens and Ingushi with collaboration with the Germans. Their deportation was ordered in February 1944. An account of Soviet methods was related by Col. Grigori Burlutskii, a defector from the NKVD, the feared Soviet secret police. He participated in the evacuation of the Chechen village of Novosilskoye. According to Burlutskii, the Chechen population was ordered to assemble in village centers February 23, 1944, to celebrate Red Army day. The holiday mood of the crowd was rapidly changed when Major Khorin, the counterespionage officer, read the following announcement:

It has been established that during the time of the German occupation of Soviet territory, the population of the Chechen-Ingushi Republic gave aid to the enemy, collaborated with them, formed bandit units and carried on hostilities against the Soviet army. In this way they damaged Soviet power and aided the enemies of Communism. For these reasons, the Communist Party and the Soviet government have decided that the entire population of the autonomous Republic of Chechen-Ingushi shall be banished forever to the far regions of the Soviet Union.¹²

Colonel Burlutskii was awarded an inscribed gold watch which expressed gratitude for "the successful accomplishment of a mission."¹³ General in the NKVD Ivan Serov won a "Hero of Soviet Union" medal for directing the deportations.

The scope of the population transfers, the thoroughness with which they were carried out, and the awards bestowed on their directors, indicate the importance to Stalin of the policy of deportation. The Soviets might have justified these measures in several ways. They mention the usual ideological charges of "bourgeois nationalism." The deportations could have been used to weaken resistance to Stalin's collectivization programs. Stalin might have relocated the Islamic minorities to sever an irredentist attraction from Turkey and Iran. Exile could have been one method of settling the underpopulated regions of Soviet Russia. Fear of "counterrevolution" might have been another motive; that is, fear of allowing other minority problems to develop like that of the Ukraine. The relocation of the largest minorities might have served as a warning to smaller minority groups to curb their own nationalism. Punishment for collaboration with enemy Germany can hardly be ruled out as another motive for relocation:

It is, of course, perfectly true that the Germans raised units from among the Chechens, as they did for most of the minority nations of the U.S.S.R.—and, indeed, from the Russians themselves.¹⁴

The Soviet policy toward the displaced minorities was reconsidered during the mellowing of party authority that followed the death of Stalin. In his famous

⁴ *Calcutta Statesman*, May 4, 1955, p. 53.

⁵ Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁷ Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

⁸ *Conquest, op. cit.*, p. 91.

¹⁰ *The New York Times*, May 3, 1969.

¹¹ Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

¹² Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

¹³ Charles Thayer, "MVD" "Man's Declaration of Independence," *Life*, July 5, 1954, p. 72.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

¹⁵ *Conquest, op. cit.*, p. 122.

"secret speech" to the 20th Party Congress in 1956, First Secretary Khrushchev criticized the relocation program:

Not only a Marxist-Leninist but also no man of common sense can grasp how it is possible to make whole nations responsible for inimical activity, including women, children, old people, Communists, and Komso-mols, to use mass repression against them, and to expose them to misery and suffering for the hostile acts of individual persons or groups of persons.

Khrushchev singled out the Chechens, Ingush, Balkars, Karachai, and Kalmyks as "suffering people." But he did not mention the Crimean Tatars or the Volga Germans as rehabilitated.

In February 1957, the Supreme Soviet of nationalities issued a decree to restore national autonomy to the displaced minorities. With certain restrictions, members of the restored exiled groups were allowed to return to their homeland. Although the offer appeared generous, it soon became apparent that the experiences of the deportees had not turned them into model Soviet citizens, and that control still had to be exercised by trustworthy Russians.

Yet several sizable nationalities, the Jews, Volga Germans, and Crimean Tatars, still have no national territory in the multinational Soviet state. The Jews, currently the object of political "anti-Zionism," do not press for territorial claims. Neither do the Volga Germans, who have assumed an inferior status since World War II.

The Crimean Tartars are another exception to the Soviet policy reversal. This group was not rehabilitated until September 1967 when they were formally absolved of Stalin's charges of collaboration with the Nazis. No publicity was permitted over this decision, which did not even appear in the national press. Tartar leaders estimate that 12,000 Tartars have been expelled or prevented from entering the Crimea since the decree of 1967.¹⁵ The Soviet leadership continues to reject the appeals of the Tartars, "who are among the most active and organized pressure groups in the country and who push their demands by concerted actions."¹⁶ The Crimean Tartar demonstration before the "world unity" congress of Communist Parties in Moscow in June 1969 is a recent attempt to force international attention on their exile.

The prospects for restoration of autonomy to any Soviet minority even to what existed in the early Bolshevik period do not appear promising. The status of the non-Russian nationalities has not yet worsened in spite of the partial re-Stalinization currently noted by Western analysts. Since Brezhnev and Kosygin have not yet reversed any decisions on the "nationalities question" made after Stalin, the minorities problem in Russia remains the Achilles heel to the Bolshevik tyranny in the Soviet Socialist Republics.

SIGNS OF PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from the headlines that a confused picture has been presented in the United States on the military situation in Vietnam, and that much misinformation prevails on the economic and political picture there. I have visited in Vietnam and, although the time spent there was brief, I explored as thoroughly as possible the problems and the successes of the allied military and civilian effort there. I talked at length with the entire top leadership of the U.S. effort and with a number of allied and South Vietnamese leaders. I came away with a strong feeling that the military situation and the nation-building progress are going far better than many people at home have realized. Militarily, our fighting forces, those of the Republic of Vietnam, and the free world forces have the situation in hand and are prepared to meet any new initiatives the enemy may attempt.

I am impressed by the manner in which modernization and training programs are progressing in the armed services of the Republic of Vietnam. I have visited their units and talked with their commanders. It should be obvious that they have assumed a stronger and more effective combat role in recent months. Now they are moving toward even broader acceptance of combat responsibility as they prepare to assume the role held by departing U.S. units.

People who saw Vietnam as I did 3 years ago have no difficulty in recognizing the tremendous amount of change which has taken place. At that time things were very rough. The Communists were in effective control of much of the terrain outside the cities. Travel was dangerous. The American forces were faced with great problems of troop and facilities buildup, and both the Vietnamese Government and its military forces were simply trying to survive.

All of this has changed for the better. Now nearly all but the jungle areas are in allied control. Areas like the Delta are completely transformed. I traveled deep into that area, where most of the people live and where the Communists had their way for so many years. At the time I was in Vietnam last, the rice crop harvest in the Delta was controlled by the Communists who were living on it while we shipped rice to Vietnam to feed the populace. Now the Communists have been pushed back, and the once tremendous flow of military supplies up the Mekong and through Cambodia has been very sharply cut back. All through South Vietnam I was impressed by the vitality of the people, the tremendous progress they have made in defending themselves and in building a more decent life. Everybody is working or fighting there. There is much more security for the people now, and one can see from the air the signs of progress. The highways are crowded, goods are moving, people are moving, they are building, and they are proud of the contribution that their own efforts have made.

The Communist regiments, which for a long time moved almost at will in the Saigon area, have been pushed back and

many of their forces have had to be relocated near the DMZ as the result of shortage of supplies elsewhere. However, a glance at the headlines shows that there is still heavy fighting in progress. The war is not over. Although the enemy has been hurt and hurt badly, the cessation of the bombing made it easier for him to obtain supplies, and this has required a larger effort by allied ground, air, and naval forces. Even so, battles now are being fought far from the population centers. The enemy has been unable to achieve any significant military victory and is resorting largely to hit-and-run tactics in the field and to gangster-like terror attacks on innocent civilians in the cities. Intelligence sources have revealed that he is reconverting some of his units from combat field organizations to sapper units for resorting to guerrilla-type operations. These are obviously not the tactics of a military winner.

Military successes are making possible a strong pacification program which is essential to the survival of the Republic of Vietnam as a nation. It is my belief that pacification is going forward in a more positive manner than ever, and this despite the enemy's continuing efforts in the field. More and more hamlets are being brought under government security. Out of a population of 17 million people in South Vietnam, 15 million live within areas of government security. This security continues to gain ground despite enemy attacks, coercion, assassination, extortion, and terrorism aimed at destroying the confidence of the people in the government.

Nearly 1 million men and women are serving in the armed forces of the Republic of South Vietnam. That is the equivalent of having 18 million in the armed services in our own country. They serve not for 1 year or 2 years or 5 years but for whatever period of time is required to defend their nation, their families, and their homes against communism. During that time, losses suffered by the Vietnamese forces have been 1½ times the number of U.S. deaths. This is a fact often overlooked.

On the battlefield the enemy has been badly hurt. He has lost over one-half million killed since 1961. This is a very large number for a nation of 20 million people. The enemy is also losing politically. Some 22,000 of his fighting forces have defected to the South Vietnamese side. It is now extremely difficult for the Communists to get the voluntary cooperation of the villagers. In an effort to keep up the strength of their fighting forces they are press-ganging the young people into their armies and in the areas of control which are left to them, they are forcing the people to pay taxes and to give up their rice. Nevertheless, the Communist is a stubborn enemy, and he continues to fight. However objective our efforts may be at the Paris peace talks, we have no recourse but to maintain pressure on the enemy in Vietnam until those talks bear fruit.

In the meantime the progress made by the South Vietnamese is most encouraging. Their units are gaining in strength and complements, and they are daily

¹⁵ New York Times, May 3, 1969.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

taking on greater responsibility in combat. With patience and understanding, it is conceivable that in time most of the burden of combat can be assumed by these forces. To precipitate a withdrawal of American units would give the Communists the encouragement they need to renew their own assault against South Vietnam.

In fact, much harm has been done by overemphasis on the withdrawal of U.S. forces in Vietnam. It is a natural thing for the families of servicemen to want their men returned from the fighting area, but it is equally important that they understand our responsibility not to abandon the obligations which we have accepted in that area. I do not feel that the administration is prepared to accept the inevitable results of too early withdrawal of American fighting units. Nothing has been resolved by the peace talks, and the only recourse left is to continue the military effort in Vietnam until a more realistic attitude is taken in the negotiations. Mr. Nixon has been quoted as stating that he will not be the first American President to lose a war. To abandon the struggle in Vietnam or to accept Communist terms is to lose the war.

We have made mistakes, of course, and there has been waste as in all wars. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of improvement in the picture in Vietnam and I am optimistic about the future, unless the United States decides the game is not worth the candle and turns its back on a valiant and thus far successful effort.

Let me say finally I have the highest praise for the U.S. servicemen who have fought this difficult war with great dedication and determination. On the ground, in the air, and afloat they have turned in an admirable performance and in the process have succeeded in stopping a determined and ruthless enemy.

OUR ORDER OF PRIORITIES SPELLS NATIONAL DISASTER

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, almost every American hopefully anticipates the extrication of our Nation from the morass that is the war in Vietnam. Should such an event occur, we eagerly await a reversal of national priorities, with urgent emphasis upon domestic requirements which can brook little further delay. It is not only universally recognized that such restructuring of national priorities is in order, but that it is imperative. Further delay in addressing massive efforts to these sores on our body politic is to court continental disaster of the most gigantic proportions. Our problems center around our cities. Vast sums are essential to any cure. Such funds can only be made available by more reasonable distribution of tax burdens, major internal institutional reforms, and a more equitable distribution of national income.

The previous administration showed some understanding of this equation,

predicting a "peace dividend" from an end to the war and natural national economic growth. It also envisioned some meaningful scaling down of our military budget. Such projections ranged into the area of \$16 billion annually 18 months after peace was restored. It was expected to grow to \$19 billion annually after 30 months of peace. Most of this revenue was projected for the domestic sector of our economy. Also noted was that major crying needs for such capital were not particularly for new programs marking significant social departure. Rather, these funds would be rushed in to fill the yawning breach in American life caused by the impending collapse of our metropolitan areas.

So we allowed ourselves the luxury of a dream or two—a hope of some bold, heartening beginnings. Perhaps it had not all been for nothing. Until August 25, when fantasyland became harsh reality land. For on that balmy day, the administration calmly stepped forward, wiped away a crocodile tear or two, and informed America that such a peace dividend was a faint hope at best and a mirage at worst. Almost all the Nation's mayors of both parties greeted this announcement with dismay. Yet the powers that be reiterated that most leftover money resulting from any peace settlement would go for existing and ongoing military and nonmilitary programs. I guess that is the way the rainbow dissolves.

The administration offered no figures to substantiate such disagreement with its predecessor. It was conceded that military expenditures might well increase. An annual rise of 4 to 5 percent in our gross national product was also discounted.

For the average lower and middle income taxpayer praying for even minimal relief, there is an obvious hint that chances for a tax cut of a meaningful nature are infinitesimal. Future direction are now very discernible—more for the status quo; little for taxpayers; even less for already slashed domestic programs.

Most of all we must understand that this is a death knell for the cities of the United States. Metropolitan areas and dependent suburbs we spend so much on to defend will soon be extensive trash heaps, choked by pollution and autos, crammed with slums and vermin. Tax bases collapsing, sources of revenue exhausted, problems ignored by national leaders and the President, they will shortly strangle and expire.

A massive national effort, fueled by capital freed by a major cutback or an end to the war in Asia, could spark urban rebirth. Hopes, talents, and desires to accomplish a metropolitan renaissance exist. All merely await a spark of leadership, the hand of concern, and impetus provided by a realization that national priorities have been reversed. Alas, this is a forlorn hope. Such is not to be the case.

Parochial mentalities operating on partisan lines in the name of jingoism and yesterday's limited concepts have condemned our cities to death, and part of us with them. Apathy and change

have prodded them up the steps of the scaffold. Violence and hate have placed the black hood over their faces. War and fear have knotted the hangman's rope and placed it around their necks. Political partisanship, pettiness and 19th century thinking will pull the lever releasing the trap under their feet. Fools will cheer. Knowledgeable persons will weep.

Silent applause from those who have always distrusted and misunderstood the urban idea will be neither prolonged nor deeply enjoyed. America perishes with the cities, choked by the same noose. Why? If several people are tied together and pushed into the water, their survival or fate will not be selective.

The President's refusal to accept the concept of a mass urban transit trust fund will harm suburbs and countryside as much as cities. Refusal to enforce existing laws on water and air pollution will strangle all that grows everywhere. Pollution respects no boundaries. Failure to conquer problems of waste disposal will inundate the land with putrefying, ugly garbage. Poor housing in cities pours more people into an already overstrained suburban belt. Violence in cities means fear and eventual disaster for suburbia. Lack of penetrating, meaningful tax reform means destruction of national confidence in that most basic of institutions—our tax system. Short-changing our elderly and other minorities exposes basic hypocrisy in our society, causing so many to lose faith in both its meaning and promise.

Instead of reform, what will we receive? In the name of peace and defense, we shall genuflect ever deeper before Mars. More shiny toys for the military. More preference for oil companies which rob the public. More cross-Brooklyn expressways which threaten neighborhoods. More rich subsidized farmers. More auto pollution. More riots. More traffic jams. New aircraft carriers of the "sitting duck" class. More millionaires who pay no taxes. Higher supermarket prices. More fat and rotten chicken in hot dogs.

While buildings rot. And paint peels. And potholes grow deeper. And rats scurry. And waters darken. And air thickens. And lakes die. And rivers foul. And sirens wail. And trains run slower and collide more often. And taxpayers flee. And poverty spreads. And the elderly sink into deep despair. And drugs cost more. And hatred deepens. And violence gets bloodier. And tear gas plops. And sewers and drains smell worse. And airports clog up further. And the administration watches.

And the sky is blue over San Clemente—and along the DMZ—and everywhere. And every day in every way, prosperity is just around the corner—two chickens in every pot—and grass will grow in the streets of a hundred cities, just as Mr. Hoover said—and the Messiah will arrive; maybe tomorrow.

We must reorder national priorities or we are doomed. We must rebuild our cities or our society will pay a penalty that will make our descendants blanch in retrospect. We must provide for defense, but insure that our Republic em-

bodies what we are fervently attached to the defense of. If not then we shall become a military state, crouched and armed to the teeth—on a pile of refuse covering the rotting remains of what was once our America.

THE BEAR IS LEARNING TO SWIM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our involvement in Vietnam is costing this Nation upwards of \$30 billion annually. Not only is this money that could go for desperately needed domestic requirements, it is also capital we could and should be spending on other vital areas of defense. While we are preoccupied in backyards of the world, such as Vietnam, the main tent and center ring is being occupied by our strongest potential opponent.

While America wastes her substance in Vietnam, she is also frittering away further time, efforts, and money on massive supercarriers, which I believe belong to the "sitting duck" class of ships. Massive floating islands, I feel that in case of conflict they would be pinpointed primary targets for the Soviet Union's massive and ever-growing fleet of ocean-going submarines. Meanwhile, we babble on here at home about new manned bombers, main battle tanks and fighting land wars. All of this seems to me to consist of nine-tenths nonsense and one-tenth wishful thinking.

Have we no eyes to see what is happening? Look at the oceans of the world. Read the steady stream of reports in our major media about growth of the Soviet merchant marine and the Soviet military fleet. Further, they utilize their merchant marine as a weapon, followed closely by naval units to strategically exploit trade openings and protect their merchant ships. All this spells menace to us. Yet although we speak of the threat, we do nothing to counter it.

The Soviet submarine fleet is the largest in the world, including significant numbers of nuclear powered submarines. Polaris-type Soviet submarines are now on at least semipermanent patrol off the ocean coasts of our Nation. Major Soviet shipyards in several areas of that nation are laying down new submarine keels as fast as possible. Soviet capital units ply the oceans of the world, showing their flag along the Persian Gulf, in western ports of India, all along the littoral of the Indian Ocean and even into the Caribbean Sea itself. The vacuum the British so foolishly are leaving east of Suez is one the Soviets are inexorably filling with naval power.

Their fleet in the Mediterranean is turning the eastern portion of that vital body of water into a Russian lake. The Aegean Sea is their favorite maneuver area, and recently their units actually outnumbered our own Sixth Fleet. Our major interest and involvement in Europe, already weakened by an Asian obsession is further endangered and weakened as Soviet naval power outflanks southern NATO members. Greece

and Turkey are already well on their way to being strategically compromised. Soviet amphibious capabilities are constantly being enhanced as they wisely invest in swift strike forces and fast ships armed with surface to surface missiles. Our development in all of these areas is lagging or nonexistent.

For the cost of one of our major carriers of the "sitting duck" class we could obtain several submarines in the "hunter-killer" class which are so essential to balance steady growth of Soviet submarine capacity. Instead of remaining entangled in the morass of Asia's farthest backyard we must shake off such a sterile preoccupation. We must begin again to concentrate on "bread and butter" hardware in areas of strategy central to continued well-being and long-range interests of the United States.

The Southeast Asian littoral can easily be commanded from the sea. It is not vital to the defense of this Nation. Once the United States lessens its presence in such areas, as we inevitably will, that entire area of Asia will be free to become a cockpit for massive combat between the Soviet Union and Communist China. Our presence merely delays an inevitable confrontation between the two feuding Communist giants. Let us leave them there to their own devices. We shall meanwhile be free to bolster our own positions of strength, just as we leave them there to their own devices as the Soviets are doing now at our expense. Further, it is worthwhile to point out that Soviet naval growth is of particular concern because they are challenging the United States in an area where we are supposedly supreme.

There was no chance of world war in the very early years of this century until Hohenzollern Germany began building a high seas fleet that seemed to pose a major challenge to Great Britain's traditional oceanic hegemony. In order to head off a perilous state of mind which would ensure the inevitability of a conflict between the United States and the Soviets over command of the seas, we must immediately insure that no matter what they do afloat, they will not be able to begin to challenge us there. This seems to me, unenlightened though I am, to be elementary strategic and political thinking. Perhaps I only reveal my ignorance, but these are obvious facts as I observe and translate them.

THE 101ST AIRBORNE VETERANS OBSERVE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLLAND LIBERATION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a delegation representing the 101st Airborne Division will leave tomorrow for Europe to take part in the 25th anniversary ceremonies of the liberation of Holland by the 101st Airborne Division. I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the 101st for their many contributions to the national security of the United States and to the forces of freedom throughout the world.

I would also like to say how honored I was when Urban F. Lang, the president of the New England chapter of the veterans of the 101st, requested from me a U.S. flag which would be suitable for presentation to one of Holland's liberated towns. During the recent national convention of the 101st Airborne here in Washington Mr. Lang, a resident of Bethel, Conn., discussed with me the overall program and I was delighted to furnish him with an American flag which had flown over the U.S. Capitol. I enclose his subsequent letter explaining how the delegation will present the flag:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: On behalf of the New England Chapter of the 101st Airborne Division Association and the 101st Airborne Division Association I wish to thank you for supplying our United States Flag which has flown over the United States Capitol.

The flag will be presented to one of the Corridor Towns in Holland in your name as part of the Twenty Fifth Anniversary Ceremonies of the Liberation of Holland by the 101st Airborne Division.

Our group will be leaving the Kennedy International Airport on September 5th, 1969 at 9:45 PM (21:45 hours) via KLM Royal Dutch Airlines to take part in the official ceremonies in Holland. The group will return to the United States on October 1st, 1969.

Sincerely yours,
URBAN F. LANG, President,
New England Chapter.

Back in the days of the Civil War, one regiment of the famous Iron Brigade had as its mascot a famous war eagle named Old Abe. A sergeant always carried this eagle into the fire and smoke of battle, and the eagle, perched on a shield between the national colors and the regimental colors, screamed above the roar of the guns, inspiring Union soldiers to ever greater heights of bravery and heroism. This eagle, a living symbol to the soldiers of the country they loved and defended, went through 36 battles, although wounded at Vicksburg and again at Corinth.

That same Screaming Eagle has been incorporated into the shoulder patch of the 101st Airborne, and has given them not only their nickname, but also a tradition of patriotism, heroism, and courage.

The 101st has lived up to the inspiration of its mascot. It became the first unit in the history of the Army to receive the Distinguished Unit Citation for an entire division. The 101st received a total of 13 unit citations. Two of its number were awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; four received Soldiers Medals; 20 of its soldiers received the Legion of Merit; 56 were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross; 456 Screaming Eagles received the Silver Star; and 9,488 soldiers received the Bronze Star Medals. Two of its most heroic members, Lt. Col. Robert G. Cole and Pfc. Joseph E. Mann, were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The 101st Airborne also received three foreign decorations: the French Croix de Guerre with Palm, the Belgian Fourragere, and the Netherlands Orange Lan-yard.

The unit, which in 1956 became the

first nuclear-equipped airborne division in the world, was also credited with capturing two of the enemy's most notorious war criminals: Robert Ley, the Nazi Minister of Labor and a close advisor to Hitler; and Julius Streicher, the infamous perpetrator of racial hatred who ordered the deaths of thousands of innocent Jews.

The gallantry of the officers and the men of the 101st Airborne in all of their actions showed an excellence unsurpassed in any World War II operations in Europe. Today, we pay tribute to only one of their many important missions—the liberation of Holland. Today, we specially honor one segment of that division—those Screaming Eagles from the New England area. Yet we remember with pride that all of the men of the 101st Airborne showed remarkable courage and patriotism in all of their military operations.

Participating in the largest airborne operation of the war, the 101st dropped into Holland on September 17, 1944, to begin 73 days of continuous action. Through their persistence and bravery, the Screaming Eagles played a major role in securing and maintaining a vital supply and armor route for the British Second Army.

The liberation of Holland, in the eyes of the Screaming Eagles, was the story of a road—of the men who fought and died to get it and then to keep it open. The road ran 110 miles through Holland, from Belgium north to the Zuyder Zee. The 101st was in charge of 20 miles of that road, from Eindhoven through Zon and St. Oedenrode to Vechel and Uden.

The fighting was desperate. Twenty miles is more than a division is supposed to defend, especially when that road is a corridor inviting attack from both sides, a corridor that threatens to cut off a desperate enemy from his available resources of men and materiel. Against these odds, the only advantages on the side of the 101st were surprise, courage, and resourcefulness.

Upon landing, the battalions were assembled and operating in less than 1 hour. Only two of the 424 planes carrying paratroopers failed to arrive; only one of the four pathfinder planes failed to arrive. Between 1300 and 1330 hours, some 6,769 men jumped; casualties were less than 2 percent. The drop into Holland was one of the most successful landings ever made by this paratroop division.

The 101st took Vechel and held the Zon bridge. St. Oedenrode and Eindhoven fell after sharp fighting. Opheusden changed hands in a shifting struggle, but the enemy was finally forced to withdraw on October 9.

Pfc. Joseph E. Mann became one of the Division's two Congressional Medal of Honor winners in the battle at Best. The fight for Best raged 3 days. At stake was a key communications route through which the Germans could pour reinforcements. The enemy was deployed in strength at the Best Bridge. The town and the bridge finally fell to the 101st after one of the most bitter battles in the entire Netherlands campaign. It was here

that Pfc. Mann, a symbol of the indomitable spirit of the Screaming Eagles, smothered a grenade with his already wounded body to save the lives of his fellow paratroopers.

The 101st Airborne has continued its heroic traditions in Vietnam. From Saigon to Quang Tri, in the jungles, in the rice paddies, on the mountains, the Screaming Eagles have shown the courage and skill for which they are renowned.

They have been the firemen of the Vietnam war, moving from hot spot to hot spot, whenever and wherever they are needed. A reserve action force capable of air mobile or parachute assault anywhere in the theater of operations, the 101st has rewritten the rule book of war in devising new tactics to deal with an elusive enemy who refuses to fight a conventional war. The 101st has adopted semiguerrilla tactics, combining American helicopters and firepower with techniques of stealth, flexibility, and mobility, in an attempt to beat the Communists at their own game.

The Screaming Eagles first dropped into Vietnam in 1965, in the biggest Pacific airlift of the war. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, their former commander, greeted them upon their arrival and told them:

If the time comes in a battle when the Vietcong are pressing you on all sides, remember what was said at Bastogne, when the division was surrounded by nine German divisions: "They got us surrounded, the poor bastards!"

The 101st has remembered the story well.

On January 29, 1967, the 101st returned to their home base after 372 days of continuous combat, an endurance record unthinkable in conventional warfare. Yet this feat was nothing out of the ordinary for the firemen of the Vietnam war.

The 101st has won a number of outstanding military victories, but just as important have been the decisive moral victories they have won while working with, and for, the Vietnamese people. Though difficult for an outfit on the move, the Screaming Eagles have worked to improve the communities which they are defending.

This seems to be the essence of the greatness of the Screaming Eagles. Wherever and whenever they have been called, they have more than risen to the occasion. They have fought their hardest to defend the liberty of threatened lands; they have worked their hardest to create better communities for the day when the hostilities end. I am proud to salute the 101st Airborne Division, and to honor them on their valor and heroism throughout history and throughout the world. I repeat to them the famous words of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, addressing the 101st during World War II:

I know you will meet every test of the future as you met it at Bastogne.

REGULATION OF SEXUALLY PROVOCATIVE MAIL

(Mr. ERLNBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, when the National District Attorneys Association met in July for its summer meeting, it adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there is pending before the United States House of Representatives, certain legislation dealing with the regulation of the dissemination of sexually provocative advertisement by use of the United States Mails, and

Whereas, the National District Attorneys Association, having met at its regularly scheduled summer meeting of 1969, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, hereby finds that the indiscriminate dissemination of such advertisements constitutes an unwarranted invasion of the privacy and sanctity of the home.

Now therefore be it resolved that the National District Attorneys Association does recommend to the Congress of the United States that it enact appropriate legislation regulating such indiscriminate use of the mails, and

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be spread of record on the minutes of the National District Attorneys Association and that the Secretary be directed to forward copies thereof to those he deems appropriate.

In bringing this resolution to my attention, William V. Hopf, State's attorney for DuPage County, Ill., noted that it comports to H.R. 13241, H.R. 13459, H.R. 13477, H.R. 13478, and H.R. 13500, which 58 of our colleagues in the House and I have introduced to stem the flow of obscene and sex-oriented advertising through the mails.

Our present law on the mailing of such material simply is not getting the job done, as witness the 234,000 obscene mail complaints the Post Office Department has received during the last year.

Our proposals say that these peddlers must first ask permission of the prospective customer in a form letter which contains no pictures and no lurid language. Having gotten permission, the seller may send as much advertising as he pleases. Without permission, he risks a penitentiary sentence if he puts offensive material into the mail.

With this constitutional approach, we would help to turn the tide of unwanted pornography which is flooding our homes, we would help parents in protecting their children from exposure to pornography, and we would put the administrative burden where it belongs—on the purveyor of smut mail rather than on the Post Office Department or the Department of Justice.

The National District Attorneys Association has joined the President, the Postmaster General, and more than 200 Members of Congress in urging such legislation. The House Postal Operations Subcommittee has held hearings, and I hope it will soon be able to resume its consideration of this subject so that Congress may fulfill its will and obligation.

THE PROBLEM OF FEDERAL AID PROGRAM INFORMATION

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the information crisis that exists in Washington. This crisis still exists despite the innovative ideas of the new administration. Local and State officials still encounter a myriad of difficulties in trying to obtain meaningful, complete details about Federal-aid programs, and the information crisis is worsening daily. In April, the Office of Economic Opportunity published the inadequate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. All across the country now, administrators are grappling with incomplete guidelines, incomplete funding information, and program requirements that are being modified constantly.

When I began research into the problem of Federal-aid program information almost 2 years ago, I found that no one, anywhere, knew how many Federal-aid programs existed or how much money we were spending on these programs. I found that no single repository of information existed anywhere in the Government. After 8 months of research, I introduced H.R. 338, the Program Information Act, which now enjoys bipartisan cosponsorship from 184 Congressmen and 11 Senators. This legislation would require the President to publish an annual catalog of all Federal-aid programs and to update the catalog monthly.

The Bureau of the Budget has now issued a report on H.R. 338, and, with some specific amendments, recommends passage of the legislation. The Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations begins hearings next week on H.R. 338 (S. 60) and other legislation. Rather than reiterate the arguments I have previously set forth in favor of this bill, I would like to let some of our constituents do the talking. I sent out a questionnaire earlier this year to 10,000 city, State, and local officials, as well as to educators, private consultants, and civic associations, asking for their views on the accessibility of information from the Federal Government and the value of the Program Information Act. From the thousands of replies I received, I have chosen a small group of the most succinct and expressive comments, which I would like to share with my distinguished colleagues on a daily basis over the next 2 weeks.

From a midwestern college comes this comment:

A government-wide catalog would be tremendously useful. I now have ten or twelve books on my shelf, a full file drawer, and subscriptions to several commercial and free governmental publications in an attempt to keep up to date with developments in this field . . . I have no feeling of confidence that I have covered all the bases.

From a southern county official:

There is an urgent need for accurate detailed funding information for all federal programs . . . we waste thousands of dollars tracking down programs which are widely advertised but where little or no source of money exists.

From a city official in North Carolina:

With a complete, government-wide catalog, I could research our chances of acquiring

assistance before trips, phone calls, letters to the regional office center and to Washington. I could have at hand in my office the data to guide our thinking to the grant program agency where we would be most likely to succeed.

From a western official in a housing program:

Most catalogs are focused on what the program provides for, with too little emphasis on the actual functional availability of funds. It is hard to determine what kind of programs are, in fact, being funded.

From a western college:

Your plan to have an updated monthly catalog of complete program descriptions covering all federal assistance programs sounds like the one greatest need we have at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I will address this subject again on the next day of legislative business.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for September 3 through September 5, 1969, on account of official business with Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. CORMAN, for Thursday, September 4, on account of official business.

Mr. MELCHER (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), for Thursday, September 4, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLACKBURN) and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MOSS to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE of Texas to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KOCH to include with remarks made in the Committee of the Whole an editorial from the New York Times of today.

Mr. BURTON of California 1 minute speech to follow the remarks of Mr. WATSON made in the Committee of the Whole while speaking out of order.

Mr. HANNA immediately following Mr. VAN DEERLIN's special order today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 12085.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLACKBURN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in three instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. UTT in two instances.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. RUTH.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. PELL.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

Mr. MONAGAN in four instances.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in six instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. KARTH in four instances.

Mr. KEE in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
 Mr. DOWNING in three instances.
 Mr. O'HARA in four instances.
 Mr. PEPPER.
 Mr. YATRON in two instances.
 Mr. ULLMAN in 10 instances.
 Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
 Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.
 Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.
 Mr. MARSH in two instances.
 Mr. HANNA.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 855. An act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2056. An act to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to permit unmarried judges of the courts of the District of Columbia who have no dependent children to terminate their payments for survivors annuity and to receive a refund of amounts paid for such annuity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2502. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, 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. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

pose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 8, 1969, 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:

1116. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Department of Labor's Neighborhood Youth Corps program on the Gila River Indian Reservation and the off-reservation area of Pinal County, Ariz., under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1117. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the overseas dependents school system in the European area, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application by the Central Oregon Irrigation District, Redmond, Oreg., for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(c) of that act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4869. A bill to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9756. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraph 11, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9477. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 850. A bill to designate

the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 526. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7737, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (Rept. No. 91-474). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11039, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended (Rept. No. 91-475). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 528. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 574, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments (Rept. No. 91-476). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13602. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 13603. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13604. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13605. A bill, to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 13606. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13607. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13608. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13609. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend the program of assistance under that act for community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, to establish programs for mental health of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13610. A bill providing for a moratorium on the discontinuance or reduction of railroad passenger train service, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 13611. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13612. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 13613. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 13614. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 13615. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide adequate financial assistance and to increase the allotment to certain States of construction grant funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 13616. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for adult education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 13617. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$4,800 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 13618. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed in the United States from the first Sunday following Memorial Day to the first Sunday following Labor Day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 13619. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 13620. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13621. A bill to expedite delivery of special delivery mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTTON (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 13622. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to extend, in certain pending cases, the period prior to approval of a neighborhood development program within a public improvement or facility must

have been commenced in order to qualify as a local noncash grant-in-aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13623. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 13624. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13625. A bill to establish a national program to provide income supplements to every family in need thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 13626. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 13627. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to increase the authorization for certain works in connection with the Chesapeake Bay Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13628. A bill to provide fair treatment for franchisees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income insurance payments received for additional personal, living, or family expenses incurred as the result of the loss of use of a residence as a result of casualty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. AYRES, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. QUIE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. DENT, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. RUTE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 13630. A bill to extend certain expiring provisions of law relating to vocational education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DORN, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TALLCOTT, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. MAHON, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mrs. MAY):

H.R. 13631. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants and making them available to the public, by making protection available to those who breed, develop or discover them, thereby promoting progress in the useful art of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13632. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 13633. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.J. Res. 884. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 885. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 20 through April 25, 1970, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 886. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 529. Resolution urging the President of the United States to take whatever action may be necessary to stop air piracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. GROVER, Mr. NIX, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H. Res. 530. Resolution condemning discrimination, prejudice, and violence against the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland, and requesting the President of the United States to seek a meeting of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. 13634. A bill for the relief of Luigi Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13635. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Sodano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 13636. A bill for the relief of Miss Gita H. Elguin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 13637. A bill for the relief of Lina Lillian Bonini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.R. 13638. A bill for the relief of Mee June Wong, Chee Wing Yuen, Suet Yi Yuen, Wai Kwong Yuen, Pui Yee Yuen, and Man Yee Yuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Irene Siddons et al., Spokane, Wash., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. Also petition of Joanne Morris et al., Fort Lauderdale, Fla., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court; 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.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1969 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,500. E. (9) \$7,689.15.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,433.06. E. (9) \$5,433.06.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$4,036.90.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,507.78.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,818.05.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$12,415.38. E. (9) \$12,415.38.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$95,997.07. E. (9) \$40,744.17.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$462.50. E. (9) \$106.50.

A. Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., 6767 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$8,966.87.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,399.84.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and a subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Air for public elementary and secondary education, 2104 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,160.24. E. (9) \$826.57.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil Shale Corporation.

A. Davis M. Batson, 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.

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) \$1,200.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,770. E. (9) \$408.87.

A. Helen W. Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,763.95.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,542.16.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman, Diamond & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,250.

A. John F. Bonner, Room 100, Philip Murray Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$174.93.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 88-04 63d Drive, Rego Park, N.Y.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$278.56.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

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.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Callahan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$240.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles A. Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) \$1,067.61. E. (9) \$1,047.98.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8232 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,187.25. E. (9) \$82.92.

A. Col. Joseph I. Chabot, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

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) \$30.

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. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$31.24. E. (9) \$10.97.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$44,621.94.

A. Citizens for a Postal Corporation, Inc., Post Office Box 1807, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. Claire, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.

B. The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street Providence, R.I.

D. (6) \$68.75.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$70.59.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,906.26.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,259.02.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Jay Cresswell, Box 8701, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) \$171.13.

A. Francis D. Cronin, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$1,269.23. E. (9) \$869.95.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Chemical Fibres Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Woolen & Linen Textiles Exporters Association, 4 Chome, Bingomachi, Nigashiku, Osaka, Japan.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Unione Industriale Pratese, Prato, Italy.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Vorort des schweizerischen Handels- und Industrie-Vereins Borsenstrasse 26, Zurich, Switzerland.

A. Fred E. Davis, 916 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. NAM.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,375.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. V. I. Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, V.I.

A. DeHart and Broide, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, New York, N.Y., and Sales Promotion Companies.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 103 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$975.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$177.50. E. (9) \$177.50.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$37.45.

A. Alfred Edwall, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,772.06.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,772.06.

A. Richard W. Emory, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$535.86.

A. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Council, Inc., 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$9,250. E. (9) \$519.96.

A. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,477.80.

A. Richard E. Faggioli, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$55.70.

A. Bonner Fellers, 3535 Springland Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Taxpayer's Committee To End Foreign Aid, 3535 Springland Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mello G. Fish, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$705.98. E. (9) \$101.33.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$139.66. E. (9) \$139.66.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$750.35.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$653.34.

A. William C. Greer.

B. The Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$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) \$2,700. E. (9) \$58.77.

A. William T. Gibb, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. Douglas R. Gordon, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. Frederick D. Goss III, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$252.02.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Evaporated Milk Association, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$162.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue (Post Office Box R), Pasadena, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. NAM.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. O. Henderson, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Professional Organizations.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$124.33.

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.

E. (9) \$25.

A. Mrs. Elizabeth S. Hendryson, 6303 Indian School Road NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. William Graham Hinkle, 2011 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Executives Consultants, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.

A. William Graham Hinkle, 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Self-Employed Individuals, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,465.50. E. (9) \$270.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$40.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$12,073.52.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph K. James, Rear Adm., U.S. Navy (retired), 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping.

D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$4.08.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$725.

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. Elmer A. Jones, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$488.71.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$535.86.

A. Kevin J. Kearney, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. COMAC, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$200.

A. Eugene Adams Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

E. (9) \$400.

A. Edward F. Kenney, 225 South Meramec Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.

B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$363.

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) \$637.88. E. (9) \$27.75.

A. King, Miller, Anderson, Nash & Yerke, 1200 American Bank Building, Portland, Ore.

B. Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Post Office Box 520, Pendleton, Ore.

E. (9) \$661.31.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$224.75.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Chemical Fibres Association, 3-3-Chome, Muromachi, Nihonbashi, Tokyo, Japan.

D. (6) \$600.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arden Publishing Co., Tucson, Ariz.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Don F. Lobb, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.

A. Paul H. Long, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$27.58.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,437. E. (9) \$342.68.

A. James H. Lynch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,809.80. E. (9) \$667.79.

A. John L. McConnell, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$150.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$3,625. E. (9) \$615.90.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.

E. (9) \$152.08.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1291 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,925. E. (9) \$109.59.

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 the subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,999.98. E. (9) \$1,368.94.

A. John S. McLees, 1516 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,700. E. (9) \$69.33.

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) \$209.70. E. (9) \$7.64.

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) \$1,300.

A. Don Mahon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$4,138.04.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$280.55.

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) \$3,674.07. E. (9) \$308.72.

A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$535.86.

A. Robert A. Maslow, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. May, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$479. E. (9) \$22.44.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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) \$1,200.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Lighting Corp., 600 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$45,000.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,998.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 1375 Peachtree Street N.E., Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street N.E., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$51.50. E. (9) \$8,816.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Ethyl Corp. 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,444.43. E. (9) \$1,028.23.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$18,785.57. E. (9) \$19,122.32.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$12,811.31.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$52,219.83.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$23,295.94.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$27,354.50. E. (9) \$2,948.18.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$170.53.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,062.50. E. (9) \$1,990.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,745.20.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,133.11.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,234.15. E. (9) \$1,271.61.

A. National Turkey Federation, Mount Morris, Ill.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$35,026. E. (9) \$5,245.24.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$224.75.

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) \$35.85.

A. Leo O'Brien, 160 South Manning Boulevard, Albany, N.Y.

B. Home Rule Committee, Virgin Islands Legislature, St. Thomas, V.I.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Leo O'Brien, 160 South Manning Boulevard, Albany, N.Y.

B. Home Rule Committee, Virgin Islands Legislature, St. Thomas, V.I.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$425.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$22.20.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,114. E. (9) \$1,172.90.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers.

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) \$569.46.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$500.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Potomac Basin Federation, care of John R. Moulton, RFD 1, Charles Town, W. Va.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$342.20.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,203.50.

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) \$218.75.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Department of Tourism and Trade Development, Hamilton, Bermuda.

D. (6) \$1,666.

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) \$1,891.47.

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. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sidney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$39,667.15.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.

E. (9) \$1,422.86.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., 95 Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J.

A. Darrell G. Renstrom, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,691.76. E. (9) \$30.78.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John 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) \$628.12. E. (9) \$59.37.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$562.50.

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) \$1,875. E. (9) \$117.84.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

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) \$107.85.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$535.86.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street, 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. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,700. E. (9) \$30.42.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$4,300. E. (9) \$3,266.30.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$825.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$95.30. E. (9) \$300.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$172.86.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$190.73.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Spelser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mrs. Annalee Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$57,869.07. E. (9) \$10,975.41.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$389.45.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

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. The Taxpayers Committee To End Foreign Aid, 3535 Springland Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$969.23. E. (9) \$645.20.

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) \$3,919.92.

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. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Joel B. True, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. NAM.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. NAM.

A. W. Lloyd Tupling, 235 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. The Universal Exchange, Post Office Box 8701, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) \$368.47.

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. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

E. (9) \$535.86.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

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) \$8,750.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$50.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 910 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., Box 8339, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harding deC Williams, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. NAM.

A. Milburn E. Wilson, Route 1, Fremont, Mich.

B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Clay B. Wolfe, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$416.60.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1969:

(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]

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. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.

A. S. Allan Adelman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$915.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,238.67. E. (9) \$6,238.67.

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) \$10,982.06. E. (9) \$10,982.06.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Ale, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$215.30.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish HUAC/HISC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,040. E. (9) \$1,384.17.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$46.75. E. (9) \$3.40.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,687.50. E. (9) \$157.54.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$26.10.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$8,352.12.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$39,497. E. (9) \$39,497.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$44,941.59.

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) \$19,728.46. E. (9) \$19,728.46.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,500.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,650. E. (9) \$1,650.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$12,415.38. E. (9) \$12,415.38.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,857.18. E. (9) \$3,511.22.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$2.

A. American Landowners Association, Box 294, Harpers Ferry, W. Va.
D. (6) \$417. E. (9) \$400.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$8,624.24. E. (9) \$34,236.52.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$871.38. E. (9) \$155.96.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$166.35.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$23,413.63.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$730.

A. American Optometric Association, in care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$3,322.30. E. (9) \$3,322.30

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 2104 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,829.61. E. \$811.80.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,658. E. (9) \$9,661.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$420.40.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. The American Short Line RR Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$945.72. E. (9) \$945.72.

A. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$476.48.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 224 Ellington Road, Longmeadow, Mass.
D. (6) \$72.63.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$13,318.79. E. (9) \$13,318.79.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$60.

A. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$750.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,636.85. E. (9) \$3,636.85.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 410 Park Avenue, 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. Edward T. Anderson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,341.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$144. E. (9) \$201.03.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,812.50. E. (9) \$53.30.

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) \$462.50. E. (9) \$118.35.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$3,468.75. E. (9) \$1,467.84.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif.

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.

A. Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., 6767 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$13,247.57.

A. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$385.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$200.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 406 American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,508.04. E. (9) \$11,508.04.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors, Inc., 50 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$285.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$400.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$9,679.54. E. (9) \$9,692.78.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$50.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$301.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aerospace Services Association, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$2,970.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Itek Corporation, 10 Maguire Road, Lexington, Mass.
D. (6) \$30,000. E. (9) \$30,527.09.

A. John F. Banzhaf III, 500 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Action on Smoking and Health, 2000 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,768. E. (9) \$909.59.

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. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$139.13. E. (9) \$30.10.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Ore.
B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Courthouse, Roseburg, Ore.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$564.14.

A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America, Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$306.70.

A. Eugene T. Bartkowiak, 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Lucius D. Battle.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Dita Davis Beard, ITT Building, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., ITT Building, 1707 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$6,425.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. John H. Beidler, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,125.01. E. (9) \$446.35.

A. James F. Bell, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$937.50. E. (9) \$77.83.

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) \$6,000.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Berlack, Isaacs & Liberman, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. General Public Utilities Corp., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$26.65.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,240. E. (9) \$508.50.

A. Sidney W. Bishop, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,656.25. E. (9) \$59.84.

A. John H. Bivins, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$760.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) \$77.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William Blum, Jr., 704 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue, Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,633.33. E. (9) \$649.06.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman, Diamond & Grodon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. Bonner.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$75.

A. Book Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 161 East 42d 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) \$400.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$162.30.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$325. E. (9) \$33.44.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fairchild Hiller Corp., Germantown, Md.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Suite 325, Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

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) \$5,000.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$1,950. E. (9) \$174.87.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$5,546.62.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$66,666.66.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$2.85.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$33.

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) \$3,657.60. E. (9) \$1,088.33.

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.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Joseph P. Brosnan, 9160 Springhill Lane, Greenbelt, Md.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, 217 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
E. (9) \$1,825.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$16,642.82. E. (9) \$16,642.82.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ebasco Industries Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$882.50.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Public Utilities Corp., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Anne Bryant, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. COMAC Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; main office, 1500 North Woodward Avenue, Birmingham, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,732.50. E. (9) \$217.60.

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) \$150. E. (9) \$4.92.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of D. J. Casarella, 88-04 63d Drive, Rego Park, N.Y.
E. (9) \$9.07.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Burger.
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 of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) \$96.02.

A. Dr. Lowell A. Burkett, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) \$19,233.31. E. (9) \$1,157.57.

A. George Burnham 4th, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$498. E. (9) \$312.

A. George B. Burnham, 120 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 120 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$685. E. (9) \$685.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$203.09.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$630.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Callahan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO-CLC, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$240.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$1,146.59.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$445.31.

A. Charles A. Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald A. Capone, Kirilin, Campbell & Keating, Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Avenue, London E.C. 3, England; CENSA/CES Joint Container Committee, 30-32 St. Mary Ave, London E.C.3, England.
D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$519.19.

A. Philip Carlip.
B. National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association District 2, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$114.50.

A. Philip Carlip.
B. Seafarers International Union, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,230.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,066.66. E. (9) \$196.82.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8232 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

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. Ralph E. Casey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,187.50. E. (9) \$391.19.

A. E. Michael Cassidy, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael J. Cefalo, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of District 50, UMWA, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,270.04.

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) \$20.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Louis A. Cohn, care of Super City Department Store, 710 North Stone Avenue, Tucson, Ariz.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$225.65.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, 5757 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$133.97.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

E. (9) \$726.25.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Newspaper Committee for a Free and Competitive Press, 33 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$6.25.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$9.99.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,700.

A. Leslie Cheek III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Transportation Union.

E. (9) \$250.

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. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$5,692.85. E. (9) \$5,647.14.

A. Edwin Christianson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell T. Christison, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, in care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$345.24. E. (9) \$219.54.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$31,698.41.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,604.

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) \$1,400. E. (9) \$81.46.

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. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atcheson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Houston Chemical Co., 1 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ethyl Corp., 451 Florida, Baton Rouge, La.; and E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Wilmington, Del.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$11.25.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oil Shale Corp., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$504.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington International School, 3211 Volta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$9.30.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Tobacco Co.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$368.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$368.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Liggett & Myers Inc.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$368.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Philip Morris, Inc.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$368.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$368.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Toy Manufacturers of America, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$220.49.

A. David Cohen, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,687.52. E. (9) \$566.99.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza.

A. William J. Colley, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$897.02.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$660.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, care of Carpenter Technology Corp., Reading, Pa.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$450.

A. Paul G. Collins.

B. The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.

D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$2,079.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$2,079.

A. Comac Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; main office, 1500 North Woodward, Birmingham, Mich.

E. (9) \$20,184.03.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1427 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,446.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$211.07.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, care of P. W. K. Sweet, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$11,741.28. E. (9) \$11,741.28.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,423.82.

A. The Committee To Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,470. E. (9) \$4,065.73.

A. Committee on Metropolitan Washington Banking, care of C. Jackson Ritchie, Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,868.75. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$1,628.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,150. E. (9) \$10,625.05.

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, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$205.28.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Light Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,748. E. (9) \$1,624.21.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$325. E. (9) \$190.

A. John A. Connor, 15 Bowden Avenue, Barrington, R.I.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$211.36.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$72.48.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) \$61.56. E. (9) \$983.51.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$21.25.

A. Darrell Coover, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,100. E. (9) \$704.68.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, in care of P.W.K. Sweet, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Metropolitan Washington Banking, in care of C. Jackson Ritchie, Union Trust Co., 15th & H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Owen M. Cornell, Jr., 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$166. E. (9) \$16.

A. Emmet P. Corrigan, 922 24th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Association of Journeymen & Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States & Canada, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) \$125.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$25,261.41. E. (9) \$31,393.78.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$165.24.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$653.89. E. (9) \$653.89.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami, Fla.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Casualty and Surety Agents, 83 Malden Lane, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 2001 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Moller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, 900 Spring Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Mixed Manufacturers Bureau, 900 Spring Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Francis D. Cronin, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$475.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Michael B. Crowson, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Steele Culbertson.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$121.09.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$1,430.77. E. (9) \$991.50.

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) \$6,000. E. (9) \$2,570.29.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Penn Central Co., 230 Park 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) \$1,125. E. (9) \$46.46.

A. John Davenport, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$165.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$181.33.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$377.80.

A. Fred Davis, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.

D. (6) \$20,000. E. (9) \$423.67.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. V. I. Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, V.I.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$89. E. (9) \$138.

A. Michael B. Deane, 611 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$66.70.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Ray Demison, 815 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,556.50. E. (9) \$512.84.

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) \$900.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,625. E. (9) \$663.57.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Russell C. Derrickson, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Responsive Environments Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$50.

A. Claude J. Desautels & Associates, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,492.38.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., 121 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Mass.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. C. H. DeVaney, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$45.55.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,426.27. E. (9) \$235.16.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,653.34. E. (9) \$103.34.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$285.

B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,207.45. E. (9) \$7.45.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) \$14,500. E. (9) \$4,604.04.

A. Discover America Travel Organizations, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$134,867.96. E. (9) \$682.50.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$9.60.

A. William H. Dodds, UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$954.50. E. (9) \$123.10.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harry J. Donohue, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$1,908. E. (9) \$88.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 1128 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,318.21. E. (9) \$167.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,845.44. E. (9) \$297.15.

A. William Du Chesi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$975.15. E. (9) \$100.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$285.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$975.

A. Roy W. Easley, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6.90. E. (9) \$3.40.

A. Macon T. Edwards, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.

D. (6) \$3,424.69. E. (9) \$2,579.15.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$3,285.24. E. (9) \$797.27.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$6.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Ely and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ely and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 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. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Richard W. Emory, Esq., 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Council, Inc., 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$7,850. E. (9) \$4,372.65.

A. James C. England, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$115.51.

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) \$772.80. E. (9) \$76.80.

A. Richard E. Faggioli, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,712.15. E. (9) \$280.23.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$85,558.68. E. (9) \$18,934.08.

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., Canada.

D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$150.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$41.50.

A. Francis S. Filbey, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,739.77.

A. Firearms Lobby of America, 415 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,538.29. E. (9) \$2,453.65.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,550. E. (9) \$21.65.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gene Fondren, Post Office Box 192, Taylor, Tex.

B. Texas Railroads.

D. (6) \$4,018. E. (9) \$1,350.96.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$969.83.

A. Frederick W. Ford.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$834. E. (9) \$36.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$225.79. E. (9) \$225.79.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,950. E. (9) \$422.13.

A. Ronald J. Foulis.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$60.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Company, 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$204.12.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) \$65.10. E. (9) \$32.62.

A. Walter L. Frankland, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$209.40.

A. Robert M. Frederick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 211 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$47.25.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 161 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.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Bernice Friedlander, 950 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. LASH, Legislative Action on Smoking and Health, 2000 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,768. E. (9) \$909.59.

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) \$275. E. (9) \$30.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$63,907. E. (9) \$13,725.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Chase Manhattan Bank (National Association), 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$882.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$720.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$215.22.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Royal Crown Cola Co., Columbus, Ga.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$199.50.

A. William B. Gardiner.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$108.20.

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.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. General Public Utilities Corp., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$5,534.80.

A. William T. Gibb, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$174.75. E. (9) \$17.33.

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.

E. (9) \$3,497.40.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$51.

A. Dave Givens, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$6.36.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$31.21.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Douglas R. Gordon, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. Frederick D. Goss, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$278.36.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$11,718.79. E. (9) \$5,075.32.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,349.96. E. (9) \$163.80.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$186.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Gray, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,881.61.

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. Robert K. Gray, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

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) \$125. E. (9) \$205.18.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

E. (9) \$1,637.75.

A. Clifford P. Greck, 432 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

B. American Educational Publishers Institute, 432 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Evaporated Milk Association, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc.

D. (6) \$4,100. E. (9) \$1,850.

A. Jerome R. Gulian.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,400.

A. Matthew Hale, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., and 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 W. Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$302.50. E. (9) \$197.12.

A. Thomas A. Halsted, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000.06.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ida Cason Callaway Foundation, Pine Mountain, Ga.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$20.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America.

D. (6) \$30. E. (9) \$90.30.

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) \$5,250. E. (9) \$144.54.

A. Edward F. Harding, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$476. E. (9) \$557.

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.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$825. E. (9) \$441.54.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 211 E. Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Life Convention, 211 E. Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$368. E. (9) \$125.76.

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.

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) \$1,712.50.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lewis B. Hastings, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 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) \$140.33.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$4.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,687.50. E. (9) \$81.43.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$300.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 W. 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$37.30.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$303.07. E. (9) \$303.07.

A. Patrick B. Healey, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$195.62.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York N. Y. and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. 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) \$1,000.

A. C. O. Henderson, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.

B. Professional Organizations.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$200.

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. Mrs. Elizabeth S. Hendryson, 6303 Indian School Road NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 E. 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 E. 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$666.08.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$2,298.81.

A. A. S. Herlong, Jr., 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Southeastern Railroad, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$353.08.

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.; Redfield Gun Sight Co., Denver, Colo.; Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$114.59.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. U. S. Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$140.55.

A. George T. Higgins, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$150.

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) \$200.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. James J. Hill, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wm. Graham Hinkle, 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Executives Consultants, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Wm. Graham Hinkle, 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Self-Employed Individuals, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry R. Hinton, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,100. E. (9) \$796.27.

A. Mrs. Mae Hipsley, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$712.50. E. (9) \$19.78.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$290.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$195.

A. Irvin H. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. Bryce P. Holcombe, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL-CIO, 217-19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,825.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$465.

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.

A. Frances Holway, Box 47, Rye, N. H.

B. Animal Welfare, 810 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$170.25.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Allstate Insurance Co., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, 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, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$4,495.84.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$320. E. (9) \$117.75.

A. James L. Huntley, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,875. E. (9) \$1,541.21.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

B. William R. Smith, Washington, D.C., and others.
E. (9) \$324.

A. Clifford J. Hynning, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee To Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,300.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,133.25. E. (9) \$5,133.25.

A. Harry A. Inman, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$82.50. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H St. NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$200.15.

A. International Association of Machinists, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$7,004.50.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$15,970.19.

A. International Economic Policy Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,881.61.

A. International Union of District 50, 4880 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,270.04.

A. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$2,891.57.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$9,851.35. E. (9) \$10,918.15.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 1200 18th St. NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Jackson, 627 Allison St. NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$2,750. E. (9) \$304.47.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$150.

A. Robert L. James, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bank of America N.T. and S.A., 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$350.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) \$400.

A. Daniel Jaspán, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,143.01. E. (9) \$57.10.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

F. Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Chas. D. Jennings, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$725.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,230.72. E. (9) \$247.32.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$300.

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. Charlie W. Jones, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Elmer A. Jones, 1145 19th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$501.39.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$145.50. E. (9) \$204.90.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$53.80.

A. Oliver H. Jones, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$11,250. E. (9) \$4,550.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$7.20.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. Carlton R. Kear, Jr.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$137.50.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, 725 15th Street, Washington, D.C.

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.

B. The Superior Oil Co.
E. (9) \$275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$37.48.

A. Eugene Adams Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation.

A. George J. Kelley, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Daniel C. Kellick, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$29.25.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Stephen E. Kelly.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,379.34.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) \$98.20.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$3,277.49. E. (9) \$1,110.21.

A. Edward F. Kenney, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenyon & Kenyon, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$150.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$150.

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) \$1,012.50. E. (9) \$90.81.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) \$1,1481.08.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$825.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 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) \$662.40.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, Masters & Rowe, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert C. Kirstein, 30 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,375. E. (9) \$26.95.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) 114.13. E. (9) 169.60.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.

B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$66.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 90 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,546.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,999.98.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$475.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (A Delaware Corps), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$918.93.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$25.15.

A. Wm. 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.

A. Horace R. Kornegay.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. June Kysilke Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$98.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$578.70.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,755. E. (9) \$1,521.69.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,472. E. (9) \$752.77.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,873. E. (9) \$7,601.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$10,457.63.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Transportation Union.
E. (9) \$200.

A. Albert Lannon, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,972.46. E. (9) \$329.76.

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) \$711.50.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1660 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$75.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$267.84.

A. Legislation for Animal Welfare, Inc., 3045 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7.17. E. (9) \$50.

A. Legislative Action on Smoking & Health, 2000 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,768. E. (9) \$909.59.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$230.25.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,999.96.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$80.29.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of Producers of Ferroalloys and Related Products.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$105.

A. Marx Leva, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arden Publishing Co., Tucson, Ariz.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$21,380.83. E. (9) \$25,540.65.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$9,404.07. E. (9) \$9,404.07.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12.50. E. (9) \$60.75.

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) \$5,500. E. (9) \$673.83.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$417.48. E. (9) \$186.50.

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) \$1,600. E. (9) \$430.90.

A. Paul H. Long, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$64.35.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Cannery 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) \$625.

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) \$1,000.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$11.68.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300 or less.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,020.50.

A. Bruce E. McCarthy, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. McCarthy, 1700 K Street, Washington, D.C.

B. United Utilities, Inc., 2330 Johnson Drive, Shawnee Mission, Kans.

A. John L. McConnel, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$325.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 814 Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$284.60. E. (9) \$81.50.

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) \$150.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,984.51. E. (9) \$250.86.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.

E. (9) \$170.18.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.

B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$463.33. E. (9) \$175.68.

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) \$4,712.50. E. (9) \$432.32.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,770.74. E. (9) \$676.12.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Saving Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$213.86.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,608.35. E. (9) \$62.18.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

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) \$240.30. E. (9) \$19.27.

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) \$1,300.

A. Robert L. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$97.05. E. (9) \$79.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 5223 River Road, Washington, D.C.

B. Printing Industries of America, 5223 River Road, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$1,125.

A. Earl S. Mackey, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$800.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, c/o J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$38.30.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$112.

A. Carter Manasco, 6932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$152.88.

A. Mike Manatos, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East 6th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) \$42.

A. Manufacturing Chemists, Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 924 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., One West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,250. E. (9) \$164.38.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

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) \$3,674.07. E. (9) \$968.38.

A. Winston 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) \$684. E. (9) \$97.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$239.38. E. (9) \$225.

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) \$110.

A. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$110.

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.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Alfred Maskin, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$44.29.

A. Robert A. Maslow, 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,700.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$26.92.

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) \$5,499.91. E. (9) \$1,419.48.

A. P. H. Mathews, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,611.70. E. (9) \$1,202.91.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$363. E. (9) \$269.95.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,298.50 E. (9) \$81.40.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,110. E. (9) \$1,981.08.

A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$166.49.

A. James E. Meals, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,032.53. E. (9) \$1,283.43.

A. Kenneth A. Melklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,712.50.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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) \$1,200.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis.

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. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) \$1,950.

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 Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) \$4,305. E. (9) \$714.57.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$875.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Utilities, Inc., Post Office Box 11315, Plaza Station, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) \$120.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Ore.

B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Ore.

E. (9) \$854.72.

A. Robert H. Miller, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

A. Jack Mills, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc.

A. Marion Daniel Minchew, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$206.25. E. (9) \$8.62.

A. Mobile Housing Association of America, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$2,499.99.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, Post Office Lock Box 829, Boise, Idaho.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,249.

A. Michael Monroney.

B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$584.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Morin, 1311 Delaware Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$377.

A. T. H. Mullen, 4301 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va.

A. John J. Murphy, 33 Willelinor Drive, 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. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, 1375 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$103. E. (9) \$122.79.

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) \$9,499.98. E. (9) \$532.03.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, 1510 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750.

A. John J. Nangle, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$775.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Newark, N.J.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$22.85. E. (9) \$22.85.

A. National Association of Credit Management, 44 East 23d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$76.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,617.61. E. (9) \$7,920.91.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$100.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$73,235.32. E. (9) \$1,329.84.

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) \$2,144.15. E. (9) \$2,144.15.

A. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$35,000. E. (9) \$15,637.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$47,338.45. E. (9) \$13,761.70.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA), 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,820.62. E. (9) \$1,820.62.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$225.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$4,994.12.

A. National Committee To Abolish HUAC/HISC, 555 N. Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,579.99. E. (9) \$1,579.99.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

D. (6) \$5,885.80. E. (9) \$20,008.60.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$7,442.59. E. (9) \$7,442.59.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$18,659.31. E. (9) \$22,316.39.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$5.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$524.30.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$942.36. E. (9) \$937.16.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,500.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$249,249.29. E. (9) \$14,901.44.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$27,375.84. E. (9) \$27,375.84.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,947.12. E. (9) \$3,743.74.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$9,350.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$9,220.84. E. (9) \$19,759.75.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$116.20.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$10,593.30. E. (9) \$2,341.07.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,395.15. E. (9) \$1,395.15.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) \$7,367.16. E. (9) \$7,367.16.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$7,981.10. E. (9) \$7,981.10.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$826.54.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,102.35. E. (9) \$3,648.12.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$444.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$5,686.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$10,990.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,518.58.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,662.62. E. (9) \$1,662.62.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) \$5,152.34.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$12,400. E. (9) \$13,179.97.

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) \$2,685.42.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$62.11.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$1,568.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,475.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$524.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cuna International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$309.90.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,234. E. (9) \$63.70.

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. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,753.40. E. (9) \$966.84.

A. James W. Nisbet, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

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. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$547.20.

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) \$69.05.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$15,962.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 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) \$3,125. E. (9) \$250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$650.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$334.68.

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) \$5,325. E. (9) \$178.43.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$145.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$556.50.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$160.

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) \$7,192.11.

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, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,187.51. E. (9) \$175.38.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 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) \$1,426.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York City.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$15.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$8.60.

A. Jerry H. Opack, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Hoeman Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$464.50. E. (9) \$1,170.27.

A. Franklin L. Orth, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$185.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lou Ann Palmer, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$50.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kan.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Parel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$178.50. E. (9) \$180.80.

A. Judith E. Park, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,013.90. E. (9) \$205.03.

A. Michael L. Parker, 1910 Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,833.33. E. (9) \$2,404.53.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

B. West Virginia Railroad Association.

D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$138.55.

A. Parsons, Tennent, Hammond, Harding & Ziegelman, 600 Ford Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Comac Co., 1500 N. Woodward Avenue, Birmingham, Mich.

D. (6) \$3,606.50. E. (9) \$1,088.03.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$143.20.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Boating Industry Association, 333 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) Under \$500.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

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) \$387.

A. Pennzoll United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Texas.

E. (9) \$1,762.47.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Oil Co., 50 W. 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. J. Pessel, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$370.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National REA Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,865.31.

A. Michael Petresky, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$2,550.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$325.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$209.32.

A. William G. Phillips, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Schools of Public Health, Inc., Chapel Hill, N.C.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$837.46.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$72.85.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) \$511.40.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$1,550.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) \$23,580.97. E. (9) \$1,350.

A. Joseph M. Pollard, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County of Los Angeles, State of California, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$4.81.

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) \$253.50.

A. Potomac Basin Federation, care of John Moulton RFD, Charles Town, W. Va.
D. (6) \$25.

A. George G. Potts, 15 E. Cliff Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$660.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,470. E. (9) \$1,226.87.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M 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. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$31.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$540. E. (9) \$81.52.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$450.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,800.

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) \$218.75. E. (9) \$17.80.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 59 Ivy Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,660. E. (9) \$3,660.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$610.01. E. (9) \$231.80.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y.; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y.; National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, New York, N.Y.; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$9,049.98. E. (9) \$9,635.75.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,226.66. E. (9) \$93.24.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$297.66.

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, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$50.

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. William A. Raleigh, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,750.

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) \$21,202.93.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,689.30.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Lewis Reid, 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$355.73.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,462.50.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,070.55. E. (9) \$11,389.40.

A. Jacob Reuben, 6-183, Washington Hilton, Connecticut Avenue at Columbia Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vahlsing Management Consultants, Inc., Route 130, Robbinsville, N.J.

A. Vincent P. Reusing, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$585.12. E. (9) \$232.75.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,876. E. (9) \$359.

A. William L. Reynolds, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$43.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th 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) \$1,284.02. E. (9) \$12.48.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) \$26.75. E. (9) \$79.90.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Roberts & Holland, 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. John D. Rockefeller, 3d, Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$250.39.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kozai Club (Japan Steel Industry Trade Association), 3-16 Nihonbashi-Kayabacho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$585.

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) \$185.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$168.75. E. (9) \$5.18.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$562.50.

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) \$688.80.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. William E. Rollow, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Capital Area Council of Sportsmen.

A. William E. Rollow, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Skeet Shooting Association.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Robert J. Routier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Great Salt Lake Minerals & Chemicals Corp., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.

B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.

E. (9) \$58.55.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$1,998.01. E. (9) \$706.19.

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) \$507.50.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$818.24.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.

D. (6) \$2,006.25. E. (9) \$480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Corp., Atlantic Richfield Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Union Oil Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., Gulf Oil Corp., all Los Angeles; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Midland, Tex.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$2,913.66.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$475.

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) \$100.10.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000.

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. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) \$467.39.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$233.13.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$285.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$825.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) Nominal. (Estimated allocation to activities defined in Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.)

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$992.50. E. (9) \$20.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grant S. Shotwell, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bankers National Life Insurance Co., 1 Sunset Avenue, Montclair, N.J.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Elba Eystems Corp., 5909 East 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. David Silver, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$421.50.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$577.50. E. (9) \$1,604.86.

A. Lana H. Sims, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.

B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.

D. (6) \$128.87. E. (9) \$189.95.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,252.09. E. (9) \$630.75.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$8,835. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$29.50.

A. Smathers, Merrigan & O'Keefe, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,600. E. (9) \$115.05.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) \$125.26.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$98.50.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) \$324.44.

A. Robert B. Smith, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$150.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$114.18.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$778.32. E. (9) \$1,120.80.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$265.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,260. E. (9) \$1,252.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$339.63. E. (9) \$249.50.

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) \$425. E. (9) \$732.57.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,429.64. E. (9) \$5,547.41.

A. Carl A. Soberblom, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$422.88.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Housing Association of America, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,025. E. (9) \$474.99.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$439.30.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,100.40. E. (9) \$4.76.

A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Spelser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Nicholas J. Spiezio, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,729. E. (9) \$3,749.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$350.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Claims in Cuba Committee, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Olive Association, Sheldon Building, San Francisco, Calif.; Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association of America, 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$81.34.

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) \$5,000. E. (9) \$396.68.

A. William M. Stover, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,984.84. E. (9) \$164.75.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$290.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$5,050.50. E. (9) \$683.84.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$475.

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.

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, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$37.47.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$475.

A. John T. Sun, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Faragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Credit Co., Post Office Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$327.02.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Faragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

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. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. John R. Sweeney, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

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.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Russell D. Tall, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$1,130.77. E. (9) \$681.60.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$23.50.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$138. E. (9) \$104.

A. William H. Tinney, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Penn Central Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Mfrs. & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$1,226.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,625. E. (9) \$258.53.

A. John H. Todd, Box 23, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$626.06. E. (9) \$1,075.38.

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) \$1,750. E. (9) \$2,445.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$55.70.

A. John P. Tracey, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$50.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$4.75.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,218.75. E. (9) \$49.81.

A. Bernard H. Trimble, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$100.55.

A. Joel B. True, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Nick Tullis, 607 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$100.

A. Richard F. Turney, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$287.84.

A. John D. Tyson.

B. International Paper Co., 220 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$369.60. E. (9) \$147.20.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 66 E. 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,521.62.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$629,183.26. E. (9) \$77,552.52.

A. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$215.65.

A. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$27,783.37.

A. The Universal Exchange, P.O. Box 8701, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) \$358.47.

A. Valicenti, Leighton, Reid & Pine, and Richard L. Goldman, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors, Inc., 50 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$417.46.

A. John A. Vance, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$4,080. E. (9) \$4,459.75.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.

D. (6) \$2,006.25. E. (9) \$480.

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. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$152. E. (9) \$18.15.

A. G. W. Vaughan, 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$288.08. E. (9) \$30.20.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

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) \$150.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$418.74.

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) \$215.38. E. (9) \$92.30.

A. Richard B. Walbert, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$1,340.26.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$4,493.44. E. (9) \$1,148.37.

A. Charles S. Walsh.

B. National Cable Television Assoc., Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$30.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,884.80. E. (9) \$3,586.16.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Richard D. Warden, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,712.50. E. (9) \$340.45.

A. James A. Warren, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$200.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Occupational Therapy Association, 251 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$285.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions, 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$460.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$800.

A. Charles A. Webb, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

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) \$8,750.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. American Motors Corporation, 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$66,666.67.

A. Robert L. Weneck, 9121 West 73d Street, Shawnee Mission, Kans.

B. Weneck International Marketers, Inc., 2 East Gregory, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$2,934. E. (9) \$69.29.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.

B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz.

E. (9) \$500.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$50.

A. John L. Wheeler, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Association.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 910 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., Box 8339, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Wickert, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,312.49. E. (9) \$4,296.94.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$250.

A. Billy Glen Wiley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$736. E. (9) \$11.98.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$13.75.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

E. (9) \$1.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Estate of Albert W. Small, care of Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.

E. (9) \$6.75.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinalt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N. Dak.

A. John Willard, Box 1772 Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$647.22.

A. Francis G. Williams.

B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$167.40.

A. Kenneth Williamson, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,262.61. E. (9) \$1,018.11.

A. Earl Wilson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$277.07. E. (9) \$65.30.

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) \$1,774.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

D. (6) \$1,774.

A. Peter A. Wilson, 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee to Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy.

E. (9) \$128.25.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La.

B. Pennzoll United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$326.71.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

B. Pennzoll United, Inc., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$335.76.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$2,079.

A. Clay B. Wolfe, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$416.60.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,020.80. E. (9) \$1,409.41.

A. James Woodside, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.

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. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Signal Companies, Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,671.87. E. (9) \$488.92.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 230 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Corporate Owners of One Bank, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$43.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$35.

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) \$600. E. (9) \$12.91.

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) 4,712.50. E. (9) \$423.05.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Ethyl Corp., Houston Chemical Co.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington International School.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Getty Oil Co.

A. John L. Zorack, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) 231.65.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1969:

(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. Aberman, Greene & Locker, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Toy Manufacturers of America, Inc., 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph G. Alterman, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Theater Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Unsubsidized Lines, 1824 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trading & Production Co., One North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

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.

A. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Mutual Fund Sponsors, Inc., 50 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co., 410 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington International School.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Collectors Association, 5011 Ewing Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of State Savings and Loan Supervisors, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Peoples Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph R. Brennan, 324 East Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryant & Stratton Junior College, 150 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council on Foundations, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Sargent Carleton, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Louis A. Cohn, c/o Super City Department Store, 710 North Stone Avenue, Tucson, Ariz.

A. Joseph S. Clark, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry J. Clay, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Realty Committee on Taxation, 299 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington International School, 3211 Volta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General American Transportation Corp., 120 South Riverside Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Toy Manufacturers of America, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. The Committee To Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Connor, 15 Bowden Avenue, Barrington, R.I.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, Inc., 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Casualty and Surety Agents, 83 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y.

A. Crowell, Collier & Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

A. F. Bosley Crowther 3d, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Daly Foundation for World Peace, 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

A. DeHart and Broide, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, News Press & Gazette Co., St. Joseph, Mo.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude J. Desautels, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., 121 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Mass.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, News Press & Gazette Co., St. Joseph, Mo.

A. Thomas J. Downey, 701 Central Trust, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Oil Shale Corp.

A. Ely, Bartlett, Brown & Proctor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

B. Massachusetts Federal Savings Council, Inc., 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A. The Faller Group, Inc., 1576 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond Garcia, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Hall.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Courier Corp., 2 Nevada Drive, Lake Success (NHP-PO), New York, N.Y.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ida Cason Callaway Foundation, Pine Mountain, Ga.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. S. Herlong, Jr.

B. Association of Southeastern Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Mae Hipsley, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Peter W. Hughes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John E. Hurley, 1101 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Calcium Chloride Institute, 909 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford J. Hynning, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee To Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy.

A. Industrial Mutual Association of Flint, 901 East Second Avenue, Flint, Mich.

A. Joint Labor and Management Committee To Save Free TV, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. T. Lawrence Jones, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edwin L. Kahn, 1000 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. B'nai Brith, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carlton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. King, Miller, Anderson, Nash & Yerke, 1200 American Bank Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Post Office Box 520, Pendleton, Oreg.

A. Herbert C. Kirstein, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Lee, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr., & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Marx Leva, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. Lynch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mail Advertising Industry League, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Maslow, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, 901 North Howard Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. George G. Mead, 128 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Theater Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul Menk, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Travel Agents Emergency Committee.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bank of New York.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. H. E. Butt Grocery Co., Highway 44, Corpus Christi, Tex.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp, Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex., and Transwestern Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.

A. Albert P. Morano, 7 Mallard Drive, Greenwich, Conn.

B. Gerli Co., Greenwich, Conn., Cheney Division, Manchester, Conn.

A. Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2611 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. National Association of Theater Owners, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 N. Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Robert B. Neville, 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.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael S. Olson, Post Office Box 2056, Raleigh, N.C.

B. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, Inc., Post Office Box 2056, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Judith E. Park, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Parsons, Tennent, Hammond, Hardig & Ziegelman, 600 Ford Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Comac Co., 1500 N. Woodward, Birmingham, Mich.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Boating Industry Association, 333 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Patton, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y.

A. Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska.

A. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va.

B. Crowell, Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. E. Lewis Reid, 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center, Calif.

A. Jacob Reuben, Route 130, Robbinsville, N.J.

B. Vahlsing Management Consultants, Inc., Route 130, Robbinsville, N.J.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. Michael J. Romig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. South Padre Investment Corp., Post Office Box 1086, South Padre Island, Tex.

A. Patricia A. Samuel, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edwin R. Schneider, Jr., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mail Advertisers Education Committee of the Major Mollers and Producers of the Mail Advertising Service Association International, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph H. Sharlitt, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mail Advertising Educational Committee of the Major Mollers and Producers of the Mail Advertising Service Association International, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sharon, Pierson & Semmes, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bankers National Life Insurance Co., 1 Sunset Avenue, Montclair, N.J.

A. Sidley & Austin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Elba Systems Corp., 5909 E. 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Smathers, Merrigan & O'Keefe, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maynard H. Smith, 184 Washington Avenue, Albany, N.Y.

B. National Committee for the Protection of Patriotic Americans, 184 Washington Avenue, Albany, N.Y.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Unsubsidized Lines, 1824 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2611 E. 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 S. Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Dairymen, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Claims in Cuba Committee, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Studebaker, 3636 16th Street Washington, D.C.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Norman A. Sugarman, 1956 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Olin Foundation, Inc., 1 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Sullivan, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Retired Persons and National Retired Teachers Association.

A. Surrey, Karask, Gould & Greene 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Prudential Lines, 1 Whitehall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Faragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Carnegie Corp. of New York, 589 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James R. Turnbull.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Valicenti, Leighton, Reid & Pine and Richard L. Goldman, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors, Inc., 50 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Vinson, Elkins, Searls & Connally, 2100 First City National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.; Transwestern Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.; Gulf Central Pipeline Co., 811 Dallas Avenue, Houston, Tex.

A. Charles S. Walsh.

B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Wayne Smith Co., 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter A. Wilson, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee To Maintain a Prudent Defense Policy.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington International School.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NAUGATUCK—HOME OF CHAMPIONS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell you and my colleagues that the championship of the American Legion New England baseball competition was won by a team of youngsters representing Naugatuck, Conn., Post No. 17, American Legion.

The Naugatuck team went on to the finals at Hastings, Nebr., and while not winning the national championship made an excellent showing, not only in performance of field but also in sportsmanship. One point I would call significant in the achievement of the Naugatuck team is that it was drawn from a community of some 19,000 residents and competed with teams drawn from cities of more than a quarter of a million. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the achievements of the team representing Naugatuck, Conn., Post No. 17 in the Legion competition are the pride of Naugatuck, the Fifth Congressional District, the State of Connecticut, and of all New England. I salute them for their splendid achievements and I include here an editorial which appeared in the August 29, 1969, Naugatuck Daily News and one which appeared in the August 27, 1969, Waterbury Republican, and a copy of a telegram which I had addressed to the team prior to the start of the finals in Hastings, Nebr.:

[From the Naugatuck (Conn.) Daily News, Aug. 29, 1969]

COMMUNITY PRIDE

Community pride is a wonderful thing. And if the residents of Naugatuck are just a bit puffed up these days, it is a legitimate matter of community pride.

For it isn't every day in the week that a community the size of Naugatuck can command national attention, whether it be in the world of sports or elsewhere.

Our Post 17 Legion baseball team has made Naugatuck a name with which to be reckoned in New England sports circles.

And, as of this writing, we hope that the team is going to make the name Naugatuck something to be reckoned with in national sports circles.

But, win or lose, the Post 17 team has stirred up a degree of community pride that is not to be underestimated.

In a broad sense, what the Post 17 Legion team has done is a matter of concern for every loyal Naugatuck resident.

There are those who were faithful until the last inning of the New England tournament by making the trip to Keene, N.H. day after day to root for the local squad.

There are those who sat with ears glued to radio sets during the New England tourney, even as they wished that they might have been present in person.

There are those who made the determined and expensive effort to get out to Hastings for the national tournament.

All of these have one thing in common—pride in Naugatuck.

That's why we are suggesting that many of our fellow citizens can avail themselves of an opportunity to contribute in a substantial way to the final success of this endeavor.

They can do it by buying "booster tickets" for the Legion Post, or by sending a check to The NEWS office, c/o Frederick E. Hennick, Treas. to help pay off the additional and unexpected costs which have arisen in the course of this championship adventure.

It's a matter of community pride.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Aug. 27, 1969]

NAUGATUCK'S PRIDE

Not only Naugatuck, but the entire state can take special pride in the New England victory by the American Legion Post baseball team. Only one other city has ever had a team reach the national finals. West Hartford won in both 1959 and 1961.

The Naugatuck nine swept through the regionals for New England at Keene, N.H., with but a single loss. Coach Steve Mastrianna and everyone on the team deserve the gratitude of all in the borough. Incidentally Mastrianna, a Waterburian, volunteered as coach last year when an appeal was issued for help.

Unfortunately, the time span between the regionals and the nationals in Hastings, Neb., was such that the borough could not really give the team a proper reception. They arrived at 2:30 in the morning and had to leave at 10:30 to catch their first plane to Nebraska.

Win or lose in the national finals, on their return the borough would do well to have a "day" for the youths. They are off to do the "battle of Hastings" with the best wishes of the entire state. These wishes may not be "ringing in their ears" but they are sincere.

Coach STEVE MASTRIANNA,
Naugatuck, Conn. Post 17 American Legion
Champions, National Legion Baseball
Tournament Headquarters, Hastings,
Nebr.:

Congratulations on your inspiring and sensational performance at Keene, New Hampshire leading to Region I American Legion Baseball Championship. I can assure you that all of the 5th Congressional District especially Naugatuck, and the State of Connecticut and New England, are joining with you in cheering you on to the attainment of your objective—the National Championship.

I send my best wishes and congratulations to the team, the coaching staff, the Post 17